

PART II: LEA APPLICATION
Title I School Improvement Funds
School Improvement Grant Application
May 1, 2010-- September 30, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS		
	LEA Application	L-1
	A. Assurances	L-1
	I. General Information	L-4
	A. Overview	L-4
	B. Funding Priority and Schools to be Served	L-6
	C. Funding	L-7
	D. Timeline and Milestones	L-7
	E. Reporting and Evaluation Requirements	L-8
	F. Application, Application Review and Grant Award	L-8
	II. SIG Schools	L-10
	A. Schools to be Served	L-10
	B. Tier I or III Schools Eligible to be in the State ASD	L-10
	C. Tier III Schools to be Served	L-11
	D. Schools that the LEA will not Serve	L-11
	III. LEA Annual Student Achievement Goals	L-12
	IV. LEA Descriptive Information	L-13
	V. LEA Capacity	L-14
	VI. Budget	L-17
	VII. School Level Descriptive Information	L-19
Appendix A	Tier I, II and III Schools (Determined in 2009-2010)	
Appendix B	Title I School Improvement Grant Rubric 2010-2013	
Appendix C	Tennessee School Improvement Planning Process (TSIPP) Component 4	
Appendix D	What is a Good School (WAGS)? Appraisal Guide & Rubric	
Appendix E	School Improvement Grant (SIG) Final Requirements	
Appendix F	Tennessee Pyramid of Intervention/Model Questions	
Appendix G	Framework for Tennessee Comprehensive Systemwide Planning Process (TCSPP) Component 5	
Appendix H	TCSPP 2008 Rating Sheet	
Appendix I	Tennessee School Improvement Planning Process(TSIPP) SIP Planning Rubric	
Appendix J	External Providers Form	
Appendix K	Budget Spreadsheet	

PART II: LEA APPLICATION
Title I School Improvement Funds
School Improvement Grant Application
May 1, 2010-- September 30, 2013

SCHOOL YEAR <u>2010-2013</u>		
Name of School District: Henderson County		
Address: 35 Wilson Street	City, State and Zip Code: Lexington, Tn. 38351	
Area Code/Telephone Number: 731-968-3661	Area Code/Fax Number: 731-968-9457	
District Grant Contact Person Judy Sanders	Title: Federal Programs Director	
Address: 35 Wilson Street	City, State and Zip Code: Lexington, Tn. 38351	
Telephone No.: 731-968-3661	Fax No.: 731-968-9457	E-Mail: Sandersj4@k12tn.net
A. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.		
<p>The LEA must assure that it will—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) Modify its practices and policies as necessary to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; 3) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the SDE’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SDE) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds; 4) 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; 5) Report to the SDE the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements; 6) The requirement that School Improvement Funds will be used only to supplement and not supplant; federal, state, and local funds a school or school district would otherwise receive; 7) The lower-tier certification covering lobbying and debarment/suspension under 34 CFR Parts 82 and 85; 8) Participation in evaluation studies conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, the Tennessee Department of Education, and the local school district; 9) Completing and submitting an end of the year written report to the Tennessee Department of Education documenting the use of these funds and the impact it has on school improvement. 		

<p>10) ARRA funds (Title I-A)</p> <p>A. Comply with all applicable laws and regulations including any directives or requirements from the Tennessee Recovery Act Management (TRAM) Office;</p> <p>B. Submit reporting requirements as specified by federal and state laws, regulations and/or policies;</p> <p>C. Track all ARRA funds and expenditures in separate budget accounts and categories as required.</p>		
<p>Print Name of Director of Schools (or designee): Steve Wilkinson</p>	<p>Signature of Director of Schools (or designee):</p>	<p>Sept. 14, 2010</p>
<p>Print Name of Board Chair: Jim Grant</p>	<p>Signature of Board Chair</p>	<p>Date Sept. 14, 2010</p>

Signatures of the NCLB Field Service Consultant and the local Title I director indicate the proposed plan verifies that the application addresses the designated purposes for the use of these School Improvement funds.

The School Improvement funds are appropriately allocated. The proposal is in substantially approvable form. The application will be forwarded to the Office of Federal Programs in Nashville for final approval.

<p>Name of School District: Henderson County</p>		
<p>Title I Director's Name: Judy Sanders</p>	<p>Title I Director's Signature:</p>	<p>Date Sept. 14, 2010</p>
<p>NCLB Field Service Consultant's Name: Debbie Browne</p>	<p>NCLB Field Service Consultant's Signature:</p>	<p>Date Sept. 14, 2010</p>

Review and Initial Approval Signature Page

If multiple schools are applying, complete the table below for each school with the signatures of the assigned Exemplary Educator, AGE, or STAT. The signature indicates awareness, not agreement with the application. (Copy and paste as many signature tables as necessary.)

School Name:		
Exemplary Educator/AGE Name:	Exemplary Educator/AGE Signature:	Date Sept. 14, 2010
STAT Name:	STAT's Signature:	Date

- five percent of all Title I high priority schools in the **ALL** subgroup for math and reading/language arts combined achievement or is a Title I secondary school (defined as a high school in TN) with a graduation rate of less than 60% (for two out of the last three years). In Tennessee, there are 10 identified Tier 1 schools in 2009-2010.
- **Tier 2** – Any Title I secondary school eligible but not “served” by Title I that is in the lowest five percent of these schools in the **ALL** subgroup for math and reading/language arts combined achievement or has a graduation rate of less than 60% (for two out of the last three years). In Tennessee, there are five identified Tier 2 schools for 2009-2010.

The State of Tennessee has the following process for identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools, referred to as Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools.

The lowest-achieving five percent is calculated by the numerical rank within each pool of schools (Title I high priority schools and Title I eligible but not served high schools). The numerical rank is determined based upon the following series of calculations:

- 1) The current year math score for all students is ranked;
- 2) The current year reading/language arts score for all students is ranked;
- 3) The math and reading/language arts ranks are summed for current year rank;
- 4) Two prior years are ranked using the same method;
- 5) Two prior year ranks are averaged for prior years rank;
- 6) Current year rank and prior years rank are summed to create the combined rank;
- 7) If a school has failed adequate yearly progress (AYP) 6 years or more, the combined rank was multiplied times 6 (lack of progress factor) for the final rank.

Notes:

High priority schools are defined as schools with an improvement status or those in improvement, corrective action, or any form of restructuring as specified in ESEA. Elementary and secondary schools are weighted equally.

Schools with N count less than 10 for AYP determinations that are not in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring have been removed from the school list and are not included in the rankings.

PK-2 schools with no AYP status from a receiving school have been removed from the school list and are not included in the ranking.

For schools serving both grade spans, high school achievement data is used.

Secondary schools are defined as high schools.

In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model

Tier 3

In addition, Tier 3 schools are any Title I high priority school (a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as defined in ESEA) that is not Tier 1; therefore, did not rank in the lowest 5% of all Title I high priority schools in the **ALL** subgroup for math and reading/language arts achievement nor is a high priority high school with a graduation rate of less than 60%.

Tier 3 newly eligible schools only include Title I secondary (TN high schools) who successfully participated in high school SIG redesign funds in 2008-09 and did not make AYP for two years (2007-08 and 2006-07).

A. Funding Priority and Schools to be Served

The goal of School Improvement ‘g’ funds is to target persistently lowest-achieving schools to implement robust and comprehensive reforms to transform school culture dramatically and increase student outcomes.

The SDE has posted a listing of all Tier I, II, and III schools on the Federal Program Website: <http://tennessee.gov/education/fedprog/index.shtml> . The required National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification number is on the posted list. The LEA must complete a chart for schools that it commits to serve, a chart for state achievement school district, a chart for renewal schools intervention, and another chart for schools it will ***not*** serve. A description of the allowable intervention models for Tier I and Tier II are located in the final requirements. Renewal interventions for Tier III schools that are in correction action or restructuring 1 status will be posted on the state website.

LEAs should refer to the chart below which describes Tiers that must be served to receive SIG funds. In addition, the SDE funding priorities listed under the Funding section of this grant application should be reviewed by the LEA.

If an LEA has one or more . . .	In order to get SIG funds, the LEA <u>must</u> commit to serve . . .
--	---

Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school <i>OR</i> at least one Tier II school
Tier I and Tier II schools, but no Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school <i>OR</i> at least one Tier II school ¹
Tier I and III schools, but no Tier II schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier II and Tier III schools, but no Tier I schools	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II and Tier III schools as it wishes
Tier I schools only	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve
Tier II schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II schools as it wishes
Tier III schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier III schools as it wishes

B. Funding

Each LEA will be given a score that represents the applicant's demonstration of need for the funds and its commitment to meet the goals for improvement. Successful LEA applicants are awarded a minimum of \$50,000 and up to \$2,000,000 annually per school for the term of the grant. Grant awards will be determined based upon the complexity of the intervention model, size of the school, and costs typically associated with the intervention model. Funds are prioritized by:

- Tier I and Tier II schools,
- Tier III that are eligible for the ASD,
- Tier III schools that are renewal schools (schools in corrective action or restructuring I status),
- Tier III high schools currently implementing High School ReDesign,
- Tier III high schools not currently implementing High School ReDesign,
- Tier III middle schools, and
- Tier III elementary schools.

Grants are renewable for the two subsequent years, contingent upon appropriated federal SI funds and progress in implementing and meeting the student achievement goals established by the LEA and approved by the SDE. Each LEA/school will be required to submit an update to its grant, including budget and program information, in order to receive the grant renewal.

C. Timelines and Milestones

LEAs awarded discretionary SI grants that continue to meet the program and student achievement requirements may be funded for two additional years, pending federal SI funding and a successful year one project. Examples of how the SDE will monitor year one progress include:

- 1) Documentation of how the LEA TCSPP and the school(s) improvement plans were amended to incorporate the activities, timelines, and milestones for implementation of the intervention model or evidence-based school improvement strategies identified in the application.
- 2) Appropriate use of SIG funds to implement research-and evidence-based school improvement strategies identified in the LEA application for each school for which SI funds were provided.
- 3) Implementation of the strategies according to the timeline provided in the LEA and school level descriptive information.
- 4) Increased achievement in the ALL or subgroup category where the school did not meet the LEA or SDE benchmarks

D. Reporting and Evaluation Requirements

Applicants awarded SI grant funds must satisfy periodic reporting and accountability requirements throughout the term of the grant. These requirements address (a) fiscal accountability, (b) program accountability, (c) fiscal and program reporting, (d) site visits, and (e) internal evaluation.

1. Fiscal Accountability

Each identified school and LEA receiving SI grant funds is responsible for carrying out its school improvement responsibilities under section 1116(b) and (c), respectively.

2. Program Accountability

Each LEA and school receiving a SI grant is responsible for carrying out its school improvement responsibilities in accordance with its approved grant application and action plan.

3. Fiscal and Program Reporting Requirements

SI grantees must submit at least quarterly expenditure reports and implementation progress reports to the SDE. The LEA is responsible for ensuring that reports are accurate, complete, and submitted on time. Each district must agree to respond to data requests from SDE and USED including EdFACTS data.

4. Site Visits by SDE Representatives

LEAs and their schools must agree to site visits which will validate information provided in expenditure and progress reports and gather more detailed information on implementation efforts and challenges.

5. Internal Evaluation

LEAs and schools funded under the SI grant program will create and use data systems that include formative and summative assessments to provide staff, students, and parents, and community/business partners continuous feedback, to identify program processing and practices that are resulting in improved teaching and learning and to identify and make adjustments where needed. A report must be sent to the state annually to include leadership team and milestone meeting notes.

E. Application, Application Review and Grant Award Process

1) Application Submission

- a. There is no word count limit in the text boxes.
- b. The LEA must submit the School portion for each school they intend to serve.
- c. The LEA must submit the SIG application electronically to Jacqueline.M.Moore@tn.gov.
- d. A paper copy of ONLY the first two pages of the application must be submitted with original signatures. The LEA should keep a copy of the signed application. These two pages must be sent in to Jacqueline Moore at the address listed below:

Jacqueline Moore
TN State Department of Education, Office of Federal Programs
5th floor – Andrew Johnson Tower
710 James Robertson Pkwy
Nashville, TN 37243-0379

- e. The SDE will make a paper copy of the entire application from the LEA electronic file.

2) Criteria and Scoring System

The SDE will organize and coordinate the SI grant application readers and scoring. Application readers will rate each application on its own merits. Readers will rate the applications according to how well an application reflects rubric expectations. The scoring rubric is located in Appendix B.

3) Determination of Award Amounts

The SDE reserves the right to fund applications at a lesser amount if the grant application does not fully justify the budget expenditures.

4) Award Notification

Successful applicants will be notified within 60 days of the application closing date. Information will also be posted on the SDE Federal Programs website.

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	Transformation
Lexington High School	470180000603			X				
Scotts Hill High School	470180001427			X				

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

B. TIER I OR III SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE TO BE IN THE STATE ACHIEVEMENT SCHOOL DISTRICT (ASD):

An LEA must identify Tier I or III schools eligible to be in the ASD and mark if it will be requesting an exemption from the ASD.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER III	ASD	EXEMPTION REQUEST

II. SIG Schools

C. TIER III SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the Tier III schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve and identify the state model that the LEA will use in Tier III schools that are renewal schools by Tennessee's definition, which are schools in corrective action or restructuring I status.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	RENEWAL SCHOOLS INTERVENTION			
		TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

D. SCHOOLS THAT THE LEA WILL NOT SERVE:

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA will not serve.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III

III. LEA Annual Student Achievement Goals

The district must list the annual goals for student achievement on the SDE's assessments in **both reading/language arts and mathematics AND applicable graduation or attendance rate** (whichever is applicable) that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds. This list should be part of the LEA's TCSPP. Please attach the Component 5 and any other applicable section of your updated TCSPP. Indicate in the box how many pages are attached.

Goal 1: Henderson County Schools will increase ACT Composite scores to the state average or above.

Goal 2: Henderson County Schools will attain the Graduation Rate Benchmark of 90% or more for each high school annually.

Goal 3: Henderson County Schools will improve student academic achievement on the reading/language arts in order to meet or exceed the 2010-11 benchmark goals of 97% proficient/advanced.

Goal 4: Henderson County Schools will continue to meet or exceed the 2010-11 benchmark goal of 91% proficient/advanced on the Math EOC/Gateway.

Component 5 attached

IV. LEA Descriptive Information

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

- 1) If the LEA is **not** applying to serve each **Tier I** school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school. Must match the table labeled ‘Schools That The LEA WILL NOT Serve’ in section E:

N/A

- 2) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—

- a) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;

N/A

- b) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;

N/A

- c) Align other resources with interventions and update and attach TCSPP Component 5. Provide a budget narrative describing how the resources, as indicated below will support intervention activities.

- Describe federal resources to support the interventions/activities.
- Describe state and local resources to support the interventions/activities.
- Describe community or other resources to support the intervention/activities.

Federal resources support the following interventions:

A+LS and E4TN are provided for credit recovery as well as additional coursework. Graduation Coaches have been put in place in both high schools to monitor at risk students. A district Data Specialist position has been established to assist with data analysis and implement research based strategies for school improvement. Opportunities are provided for teachers to attend professional development workshops, conferences, etc. to improve teaching strategies and student achievement.

State and Local resources support the following interventions:

A district wide “At Risk” Coordinator will monitor student achievement and assist in the development of an action plan for on time graduation. A district Grant Writer will research available grants to support classroom teachers and enhance student performance. Professional development opportunities are supported through local resources.

- d) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. The LEA will provide:

- Name of School Improvement Grant Coordinator or other person who will address policy and procedural barriers throughout the implementation of the grant. (This responsibility will be included in the roles of the SIG Coordinator p. L-14.);

- Date of review and status of LEA board policy;
- Date of review and status of LEA practices or procedures;
- Date of review and status of handbooks of schools receiving SIG funds;
- The LEA shall describe topic(s) requiring modification and current progress of these modifications.

The School Improvement Grant Coordinator will address policies and procedural barriers throughout the implementation of the grant. The review of district board policies, practices/procedures, and school handbooks will be completed within 30 days of grant award notification. TCSPP has been modified and amended according to the most current data available. The Henderson County Attendance Policy has been revised with more rigorous guidelines. The language of school handbooks has been changed to provide more uniformity throughout the district. The curriculum of the Juvenile Academy has been more closely aligned with the regular school setting. Students are provided with computers to have individual access to all TCAP tested subjects. A Data Specialist will analyze data to provide strategies for improvement. The “At-Risk” Coordinator position has been changed from part time to a full time position to allow adequate time to monitor graduation/dropout rate data and to work with identified students.

- e) Describe actions the LEA will take or has taken to demonstrate how the reform changes will be sustained after the funding period ends.
- Identify resources, including but not limited to federal, state, and local education funding.
 - Describe the level and amount of technical assistance and professional development to schools and staff in each year of the grant funding.
 - Detail any Board-adopted policies and practices pertinent to recruiting and retaining effective teachers and leaders in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

The district will continue to recruit and retain effective teachers and leaders by posting employment opportunities on the district website, in the local schools, and by attending career fairs at local colleges. The district grant writer will seek other sources of funding for sustaining grant interventions/activities. Federal and local resources are utilized to provide professional development based on school/classroom data. The district provides technical assistance through a team comprised of a Technology Director, Technology Instruction Coordinator, and Computer Technician. Some of the responsibilities of this team are: coordinating and maintaining parent communication through district, school, and teacher websites, Parent Portal and School Messenger.

- f) Other LEA level activities designed to support implementation that might be mentioned in the school budget.

An additional Graduation Coach has been added in the high school with greatest number of students. The “At Risk” Coordinator position has been changed from a part time to a full time position. A School Improvement Grant Coordinator position will be added to oversee the management of the grant and address policies and procedural barriers throughout the implementation.

- 3) Timeline and Milestones. The LEA must include a timeline with quarterly milestones delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and

Tier II schools identified in the LEA's application.

N/A

- 4) Consultation with Stakeholders. As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. List your stakeholders and consultation dates as appropriate.

N/A

- 5) Internal Evaluation. LEAs and schools funded under the SI grant program will create and use data systems that include formative and summative assessments to provide staff, students and parents, and community/business partners continuous feedback, to identify program processing and practices that are resulting in improved teaching and learning and to identify and make adjustments where needed. A report must be sent to the state annually to include leadership team and milestone meeting notes. Please briefly describe your process to create internal evaluations of your SI grant.

The Grant Facilitator will address policies and procedural barriers throughout the implementation of the grant and be responsible for scheduling the quarterly meetings. The leadership team will examine all assessment data and/or documentation in order to determine the effectiveness of the action steps. A grant organizer will be used as a means to facilitate this process. An annual report will be sent to the state department that will include leadership team and milestone meeting notes.

V. LEA Capacity

LEA CAPACITY

A. General Capacity. The LEA is required to indicate its capacity to serve schools. The SDE will look at such areas as number of Tier I and Tier II schools, access/proximity to higher performing schools (closure model); recruiting ability for principals, especially for rural areas (turnaround and transformation models); EMO/CMO availability and capacity (restart model); relationship with teachers union; school board commitment; timeline, etc., in reviewing the LEA's capacity.

If the SDE determines that the LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates, the SDE will require that the LEA fulfill the requirements or release that portion of the grant funds.

Please describe your capacity to utilize school improvement funds.

N/A

B. LEA SIG Leadership. The LEA that accepts Title I 1003 (g) school improvement funds agrees to establish a district support team to oversee the implementation of the selected models in Tier I and Tier II schools as well as the strategies that the LEA will implement in Tier III schools. Moreover, the LEA commits to assign or hire a School Improvement Grant (SIG) Coordinator. This position can be funded with SIG funds. This coordinator will lead the district support team and facilitate the implementation of the grant at the school sites. The team will support, monitor, and assess the progress for the identified schools. One member must be the Federal Programs Director. Complete the table on next page.

Name of SIG Coordinator: (if not hired or assigned, insert TBD in box) TBA

SIG Coordinator 's E-Mail address: TBA

District Support Team				
Members	Title	Responsibility	Tier Assignment e.g. Tier I Tier II or Tier III schools	Estimate of the time each member will devote to supporting Tier I, II, and III schools (Hours/Month)
Leader: TBD	Grant Facilitator	Oversee the implementation of the SIG grants at both high schools and will address policies and procedural barriers throughout the implementation of the grant	Tier III	100 day contract Approx. 70 hrs./month
Judy Sanders	Federal Programs Director	Monitor the implementation of the SIG grant	Tier III	5 hrs./month
Tim Rogers	Secondary Supervisor	Serve on the district support team to monitor the implementation of the grant	Tier III	5 hrs./month
David Weatherford	Juvenile Academy	Serve on the district support team to monitor	Tier III	5 hrs./month

	Principal	the implementation of the grant		
Karla Morris	Data Analysis Coach	Serve on the district support team		5 hrs./month
a. How often will the LEA 1003(g) district support team meet? Quarterly or as needed				
b. How often will they report on their work and the work on Tier I, II, and III schools to the superintendent? Quarterly or as requested				
c. How often will they report on their work and the work on Tier I, II, and III schools to the Board of Education? Monthly or as requested				
d. Has the LEA 1003(g) district support team met prior to the submission of the grant application to review the individual school descriptions and to discuss how it will coordinate and manage the support, monitoring and assessment outlined in those plans? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If no, briefly describe the plans for the district support team to begin work on the Tier I, II, and III schools.				

C. School-level Leadership. For Tier I and Tier II schools, the LEA must submit resumes for school principals utilizing the turnaround or transformation model and describe search process used to attract an effective leader who can enact significant reform.

Attributes of the principal should include:

- good communication skills with community leaders, parents, teachers, and students;
- thorough knowledge of rigorous curriculum standards; instructional leadership;
- data driven decision making skills;
- experience in turning around a school;
- committed to high student achievement;
- skill to recruit and retain effective teachers and staff; etc.

The effective practices and indicators for principals:

- The Principal takes time early in the process to gain a thorough understanding of the school's operations and develop a plan of action;
- The Principal relentlessly pursues significantly improved results in student learning and related goals;
- The Principal engages, motivates, and enlists the contribution of people inside the school and in the community to achieve school goals; and
- The Principal creates metrics to measure, report, and constructively review progress on all aspects of the school's operations and its results (student learning).²

Describe your search process for effective leaders:

Number of principal resumes attached:

²Indicators of Effective Practice (Rapid Improvement Leader) Center on Innovation & Improvement
http://www.centerii.org/handbook/Resources/Appendix_Indicators_Rapid.pdf

D. External Providers (All Schools)

If external providers are to be funded as collaborative partners, describe how the LEA will recruit, screen and select external providers to ensure their quality.

Please attach your district protocol for evaluating external providers. This protocol should contain an analysis of the connection between the external provider's experience/expertise and the district and schools needs.

Complete form in Appendix J about external providers, if applicable, and attach to your application

Please check appropriate box if Appendix J is attached. Yes No

E. Professional Development (All Schools)

Each school must include a minimum of 30% of the grant funds for ongoing professional development including job-embedded training designed to build capacity and support staff. This includes literacy training for the staff unless the school demonstrates proficiency in this area.

Who in the LEA will ensure implementation of professional development plans with SIG funds?

VI. Budget

BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.
- Three-year budgets (SY 10-11, SY11-12, and SY12-13) are required for all Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools. The budget must be of sufficient size and scope to implement the intervention model or intervention selected for each Tier I, II and III school the LEA commits to serve.
- Any LEA-level activities to support implementation of a school's intervention model or strategies that are funded by the grant must be reflected in the district portion of the grant budget.

School improvement budget spreadsheets (Excel format) and justifications must be completed for the LEA and each school requesting funds (See Appendix K (a separate document)). Both tabs are necessary for the application. The budget must be detailed using the SDE’s budget codes and include a budget narrative fully explaining each budget line item.

First Tab of Excel Spreadsheet: Budget Spreadsheet

Revenue section for grants for Title I 1003 (g)

- Line 1: Insert submission date.
- Line 4: Insert LEA name
- Line 5: Insert LEA number (three digit number)
- Beginning in column I (for **Title I 1003 (g)** recipients) on line 7: Click in the cell containing the text “(School Name)” and enter the name of one funded school receiving funds from the **Title I 1003 (g) SI grant**. Press the “Enter” key to display the name of the school in all other appropriate cells.
- Beginning in **Column E on line 9** (FY10 LEA/School Status): Click in the cell and select the high priority status of the LEA from the drop-down list displayed. Click in **Column I, line 9** and select the status for each funded school from the drop-down list.
- Beginning in Column I on line 10 (FY 2010 SI Grant Award/Allocation): Insert each funded school’s budget for the year. (e.g. If your budget is \$350,000, enter “350000” and the spreadsheet will format your entry appropriately.) Repeat on line 10 in both columns J and K to display the entire three-year budget for the school.
- Enter the district portion of each school’s total award in columns E, F and G, if applicable. The spreadsheet is formatted to total the budget amount entered in columns E through K and will enter the combined total on line 10 in Column D. The amount displayed in Column D, line 10 **cannot exceed the total school award** for the three-year grant period.

- In Column I, line 11, select the Intervention Model to be used by the displayed school.

Appropriations section

*The first two columns are “frozen” so you can scroll over to the appropriate column for each year’s budget and have the descriptions right next to the cells where you **enter the budgeted amounts.***

- **Lines 18-176:** Insert proposed appropriations for the district and the funded school. (e.g. district-wide are expenses such as teachers who provide district-wide services) Each category’s sub-total will automatically calculate.
- **Line 13, Check cell:** Look to see that the budget minus expenditures equals zero.

Second Tab of Excel Spreadsheet: Budget Justification Sheet

- On line 1, the LEA name and LEA number will auto fill from the spreadsheet, so no entry is needed. The cells are locked.
- Complete the Justification cells for those items by year.
- Beginning on line 9, enter one account number/line item number per section/line for each budgeted item on tab 1. (e.g. 71100/722) Press “Tab” to go to the next column.
- Enter the line item description matching that line item number in the first column. (e.g. IF you entered 71100/722 in the first column, the description typed in the second column would be “Regular Instructional Equipment”.) Press “Tab” to go to the Justification columns.
- For each year that district-wide and funded school expenses included line item 71100/722, enter a detailed justification for that expense. (If the justification is the same for multiple years, type the justification in the first applicable column and then “copy and paste” the information in the other applicable columns.)
- Once the description has been entered, press “Alt-Enter” two times and enter the total cost for the line item being funded by the district or school funds.
- Press the “Tab” key to go to the next column.
- Continue for each line item budgeted with these grants.

VII. School Level Descriptive Information

An LEA must submit this section for each individual school. A separate template is included with the application package so the LEA can create a separate electronic file for each school served. Label each electronic file with the LEA name and School name.

A. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information for each school in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Name of School: Lexington High School

Principal Name for SY10-11: Steve Lindsey

(mark TBD if unknown at this time)

Tier: I II III

(Please check appropriate tier)

Needs of School: All and disaggregated Student Achievement Data (Insert most recent TSIP data, not AYP data, for math, reading/language arts, graduation or attendance rate by all students and subgroups)(copy and paste data into the box): **Lexington High School**

Report Card Findings

Identified Strengths:

2008 State Report Card data indicates that LHS is at or above state levels of achievement in Algebra I and Writing. Ninety-five percent of all students taking the Algebra I Gateway Test scored proficient or advanced for 2009. Ninety-four percent of all students taking the English Gateway Test scored proficient or advanced for the 2009 school year. The writing assessment is also above state average for the three-year period of 2007-2009.

2009 TVAAS data indicates that LHS scored “above” in 2009 on the Algebra I Gateway Test as well as above for the three year period of 2007-2009. The data also shows that Lexington High school scored “NDD” on the 11th grade Writing Assessment Test for 2009, but scored above the state average for the three year period of 2007-2009. The English II Gateway and the English I EOC scored “NDD” for three year period of 2007-2009.

Non-academic Report Card data indicates that our graduation rate improved from 75.6 in 2007 to 87.4% in 2008, and dropped slightly to 86.2 in 2009. It also indicates that LHS’s attendance rate is above the state goal. Exam exemption for exemplary attendance is one reason that students miss less school and are in class more, thus keeping attendance high. Our event dropout rate is also well under the state benchmark of 5.0.

Credit Recovery reports indicate that the Credit Recovery Program is making a positive difference in the lives of students who need a second chance in a course. Student report card data is examined to determine which students qualify for this program. Twenty-three students graduated due to graduation requirements being met in credit recovery during the 2008-2009

school year.

Another boost to the graduation rate is the e⁴ TN online classes. Reports from this program indicate that seven students earned credit for courses needed for graduation. This number had increased from three the previous year.

Student surveys indicate that the majority of LHS students do not hold an outside job, nor are they overly committed to clubs and organizations outside of school.

Identified Needs:

Report card data demonstrates that the 3-year state average for English II exceeds that of LHS, as well as U.S. History and Foundations II. English, math, reading, and science are below state average in both the Plan test and the ACT test. Courses to improve ACT scores would be a benefit to students in high school as well as after high school. Report card data also shows that all courses, with the exception of Physical Science, are not meeting the needs of students with disabilities.

2009 TVAAS data indicates that U.S. History EOC Test scores were “Below” for 2009, 2008, and 2007; English II Gateway Test 3-Year average is “Below”. Both the PLAN and ACT scores for 2009 were deemed “Below.”

Report card non-academic data shows that while our graduation rate improved from 75.6% in 2007 to 87.4% in 2008, it still needs to increase from 86.2% in 2009 to 90% to meet state benchmarks for 2010. It also indicates that cohort dropout rate has been consistently higher than the state benchmark of 10% for the years of 2006-2008; 2009 data is yet to be published.

Perkins reports indicate that the CTE program at LHS needs improvement in tracking the placement of graduating seniors as well as skills proficiency.

Note: New sources of data that have been added through our High School Redesign Grant initiatives have yet to be analyzed because there is no significant data to be collected to date - the programs are too new. They are listed in our sources because they will be a significant source of information this year once they are fully employed.

TEMPLATE 1.6: Report Card Data Disaggregation
(Rubric Indicator 1.6)

Report Card Data Disaggregation

Proficiency Level Disaggregation:

- Race/Ethnicity
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficiency (LEP)
- Gender
- Proficiency Level Disaggregation
- Growth Differences between High, Middle, and Low Achievers

Lexington High School scored 95% Advanced / Proficient for Algebra I and 94% Advanced / Proficient in English II. The score for eleventh grade writing Assessment was an exemplary 4.0. The Biology Gateway scores will not be published until November of 2008.

By Sub-Groups

■ **Race / Ethnicity**

According to 2009 AYP data, white students scored 97% Advanced / Proficient in Algebra I and 94% Advanced / Proficient in Reading / Language plus Writing.

African American students scored 89% Advanced / Proficient in Algebra I and 93% Advanced / Proficient in Reading / Language plus Writing.

LHS did not have enough Hispanic, Native American, or Asian / Pacific Islanders to be statistically significant. However, it is noteworthy that while Hispanic students scored 100% A/P in Algebra I in both 2007 and 2008 it fell to 67% in 2009, Reading/Language plus Writing scores fell from 100% in 2007 to 50% in 2008 but increased to 86% in 2009.

Priority for student performance: Maintain the very similar scores demonstrated among all White and African-American students; increase Algebra I, Reading/Language plus Writing AYP scores for Hispanic students.

■ **Economically Disadvantaged**

LHS had economically disadvantaged students who scored 93% Advanced / Proficient in Algebra I, while scoring 91% Advanced / Proficient in Reading / Language plus Writing, according to 2009 AYP data.

Priority for student performance: AYP scores for ED students will stay on par with other student subgroups.

■ **Students with Disabilities**

These students improved from 33% Advanced / Proficient in Algebra I in 2007 to 89% in 2008 but fell in 2009 to 79%; and fell from 86% Advanced / Proficient in Reading / Language plus Writing in 2007 to 76% in 2008 and fell again in 2009 to 73%.

Priority for student performance: Scores for students with disabilities will continue to improve across subject areas, but particularly in Reading/Language plus Writing.

■ **Limited English Proficiency (LEP)**

LHS had limited English proficiency students who scored 100% Advanced / Proficient in Reading / Language plus Writing; no students in this category for Algebra I.

■ **Gender**

The state report card will be published in November of 2009 and data is not available at this time for this subgroup.

Priority for student performance: Students of both sexes will demonstrate academic gains.

■ **Proficiency Disaggregation**

Specific information is included in the state report card, which is published in November 09.

■ **Growth Difference between High, Middle, and Low Achievers**

The difference between high, middle, and low achievers can be seen by comparing the quintiles with 1 representing the lowest achievers and 5 comparably being the highest achievers.

In all Gateway subjects there is less than 14% in the lowest quintile and over 18% in the highest quintile. Algebra I has the highest count in Quintile V, while English II and Biology have their highest count in quintile IV.

Priority for student performance: Students will demonstrate continued academic gains across the quintiles in all subject areas.

TEMPLATE 1.7: Narrative Synthesis of All Data
(Rubric Indicator 1.7)

Narrative Synthesis of Data

Analysis of the data collected for Component 1b not only helps to identify the critical areas of strength and need for LHS, but also reflects the commitment to excellence and on-going growth that is the unifying and driving force behind all our stakeholders, and demonstrates the tireless efforts of our administrators and teachers.

The big picture for LHS indicates academic growth and non-academic gains. This is illustrated in the data and based on the actions of:

- Having TVAAS 3-year average scores that are “above” in Algebra I and Writing
- Raising our TVAAS 3-year average in English II from “below” to “NDD” in 2009
- Having 95% P/A in Algebra I and 94% P/A in English II for 2009, demonstrating we are moving toward meeting the NCLB goal of 100% by 2014
- Maintaining attendance rates that are above state standards
- Earning “Above” TVAAS 3-year average scores in Algebra I and Writing for 2007-2009

- Having 100% of our LEP students score P/A in Reading/Language Arts plus Writing
- Identifying more students who need help in the form of tutoring, credit recovery, or online classes by efficiently evaluating formative and summative classroom assessments and student grades
- Providing students who have transportation issues the opportunity to do credit recovery and E4TN during the Learning Enrichment Block of the school day
- Encouraging students to attend school daily and stay cognitively “checked in” by providing incentives like exam exemption and Renaissance rewards
- Cooperating across departments and with CTE programs to use data effectively to identify student needs and place them in courses of study best suited to their goals

The other side of the picture reminds all stakeholders that there is still much to be done as we move toward the NCLB benchmarks for 2014:

- Our Biology I Gateway TVAAS scores are “below” for the 3-year average of 2007-2009.
 - Our U.S. History EOC Test AYP scores remain below the state benchmark, and our TVAAS scores have been “below” for the past 3 years.
 - Our graduation rate fell from 87.4 to 86.2 in 2009, and is still below the benchmark of 90%.
 - Our English II Gateway TVAAS scores indicate that we fell from -1.5 in 2008 to -1.8 in 2009.
 - Our Plan and ACT scores are below the state average and “below” on TVAAS.
 - Students with disabilities are below the NCLB benchmark in Reading/Language plus Writing, falling from 76% P/A in 2008 to 73% in 2009. They also fell from 89% P/A in Algebra I in 2008 to 79% in 2009.
-
- TVAAS Writing scores fell from “above” in 2008 to “NDD” in 2009, though we remain “above” for the 3-year average.
 - English I EOC TVAAS results are still negative numbers, even though the overall scores have indicated “NDD” for the past three years.
 - TVAAS scores across the upper quintiles need to be improved in all EOC/AYP testing areas.

Based on the data, the following areas of strength and need were determined:

Critical Strengths

- All stakeholders have been working together to improve our AYP scores, TVAAS effect, graduation rate, and dropout rate and to maintain continued progress toward the 2014 NCLB benchmarks. Students with academic needs are being identified more quickly and efficiently, and appropriate strategies are being employed to help increase both academic and nonacademic areas.
- A new organizational structure has been put into place, block scheduling, in an effort to help students have more opportunities to earn the credits they need for graduation, and to allow the Learning Enrichment Block to be employed to remediate all students at all grade levels.
- AYP and TVAAS 3-year average scores are above the state average in Algebra I, and Writing.
- CTE and regular education teachers are working together to give students maximum opportunities for success in the real world of work.

Critical Needs

- The graduation rate is still short of the 90% NCLB benchmark.
- Our ACT and Plan test scores are well below the state average and scored “below” on TVAAS.
- Algebra I and English II test scores are still short of 100% proficient and advanced, the 2014 NCLB benchmark. Reading/Language plus Writing AYP scores fell from 95% in 2008 to 94% in 2009.
- Biology I Gateway and U.S. History EOC test AYP and TVAAS scores are under the state average and are not meeting NCLB benchmarks.

- Students with disabilities are below the 93% NCLB AYP benchmark for 2009 in Reading/Language plus Writing, scoring 73%.

School Achievement and Goals for other Indicators: Attach an electronic copy of your TSIP Action Plan (Component 4) to your application.

Professional Development: Each school must include a minimum of 30% of the grant funds for ongoing professional development including job-embedded training designed to build capacity and support staff. This includes literacy training for the staff unless the school demonstrates proficiency in this area. Provide your school's PD plan including topics and projected dates.

1. Literacy Workshop during an Administrative Day at the beginning of school year 2010-2011.
2. AP Class training for instructors and integral staff members during school year 2010-2011 in preparation for the following school year.
3. Professional development on data analysis/disaggregation to be provided to entire staff by personnel from the SDE during staff development on September 3, 2010.
4. Professional development for graduation coaches, who will be an integral part of at risk student intervention. This will include the E-4TN Conference on June 22-23, 2010, the Lead Conference in September 2010, the School Counseling Institute in February 2011, and the Title I Conference in April 2011.
5. Professional development for integral staff members throughout the course of the school year. For example, Lead Conference, Breaking Ranks Conference, TASSE, etc.

For a Tier I and Tier II school only: State your rationale for selecting your intervention model.

Questions contained in Appendix F and *Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants* should be addressed in this rationale. (Turnaround, Restart, Closure, Transformation as listed on the ‘Schools To Be Served’ table)

Model

- Answers: 1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.

Rationale:

For Renewal Schools ONLY: List the intervention and describe rationale for choosing the state intervention (on the state’s website):

Intervention:

Rationale:

For Tier III Focus Schools ONLY: List the intervention activities the school will implement.

Lexington High School has restructured the Learning Enrichment Block to implement in-depth ACT online Prep, Write to Learn, End of Courses Coach Books, and other test preparation activities to improve and enhance all students’ testing skills. Lexington High School leadership team will be analyzing test data and reviewing testing and academic materials to improve students’ academic abilities. Several teachers and staff members will be attending AP conferences to incorporate AP courses for the coming school year (2011-2012) at Lexington High School.

For a Tier I, Tier II or Tier III school: Describe your implementation plan including quarterly milestone goals for each year and three-year timeline.

2010-2011 school year will be as follows: The 9th Grade Academy will be using English 9, Biology, and Algebra I EOC coach books during LE. Ninth graders will also be introduced to the Write to Learn program. 10th Grade students will use English 10 EOC coach books, the Real ACT Prep books, the ACT Online Prep program, and the Write to Learn program. 11th Grade students will use Algebra II and U.S. History coach books, the ACT Online Prep program, and the Write to Learn program. 12th grade students will use the WinWay Resume Writing program, the Write to Learn program, and will utilize LE to compile and complete a senior portfolio that will serve as their Senior Capstone Project. In addition to the framework for the LE block, AP courses will be identified and implemented into the 2011-2012 curriculum.

Milestones will be as follows:

- July 30, 2010 required in-service will be used to introduce the new LE assignments and activities to the faculty and staff.
- By August 31, 2010, staff training will be provided in the following areas; Write to Learn, ACT Prep Online, and Literacy workshop.
- September 3, 2010 staff development will be used for data analysis training from the SDE for the entire staff.
- Each Leadership Team Meeting for the 2010-2011 school year will be used to evaluate and analyze specific student data such as but not limited to ACT Prep online usage, Write to Learn usage, EOC scores, PLAN scores, TVASS scores, etc.
- By August 31, 2010, a rubric will be developed to evaluate the activities of the Learning and Enrichment block.
- The LE Evaluation Rubric will be implemented September 1, 2010 and will be evaluated by the end of the fall semester 2010.
- **September 30, 2010 – Quarterly Evaluation Visits– review and analyze progress**
- Quarterly evaluations will be made throughout the course of each grading period for the 2010-2011 school year to determine the effectiveness of the Learning and Enrichment block. This will be accomplished by measuring student progress within specified LE activities in accordance to timelines set forth by the administration.
- After school tutoring will begin at the end of the 1st Nine weeks for the 2010-2011 school year.
- By the end of the 1st Nine Weeks, AP courses will have been identified and selected for the 2011-2012 school year.
- By the end of the 2nd Nine Weeks, faculty members will have been selected and sent to training for the upcoming AP course offerings.
- **January 31, 2011 – Quarterly Evaluation Visitations – review and analyze progress**

- **March 30, 2011 & May 15, 2011 – Quarterly Evaluation Visits**
- By the end of the spring semester 2011, AP courses will be included in the registration material for school year 2011-2012.

ARRA Fraud Notice

Recipients of awarded funds made available under the Recovery Act shall promptly refer to an appropriate inspector general any credible evidence that a principal, employee, agent, contractor, sub-grantee, subcontractor, or other person has submitted a false claim under the False Claims Act or has committed a criminal or civil violation of laws pertaining to fraud, conflict of interest, bribery, gratuity, or similar misconduct involving those funds.

VII. School Level Descriptive Information

An LEA must submit this section for each individual school. A separate template is included with the application package so the LEA can create a separate electronic file for each school served. Label each electronic file with the LEA name and School name.

A. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information for each school in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Name of School: Scotts Hill High School

Principal Name for SY10-11: Brian Norton

(mark TBD if unknown at this time)

Tier: I II III

(Please check appropriate tier)

Needs of School: All and disaggregated Student Achievement Data (Insert most recent TSIP data, not AYP data, for math, reading/language arts, graduation or attendance rate by all students and subgroups)(copy and paste data into the box): **ENGLISH 10 All Test Takers**

2006-2007 2007-2008 2008-2009

GOAL: % Proficient & Advanced 90% 93% 93%

All Students %P/A 98% 98% 98%

N count 86 101 130

Gap (+ or -) 4% + +

White 98% 98% 98%

N count 83 97 125

Gap (+ or -) + + +

Hispanic 100% 100% 0%

N count 2 3 4

Gap (+ or -) + + 93%

Black ND% ND% 0%

N count ND ND 1

Gap (+ or -) ND ND 93%

Native American ND% ND% ND%

N count ND ND ND

Gap (+ or -) ND ND ND

Asian/Pacific Islander ND% ND% ND%

N count ND ND ND

Gap (+ or -) ND ND ND

Economically Disadvantaged 97% 95% 98%

N count 34 37 59

Gap (+ or -) 56% 56% 34%

Students With Disabilities 89% 80% 83%

N count 9 10 12

Gap (+ or -) 1% 13% 10%

Limited English Proficiency ND% ND% ND%

N count ND ND ND

Gap (+ or -) ND ND N

ALGEBRA I ALL TEST TAKERS

2006-2007 2007-2008 2008-2009

GOAL: % Proficient & Advanced 75% 83% 83%

All Students %P/A 91% 88% 90%

N count 153 144 146
 Gap (+ or -) + + +
White 90% 88% 90%
 N count 146 139 141
 Gap (+ or -) + + +
Hispanic 100% 80% ND%
 N count 5 5 2
 Gap (+ or -) + 3% ND
Black ND% ND% ND%
 N count ND ND 1
 Gap (+ or -) ND ND ND
Native American ND% ND% ND%
 N count ND ND 1
 Gap (+ or -) ND ND ND
Asian/Pacific Islander 100% ND% ND%
 N count 1 ND 1
 Gap (+ or -) + ND ND
Economically Disadvantaged 86% 89% 91%
 N count 64 54 66
 Gap (+ or -) 11% 29% 17%
Students With Disabilities 50% 69% 67%
 N count 16 16 15
 Gap (+ or -) 25% 14% 16%
Limited English Proficiency ND% ND% ND%
 N count ND ND ND
 Gap (+ or -) ND ND ND

Graduation Rate

2009 89.7% 2008 90.6% 2007 75.9%

Attendance Rate

2009 94.0% 2008 93.8% 2007 94.9%

School Achievement and Goals for other Indicators: Attach an electronic copy of your TSIP Action Plan (Component 4) to your application.

Professional Development: Each school must include a minimum of 30% of the grant funds for ongoing professional development including job-embedded training designed to build capacity and support staff. This includes literacy training for the staff unless the school demonstrates proficiency in this area. Provide your school's PD plan including topics and projected dates.

As we continue the development of our AVID program, we will need to provide staff development for the AVID district director to complete session 3 and session 4 training (this is a required training that began 2009-2010). Session 3 will occur in September, 2010 and session 4 will occur in March 2011. The cost of this training should be \$4000.00. The newly appointed AVID school coordinator will need to be trained and this will occur in summer institute 2011 at a cost of \$2200.00. Because there is the possibility of adding new AVID elective teachers, we will include \$10,000.00 to train new elective teachers during 3-year grant, 2010-2013. The implementation of additional Advanced Placement courses (AP US History, AP Calculus, and

AP English) will require workshop/professional development for three teachers at a cost of \$7500.00. The AP US History teacher will be trained June 2010. The AP Calculus teacher will be trained June 2011 and the AP English teacher will be trained June 2012. In addition, professional development will be provided to teachers of existing AP courses should test data analysis suggest additional training. This will be provided at a cost of \$5000.00. The newly appointed AP coordinator and the administrator will require AP coordinator and administrator professional development over the next three years at a cost of 12,000.00. To assist in the school wide initiative of developing effective assessment practices, namely formative assessments, a professional learning team will be developed to guide this initiative and they will travel to Atlanta, Georgia on October 6-9, 2010 and participate in an Assessment Summit sponsored by Solution Tree. It will cost approximately 10,000.00 to fund the professional development of this six member team. The team in turn will return to inservice the greater faculty during staff development throughout the school year. An additional \$2000.00 will be necessary to pay for materials to develop this professional development for all teachers. During the next three years, a book study will occur with all faculty, again focusing on assessment and the use of professional learning communities to assist in our goal to become results oriented. 35 books will be purchased each school year (2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13) to conduct the book study. This professional development will cost 3000.00. So that as many faculty as possible can receive timely and specific professional development, PD360.com user licenses will be provided to each teacher at a cost of \$------. This will allow the SHHS administration to differentiate professional development for a diverse faculty need, yet will also allow ALL SHHS faculty to experience the same authentic professional development when applicable, at very affordable costs. It will also allow us to continue our literacy focus, especially in vocabulary and writing across the curriculum. While we are doing well in this area, it will allow us to have individual and whole faculty refresher professional development at a minimal cost. We would also like to host a customized workshop for our school to open the 2011-12 and 2012-2013 school year. The focus in 2011 will be on assessment and in 2012, the focus will be on response to intervention (RTI). This should cost a total of 15000.00 for the two customized workshops. Solution Tree will provide the education consultants to lead the two workshops. Finally, as we implement a structured curriculum into our advisory period (Leading with Character and Why Try?), this will require staff development training at a cost of \$2000.00. (NOTE: \$72, 700.00 plus costs of pd360.com will equal profess dev costs for three years)

For a Tier I and Tier II school only: State your rationale for selecting your intervention model. Questions contained in Appendix F and *Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants* should be addressed in this rationale. (Turnaround, Restart, Closure, Transformation as listed on the 'Schools To Be Served' table)

Model

- Answers: 1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.

Rationale:

For Renewal Schools ONLY: List the intervention and describe rationale for choosing the state intervention(on the state’s website):

Intervention:

Rationale:

For Tier III Focus Schools ONLY: List the intervention activities the school will implement.

For a Tier I, Tier II or Tier III school: Describe your implementation plan including quarterly milestone goals for each year and three-year timeline.

1. Coordinator of Advanced Placement,AVID, School Leadership, and Data Analysis:

This position was to be added in our second year of the high school redesign grant. This person will ensure that the AP program and AVID program are progressing. To ensure that there is continuous improvement in student achievement and with graduation rate, this individual will analyze all test data, sit down with individual teachers and school administration where action plans will be developed to address the gaps identified.

TOTAL COST: 165,000.00 for three years

2. AVID Program expansion: The 2010-11 school year implementation fee will cost 3025.00. The 2011-2012 District director fee will cost \$6000.00 and 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 AVID teacher stipends will cost \$9,000 AVID fees for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 will cost \$7500.00 Tutor fees will cost 3000.00 over the next three years.AVID travel to colleges will cost 2100.00 and fees to host parent night and provide materials to

students will cost 900.00

3. Advanced Placement Program Expansion and Program Sustainance.

The AP Biology and AP Spanish programs begun in 2009-2010 will require 5100.00 for additional materials over the next three years. AP teacher stipends will require 5,000.00 over the next three years (3000.00 for 2010-11; 1000 for 2011-12; 2000 for 2012-13). AP US History will begin in 2010-2011 and will require 1000.00 for materials and 4000.00 for textbooks. AP Calculus (2011-2012) and AP English (2012-2013) will require approximately 8,000.00 to implement (2000 for materials and 6000 for texts. College board membership will cost 325.00 each of the three years for a total of 975.00

4. Professional development: The focus will be to implement AVID, Advanced Placement, advisory curriculum implementation. Moreover, a school wide initiative will focus on assessment, RTI (response to intervention), and professional learning communities. Book studies will occur over the next three years to supplement the focus on assessment, RTI, and Professional Learning Communities. Total allotted for professional development is 120,000.00

5. Central office grant coordinator. A 100-day contract will be provided to a retired educator to coordinate the grant at the district level. This individual will serve as the external evaluator and will ensure that district level leadership team will meet. The cost for this position for SHHS will be 45,000 over three years.

6. The implementation of a structured curriculum for our advisory program. Leading With Character will serve juniors and sophomores. Why Try? will serve the freshmen. Total costs for materials will be 5400.00 over three years.

7. ACT review/supplemental materials will be purchased to supplement the ACT courses that was developed during the high school redesign grant in 2009-2010. Approximate costs will be 9,000.00 over the next three years.

TOTAL 400,000.00

[The numbers will correspond with the intervention activities above]

1. Coordinator of AP, AVID, School Leadership and Data Analysis: This position will be advertised once the grant notification is received (Summer 2010). It is our desire to hire someone with a Master's degree with an emphasis in school counseling. Generally, school counselors have an understanding of the AP and AVID programs and will best know which students should be served by these programs. School counseling individuals also understand test

data and can analyze/interpret it in a way that is non-threatening to the classroom teacher. As leader of the school improvement leadership team, this individual will coordinate the sub-committees and guide the progress of the TSIPP plan. It is our goal to have this person hired at the beginning of the first year and continue this position, refining it throughout the time of the grant and beyond. Quarterly milestones: 2010-2011, Q1: a) begin to acclimated to AP and AVID b) develop school leadership team and begin TSIPP work c) analyze 2010 AP exam scores and create summary for teacher to guide instruction d) solicit and train AVID tutors Q2: a) analyze Spring 2010 EOC, ACT, graduation rate, attendance data, and AYP data and share with appropriate teachers to guide instruction b) develop data teams to assist with data summaries c) develop a plan to monitor progress of AVID students d) host first AVID team meeting of school year e) arrange AVID college trip for Fall semester Q3: a) meet with data teams to review Fall 2010 EOC and ACT data and create summaries to guide instruction b) host AVID quarterly team meeting c) solicit and train AVID tutors for Spring semester Q4: a) prepare/organize for AP and AVID training for self and new teachers b) Submit TSIPP plan May 15, 2011 c) develop and implement a plan of recruitment for AP and AVID students for following year, which should include a parent meeting d) prepare/organize college visit for AVID students e) host quarterly AVID team meeting and complete AVID certification to become an official AVID site e) coordinate AP exam proctoring and place orders for AP exams 2011-12, Q1: a) offer AVID inservice to all faculty to ensure continued school wide implementation of AVID strategies b) monitor implementation of newly developed TSIPP c) add new test data to TSIPP d) analyze 2011 AP exam scores and create summary for teacher to guide instruction d) solicit and train AVID tutors for Fall semester Q2: a) analyze Spring 2011 EOC, ACT data and work with data teams to summarize and assist teachers to guide instruction b) host first AVID team meeting of year c) arrange AVID college trip for Fall semester d) monitor progress of AVID students in two sections of AVID (9th and 10th grades) Q3: a) meet with data teams to review Fall 2011 EOC and ACT data and create summaries to guide instruction b) host AVID quarterly team meeting c) solicit and train AVID tutors for Spring semester Q4: a) prepare/organize for AP and AVID training for self and new teachers b) continue to review TSIPP implementation c) develop and implement a plan of recruitment for AP and AVID students for following year, which should include a parent meeting d) prepare/organize college visit for AVID students e) host quarterly AVID team meeting and ensure that AVID standards are still being met so we can hold AVID certification f) coordinate AP exam proctoring and place orders for AP exams 2012-13, Q1: a) offer AVID inservice to all faculty to ensure continued school wide implementation of AVID strategies b) monitor implementation of TSIPP c) add new test data to TSIPP d) analyze 2012 AP exam scores and create summary for teacher to guide instruction d) solicit and train AVID tutors for Fall semester Q2: a) analyze Spring 2012 EOC, ACT data and work with data teams to summarize and assist teachers to guide instruction b) host first AVID

team meeting of year c)arrange AVID college trip for Fall semester d)monitor progress of AVID students in three sections of AVID (9th, 10th, and 11th grades) Q3: a)meet with data teams to review Fall 2012 EOC and ACT data and create summaries to guide instruction b) host AVID quarterly team meeting c)solicit and train AVID tutors for Spring semester Q4: a)prepare/organize for AP and AVID training for self and new teachers b)continue to review TSIPP implementation c) develop and implement a plan of recruitment for AP and AVID students for following year, which should include a parent meeting d)prepare/organize college visit for AVID students e)host quarterly AVID team meeting and ensure that AVID standards are still being met so we can hold AVID certification f) coordinate AP exam proctoring and place orders for AP exams

GOALS: 1)Currently, 23 students were enrolled in AP classes for 2009-2010. We want to increase that enrollment by 20% each year for the duration of the grant cycle. 2)We do not have the number of students who scored a 3 or higher on the exams for this year, but our goal is to increase the percentage of students who score a 3 or higher by 10% each year for the duration of the grant cycle. 3)Once EOC benchmarks are set, we want to reach those benchmarks for all tests and ACT by the end of the 2nd year of implementation and we want to exceed the benchmarks by the end of the 3rd year. 4)Implement one AVID class for 2010-11; two classes (9th and 10th grade) for 2011-12; three classes (9th-11th grade) for 2012-13 5) Hire one tutor per semester for AVID for 2010-2011; hire two tutors per semester for AVID for 2011-12; hire three tutors per semester for AVID for 2012-13 6) We want 50% of freshmen AVID students to complete three years of AVID during their high school career (knowing that scheduling conflicts and other interests will prevent some from continuing the program)

2. AVID Program Expansion: AVID will provide the skills to our students to be “college-ready.” It will also provide the support to encourage students to take honors and AP courses, especially students who would have not considered such rigor. While we have implemented some AVID strategies school wide during our pilot year (2009-2010), we will continue to expand the exposure to all faculty and all students. In addition , we want to expand the AVID program so that it can loop with the students. 1 section will be available in 2010-2011 to serve 9th graders. Two sections will occur in 2011-12, one for 9th grade and one for 10th grade. Finally, three sections will be available in 2012-13, so that 9th-11th grade students will have the option for continued AVID support. We also want to maintain minimally 50% of freshmen AVID students throughout the three year AVID program. Quarterly milestones 2010-11 Q1: Inservice all teachers with AVID strategies and hire one tutor for Fall semester Q2: We want no more than 10% of AVID students who need a plan of correction; 100% of students participate in college trip Q3: Hire one tutor for spring Semester and we want no more than 10% of AVID students who need a plan of correction Q4: We want to increase AVID enrollment by 25% for the following year. We want 75% of AVID students to enroll in one or more honors and/or AP

courses for the following school year. We want 50% of AVID students to enroll in a second year of AVID.

2011-12 Q1: Inservice all teachers with AVID strategies and hire two tutors for Fall semester

Q2: We want no more than 10% of AVID students who need a plan of correction; 100% of

students participate in college trip Q3: Hire two tutors for spring Semester and we want no more

than 10% of AVID students who need a plan of correction Q4: We want to increase AVID

enrollment by 25% for the following year. We want 75% of AVID students to enroll in one or

more honors and/or AP courses for the following school year. We want 50% of AVID students

to enroll in a second and/or third year of AVID.

2012-13 Q1: Inservice all teachers with AVID strategies and hire three tutors for Fall semester

Q2: We want no more than 10% of AVID students who need a plan of correction; 100% of

students participate in college trip Q3: Hire three tutors for spring Semester and we want no

more than 10% of AVID students who need a plan of correction Q4: We want to increase AVID

enrollment by 25% for the following year. We want 75% of AVID students to enroll in one or

more honors and/or AP courses for the following school year. We want 50% of AVID students

to enroll in a second year of AVID.

3. AP Expansion and sustainance. First, we want to continue the implementation of the two

AP courses we started last year. We will change the AP biology to a full year course rather than

a semester. For 2010-2011, we will implement US History; for 2011-2012, we will add AP

Calculus and 2012-13, we will add AP English. Implementation will include a week long

summer workshop for all new AP teachers. Previous AP exam scores will be analyzed in the

first quarter of each school year to assist teachers in adapting instructional strategies and

ensuring proper coverage of standards to assist in raising scores. Benchmark practice tests will

be given in Q2 and Q3 of each school year. A parent night will also be hosted in Q3 to promote

the AP courses and encourage student involvement. Q4 will be used to give the actual exam as

designated by Collegeboard. Quarterly milestones: 2010-2011 We want 50% of AP students to

score a 3 or higher on the AP exam 2011-2012 We want 60% of AP students to score a 3 or

higher on the AP exam 2012-2013, we want 75% of AP students to score a 3 or higher on the AP

exam

4. Professional Development Plan 2010-2011, our focus of professional development will be

on Formative Assessment and how we can use professional learning communities to enhance the

formation and use of formative assessment to raise achievement. 2011-2012, our focus will

continue on assessment and we will also look at RTI, response to intervention, strategies and

attempt to implement RTI school wide, not just as a means to address students with learning

disabilities. We will continue to utilize PLC's and develop the structure of them to assist with

our overall school improvement plan. 2012-13, our professional development focus will be to

fully implement PLC work in all we do and to continue working on formative assessment and

RTI. Quarterly milestones 2010-2011 Q1 a)conduct a book study with all faculty that will introduce the ideas of formative assessment b)incorporate PD360.com with individualized focus of professional development for all faculty, with 25% of all faculty utilizing by end of first quarter Q2) develop a team that will travel to Atlanta to participate in an assessment summit; 50% of all faculty shall utilize PD360.com by close of 2nd quarter Q3) the Assessment team that traveled to Atlanta will conduct staff development for all faculty on Feb 4,2011; 75% of all faculty shall utilize PD360.com by close of 3rd quarter Q4)Conduct a survey of the effectiveness of faculty staff development; 100% of all faculty shall have utilized PD360.com by close of school year; any new AP and AVID teacher will need training during summer

2011-2012 Q1 a)conduct a book study with all faculty that will introduce the ideas of RTI, response to intervention and how high schools can utilize RTI strategies for ALL students b)incorporate PD360.com with individualized focus of professional development for all faculty, with 25% of all faculty utilizing by end of first quarter Q2) Invite a Solutions Tree consultant to come to SHHS to inservice us on the topics of formative assessment or RTI; 50% of all faculty shall utilize PD360.com by close of 2nd quarter Q3) 75% of all faculty shall utilize PD360.com by close of 3rd quarter Q4)Conduct a survey of the effectiveness of faculty staff development; 100% of all faculty shall have utilized PD360.com by close of school year; any new AP and AVID teacher will need training during summer

2012-2013 Q1 a)conduct a book study with all faculty that will focus on PLC's b)incorporate PD360.com with individualized focus of professional development for all faculty, with 25% of all faculty utilizing by end of first quarter Q2) Invite a consultant from Solution Tree to provide inservice on RTI or PLC's ; 50% of all faculty shall utilize PD360.com by close of 2nd quarter Q3) 75% of all faculty shall utilize PD360.com by close of 3rd quarter Q4)Conduct a survey of the effectiveness of faculty staff development; 100% of all faculty shall have utilized PD360.com by close of school year; any new AP and AVID teacher will need training during summer

2010-2011, we want 75% of students to reach proficient on EOC test scores. 2011-2012, we want 85% of students to reach proficiency and in 2012-2013, we want 95% of all student to reach proficiency on EOC test scores. 2010-2011, we want 50% of all faculty incorporating alternative formative assessments consistently; 2011-2012, we want 75% of all faculty to incorporate alternative formative assessments consistently and by 2012-2013, we want all faculty to consistently incorporate alternative formative assessments in the classroom.

5. Central office grant coordinator: Once we receive grant dollars, we will go through the process of hiring a 100 day person to serve as grant facilitator and evaluator for the Henderson County Schools. We will maintain this position for the three year grant cycle. Quarterly milestones: Host a system leadership team to evaluate the grant

6. Implementation of Advisory curriculum. Beginning in 2010-2011, the 9th -11th grades will

receive weekly instruction utilizing the two sets of curriculum, WHY TRY? and LEADING WITH CHARACTER: DEVELOPMENT AND LEADERSHIP in hopes of preparing students to have skills to be successful in high school and in life. As a result of implementation, we also hope to decrease the number of office referrals, the number of students taking credit recovery and the number of students retained each year. Ultimately, this will allow us to continue holding to our 95% graduation rate. In 2009-2010, we had more than 1300 office referrals. During the next three years, quarterly monitoring will occur to determine if our pace of referrals is declining. Our goal for 2010-2011 is to decrease the number of referrals by 10%; 2011-2012 by another 10% and 2012-2013 by 10%. This should make our referral total at the conclusion of 2012-2013 at less than 1000 referrals. In 2009-2010, we had 74 students earn credits through credit recovery. We would like to reduce this by 5% each year over the next three years.

7. ACT Review course We will offer as many sections as dictated by student enrollment over the next three years. Our goal this year is to implement beginning in summer by asking all students enrolled in ACT Prep to take the pretest on a designated summer test date. For each quarter of the year, we will analyze the pretest score, the final post test score and the REAL ACT score taken by the student in hopes that each student will raise their ACT score by a minimal of 2 points. We want to have 75% of all students raise their score each of the three years of implementation.

ARRA Fraud Notice

Recipients of awarded funds made available under the Recovery Act shall promptly refer to an appropriate inspector general any credible evidence that a principal, employee, agent, contractor, sub-grantee, subcontractor, or other person has submitted a false claim under the False Claims Act or has committed a criminal or civil violation of laws pertaining to fraud, conflict of interest, bribery, gratuity, or similar misconduct involving those funds.

1 6/2/2010 Submission Date

The following represents the individual budgets for federal projects administered under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

4 LEA Name Henderson County School District

5 LEA # 390

\$800,000	ENTER Total District SIG Grant in the cell to the left. Check this amount against Column D, Line 10 If the amounts are the same, your budget is balanced. If the amt.in Col. D, Line 10 is MORE than the amt. in Col. B, Line 7: you are over budget-reduce expenses If the amt. in Col D, Line 10 is LESS than the amt. in Col. B, Line 7: you are under budget-increase expenses	School Improvement Grant 1003(g) 2010-2013	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2010-2011	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013
		In Good Standing	In Good Standing	In Good Standing	In Good Standing	School Improvement 2-Improving	School Improvement 1-Improving	School Improvement 2-Improving			
9	FY10 LEA/School Status	In Good Standing	In Good Standing	In Good Standing	In Good Standing	School Improvement 2-Improving	School Improvement 1-Improving	School Improvement 2-Improving			
10	FY 2010 SI Grant Award/Allocation	799,999.98	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	120,833.32	120,833.33	120,833.33	126,850.00	115,825.00	119,825.00
11	If Tier I or Tier II school, model being implemented:										
12											
13	Check: should be zero (Award/Allocation minus Expenditures)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Appropriations

Account Number/ Line Item Number	REGULAR INSTRUCTIONAL EDUCATION	School Improvement Grant 1003(g)	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2010-2011	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013
71100	Line Item Description										
18	71100 / 116 Teachers	165,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	55,000.00	55,000.00	55,000.00
19	71100 / 117 Career Ladder Program	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
20	71100 / 127 Career Ladder Extended Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
21	71100 / 128 Homebound Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
22	71100 / 162 Clerical Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
23	71100 / 163 Educational Assistants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
24	71100 / 189 Other Salaries & Wages	87,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	23,500.00	23,500.00	23,500.00	7,500.00	4,000.00	5,500.00
25	71100 / 195 Certified Substitute Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
26	71100 / 198 Non-certified Substitute Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
27	71100 / 201 Social Security	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
28	71100 / 204 State Retirement	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
29	71100 / 206 Life Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
30	71100 / 207 Medical Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
31	71100 / 208 Dental Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
32	71100 / 210 Unemployment Compensation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
33	71100 / 212 Employer Medicare	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
34	71100 / 299 Other Fringe Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
35	71100 / 311 Contracts with Other School Systems	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
36	71100 / 330 Operating Lease Payments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
37	71100 / 336 Maintenance & Repair Services - Equipment	12,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
38	71100 / 356 Tuition	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
39	71100 / 369 Contracts for Substitute Teachers -Certified	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
40	71100 / 370 Contracts for Substitute Teachers Non-certified	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
41	71100 / 399 Other Contracted Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
42	71100 / 429 Instructional Supplies & Materials	105,299.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	29,933.32	29,933.33	29,933.33	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,500.00
43	71100 / 449 Textbooks	15,900.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,800.00	4,300.00	5,800.00
44	71100 / 499 Other Supplies & Materials	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
45	71100 / 535 Fee Waivers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
46	71100 / 599 Other Charges	18,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,850.00	3,825.00	4,325.00
47	71100 / 722 Regular Instruction Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
48											
49	71100 Subtotal REGULAR INSTRUCTIONAL EDUCATION	403,699.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	57,433.32	57,433.33	57,433.33	83,150.00	72,125.00	76,125.00

1 6/2/2010 Submission Date

The following represents the individual budgets for federal projects administered under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

4 LEA Name Henderson County School District

5 LEA # 390

Account Number/ Line Item Number	SUPPORT SERVICES/ OTHER STUDENT SUPPORT	School Improvement Grant 1003(g)	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2010-2011	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013
89	72130	Line Item Description									
90	72130 / 117	Career Ladder Program	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
91	72130 / 123	Guidance Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
92	72130 / 124	Psychological Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
93	72130 / 127	Career Ladder - Extended Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
94	72130 / 130	Social Workers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
95	72130 / 135	Assessment Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
96	72130 / 161	Secretary(s)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
97	72130 / 162	Clerical Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
98	72130 / 164	Attendants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
99	72130 / 170	School Resource Officer	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
100	72130 / 189	Other Salaries & Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
101	72130 / 201	Social Security	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
102	72130 / 204	State Retirement	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
103	72130 / 206	Life Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
104	72130 / 207	Medical Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
105	72130 / 208	Dental Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
106	72130 / 210	Unemployment Compensation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
107	72130 / 212	Employer Medicare	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
108	72130 / 299	Other Fringe Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
109	72130 / 307	Communication	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
110	72130 / 309	Contracts with Government Agencies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
111	72130 / 311	Contracts with Other School Systems	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
112	72130 / 322	Evaluation & Testing	9,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00
113	72130 / 330	Operating Lease Payments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
114	72130 / 336	Maintenance & Repair Services - Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
115	72130 / 348	Postal Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
116	72130 / 355	Travel	6,000.00	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
117	72130 / 399	Other Contracted Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
118	72130 / 499	Other Supplies & Materials	3,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
119	72130 / 524	In-Service/Staff Development	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
120	72130 / 599	Other Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
121	72130 / 790	Other Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
122											
123	72130	Subtotal OTHER STUDENT SUPPORT	18,000.00	0.00	0.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00

1 6/2/2010 Submission Date

The following represents the individual budgets for federal projects administered under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

4 LEA Name Henderson County School District

5 LEA # 390

Account Number/ Line Item Number	REGULAR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM SUPPORT SERVICES	School Improvement Grant 1003(g)	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2010-2011	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013
126	72210	Line Item Description									
127	72210 / 105	Supervisor/Director	75,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
128	72210 / 117	Career Ladder Program	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
129	72210 / 127	Career Ladder Extended Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
130	72210 / 129	Librarian(s)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
131	72210 / 132	Material Supervisor(s)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
132	72210 / 136	Audiovisual Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
133	72210 / 137	Education Media Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
134	72210 / 138	Instructional Computer Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
135	72210 / 161	Secretary(s)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
136	72210 / 162	Clerical Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
137	72210 / 163	Educational Assistants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
138	72210 / 189	Other Salaries & Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
139	72210 / 195	Certified Substitute Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
140	72210 / 196	In-Service Training	120,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	0.00	0.00
141	72210 / 198	Non-certified Substitute Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
142	72210 / 201	Social Security	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
143	72210 / 204	State Retirement	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
144	72210 / 206	Life Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
145	72210 / 207	Medical Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
146	72210 / 208	Dental Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
147	72210 / 210	Unemployment Compensation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
148	72210 / 212	Employer Medicare	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
149	72210 / 299	Other Fringe Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
150	72210 / 307	Communication	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
151	72210 / 308	Consultants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
152	72210 / 330	Operating Lease Payments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
153	72210 / 336	Maintenance & Repair Services - Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
154	72210 / 348	Postal Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
155	72210 / 355	Travel	61,200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20,400.00	20,400.00	20,400.00	0.00	0.00
156	72210 / 369	Contracts for Substitute Teachers -Certified	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
157	72210 / 370	Contracts for Substitute Teachers Non-certified	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
158	72210 / 399	Other Contracted Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
159	72210 / 432	Library Books/Media	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
160	72210 / 437	Periodicals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
161	72210 / 499	Other Supplies & Materials	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
162	72210 / 524	In Service/Staff Development	120,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
163	72210 / 599	Other Charges	2,100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	700.00	700.00	700.00
164	72210 / 790	Other Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
165											
166	72210	Subtotal REGULAR INSTRUCTIONAL PROG-SUPPORT SVS	378,300.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	60,400.00	60,400.00	60,400.00	40,700.00	40,700.00

1 6/2/2010 Submission Date

The following represents the individual budgets for federal projects administered under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

4 LEA Name Henderson County School District

5 LEA # 390

Account Number/ Line Item Number	SUPPORT SERVICES/ TRANSPORTATION	School Improvement Grant 1003(g)	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2010-2011	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013
206	72710	Line Item Description									
207	72710 / 105	Supervisor/Director	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
208	72710 / 142	Mechanic(s)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
209	72710 / 146	Bus Drivers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
210	72710 / 162	Clerical Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
211	72710 / 189	Other Salaries & Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
212	72710 / 196	In-Service Training	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
213	72710 / 201	Social Security	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
214	72710 / 204	State Retirement	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
215	72710 / 206	Life Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
216	72710 / 207	Medical Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
217	72710 / 208	Dental Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
218	72710 / 210	Unemployment Compensation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
219	72710 / 212	Employer Medicare	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
220	72710 / 299	Other Fringe Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
221	72710 / 307	Communication	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
222	72710 / 311	Contracts with Other School Systems	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
223	72710 / 312	Contracts with Private Agencies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
224	72710 / 313	Contracts with Parents	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
225	72710 / 314	Contracts with Public Carriers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
226	72710 / 315	Contracts with Vehicle Owners	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
227	72710 / 329	Laundry Service	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
228	72710 / 330	Operating Lease Payments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
229	72710 / 338	Maintenance & Repair Service-Vehicles	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
230	72710 / 340	Medical and Dental Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
231	72710 / 348	Postal Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
232	72710 / 351	Rentals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
233	72710 / 355	Travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
234	72710 / 399	Other Contracted Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
235	72710 / 412	Diesel Fuel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
236	72710 / 418	Equipment & Machinery Parts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
237	72710 / 424	Garage Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
238	72710 / 425	Gasoline	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
239	72710 / 433	Lubricants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
240	72710 / 450	Tires & Tubes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
241	72710 / 453	Vehicle Parts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
242	72710 / 499	Other Supplies & Materials	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
243	72710 / 511	Vehicle & Equipment Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
244	72710 / 524	In-Service/Staff Development	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
245	72710 / 599	Other Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
246	72710 / 701	Administration Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
247	72710 / 729	Transportation Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
248											
249	72710	Subtotal TRANSPORTATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

1 **Submission Date**

The following represents the individual budgets for federal projects administered under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

4 **LEA Name** Henderson County School District

5 **LEA #** 390

Account Number/ Line Item Number	OTHER USES/ TRANSFERS OUT AND INDIRECT COST	School Improvement Grant 1003(g)	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2010-2011	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Lexington High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2010-2011	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2011-2012	Scotts Hill High School SIG: Budget 2012-2013
293	99100										
	Line Item Description										
294	99100 / 504 Indirect Cost	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
295	99100 / 590 Cumulative Transfers TO Other Federal Projects (INCLUDING Consolidated Administration) (Expenditure(s) FROM this Title/Project)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
296											
297	99100 Subtotal TRANSFERS OUT AND INDIRECT COST	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
298											
299	Total Appropriations	799,999.98	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	120,833.32	120,833.33	120,833.33	126,850.00	115,825.00	119,825.00

Comments:

\$