SIG Form 1–Application Cover Sheet

School Improvement Grant (SIG)
Application for Funding

APPLICATION RECEIPT DEADLINE
July 2, 2010, 4 p.m.

Submit to:
California Department of Education
District and School Improvement Division
Regional Coordination and Support Office
1430 N Street, Suite 6208
Sacramento, CA 95814

NOTE: Please print or type all information.

County Name: Monterey	**County/District Code:** 2766068
Local Educational Agency (LEA) Name King City Joint Union High School District	**LEA NCES Number:** 0619650
LEA Address 800 Broadway	**Total Grant Amount Requested** $3,782,822
City King City	**Zip Code** 93930
Name of Primary Grant Coordinator Dr. John Bernard	**Grant Coordinator Title** State Administrator

Telephone Number 831.385.0606	**Fax Number** 831.385.0695	**E-mail Address** jbernard@kingcity.k12.ca.us

CERTIFICATION/ASSURANCE SECTION: As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I have read all assurances, certifications, terms, and conditions associated with the federal SIG program; and I agree to comply with all requirements as a condition of funding.

I certify that all applicable state and federal rules and regulations will be observed and that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct and complete.

Printed Name of Superintendent or Designee Dr. John Bernard	**Telephone Number** 831.385.0606
Superintendent or Designee Signature John Bernard	**Date** June 29, 2010

PDF processed with CutePDF evaluation edition www.CutePDF.com

SIG Form 2–Collaborative Signatures (page 1 of 2)

Collaborative Signatures: The SIG program is to be designed, implemented, and sustained through a collaborative organizational structure that may include students, parents, representatives of participating LEAs and school sites, the local governing board, and private and/or public external technical assistance and support providers. Each member should indicate whether they support the intent of this application.

The appropriate administrator and representatives for the District and School Advisory Committees, School Site Council, the district or school English Learner Advisory Council, collective bargaining unit, parent group, and any other appropriate stakeholder group of each school to be funded are to indicate here whether they support this sub-grant application. Only schools meeting eligibility requirements described in this RFA may be funded. (Attach as many sheets as necessary.)

Name and Signature	Title	Organization/ School	Support Yes/No

SIG Form 2, Collaborative Signatures, has been removed due to privacy concerns. Each school's SIG Form 2 is on file with the CDE. See the CDE's Public Access Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/lr/cl/pa.asp for information about obtaining access to these forms.

SIG Form 2–Collaborative Signatures (page 2 of 2)

School District Approval: The LEA Superintendent must be in agreement with the intent of this application.

CDS Code	School District Name	Printed Name of Superintendent	Signature of Superintendent
2766068	King City Joint Union High School District	Dr. John Bernard	
CERTIFICATION AND DESIGNATION OF APPLICANT AGENCY			

Applicant must agree to follow all fiscal reporting and auditing standards required by the SIG application, federal and state funding, legal, and legislative mandates.

LEA Name:	King City Joint Union High School District
Authorized Executive:	Dr. John Bernard
Signature of Authorized Executive	

SIG Form 3–Narrative Response

Respond to the elements below. Use 12 point Arial font and one inch margins. When responding to the narrative elements, LEAs should provide a thorough response that addresses **all** components of each element. Refer to *Application Requirements*, B. Narrative Response Requirements on page 22 of this RFA, and the SIG Rubric, Appendix A.

i. Needs Analysis

Response:

King City Joint Union High School District, located in rural Southern Monterey County, serves just over 2000 students in grades 9 – 12. Greenfield High School and King City High School are the two comprehensive high schools in the District. Greenfield is a persistently low-performing Tier I high school, in year 4 of Program Improvement. King City High School is identified as a Tier III high school in year 1 of Program Improvement.

A State Administrator was appointed on July 23, 2009, and is responsible for all academic, fiscal, facility, and personnel decisions for the King City Joint Union High School District . The District Board of Trustees is advisory to the State Administrator.

The Academic Performance Survey , the Inventory of Services and Support (ISS) for Students with Disabilities (formerly LRE), and District Assessment Survey (DAS) were used to assess the status and needs of the District.

Findings of the assessment instruments used to conduct the analysis:

Academic Performance Survey (APS): average rubric score 2

1. Instructional Program – standards-aligned textbooks provided in English Language Arts and Algebra I; limited intervention materials in Language Arts, no intervention materials for mathematics.

2. Access to High School standards-aligned core courses -- no pacing guides, intervention limited to one 9th grade REACH class and one 10th/11th grade English Support class.

3. School Administrator Training – Principal completed AB75 and Assistant Principal completed AB 430.

4. Teacher Professional Development -- English/Reading Language Arts and Mathematics fully credentialed; 9th/10th grade English/Reading Language Arts teachers did not attend

AB472 training; 80% of Algebra teachers completed AB472.

5. Student Achievement Monitoring System – 9th grade Gates McGinnity placement test for class placement, written essay four times a year, no assessments to inform teachers of student progress.

6. On-going Instructional Assistance and Support – no coaches or specialists, no on-going training in either Language Arts or Mathematics.

7. Teacher/Department/Subject Matter Collaboration – no uniform, regular collaboration opportunities; no use of curriculum-embedded assessment data and data analysis; limited collaboration at monthly staff meetings.

8. Intervention Program for Students Below Grade Level -- one 9th Grade REACH class, afterschool CAHSEE class available, SES tutoring available as requested.

9. Fiscal Support -- Minimal School Site Plan, due to district financial situation, no categorical site budget designated.

The instructional program, teacher professional development, and student achievement function at a minimal level and must be a reform program priority.

Inventory of Services and Support (ISS) for Students with Disabilities (formerly LRE):

District states: The district follows all legal guidelines regarding the placement of students with special needs into the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). This is a function of the Student Study Team process, initially, and then a product of the IEP Team decision regarding placement. Psychological and Academic testing instruments are among a variety of things that the team reviews. There may also be supplemental placements into Occupational Therapy, Speech and Language services, Adaptive P.E., Health and Nursing services, Itinerant vision services, counseling, etc.. We collaborate with the Monterey County Office of Education, local health, behavioral, and rehabilitation services, and non-public agencies or schools.

District Assessment Survey (DAS):

A. Governance -- average rubric score 2

1. The State Administrator provides district management, the Board is advisory and is undergoing governance training.
2. LEA's vision, mission, policies and priorities are being updated.

3. LEA leadership's goal is to change to new culture of respect and trust in the district.
4. LEA is establishing expectations for instruction, assessment and professional development.
5. LEAP in process of completion.
6. Fiscal policies in process of alignment.
7. Commitments under revision.
8. Accountability not occurring for credentialed personnel.
9. Data system in place, not used.

B. Alignment of Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment -- average rubric score 1

1. Moving to SBE adopted standards for instruction.
2. Majority of core instructional materials are standards-aligned, need to adopt appropriate intervention materials.
3. All students do not have access to the core curriculum and intervention programs.
4. Pacing guides not complete in core subjects.
5. Need collection and analysis of common formative and summative assessment data to inform instruction.

C. Fiscal Operation – average rubric score 1

1. FCMAT report supports placing district in state receivership.
2. LEA Plan under development.
3. LEA differentiated funding to sites is under review.

D. Parent and Community Involvement -- average score 2

1. Parent compact in place.
2. Systems for 2-way communication in English/Spanish established.
3. SSC in place, needs training.
4. Some parent participation in SSC, ELAC, DELAC, Booster clubs.

E. Human Resources – average rubric score 1

1. Recruiting principals difficult, has not been a priority.
2. Limited professional development for administrators.
3. First year to perform comprehensive review of administrators.
4. Hiring and placement policies traditionally dictated by teachers union and contractual agreement.
5. Teachers currently highest paid in the state.
6. Ongoing support for teachers through Beginning Teacher and Support and Assessment (BTSA) and some mentors.
7. Evaluation not based on California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).

F. Data Systems and Monitoring – average rubric score 2

1. Need training in the use of data management system.
2. Technology system in place, not used district-wide.
3. Student data management system in place, minimal use by staff for student data.

G. Professional Development – average rubric score 1

1. Little Professional Development for instructional staff.
2. Efforts will be made to provide Professional Development.
3. Administrators need training in adopted materials.
4. Teacher training in adopted materials very sporadic.
5. No ongoing and targeted support for research-based instructional practice.
6. Training in use and analysis of student achievement data attended on a voluntary basis.
7. Collaboration time has been eliminated.

The DAS finds the District less than compliant in all survey areas. The State Administrator's priority is to focus on all areas of the District Assessment Survey, beginning with the fiscal operation, curriculum/instruction/assessment, human resources, and staff professional development. These assessment instruments support the need for comprehensive district and school-wide reform.

- The LEA and school personnel responsible for conducting the above needs assessments were limited to the Greenfield High School site administrators and the District Director of Educational Services. There were no other collaborative partners. The Greenfield High School Assistant Principal completed the Academic Performance Survey (APS) in collaboration with the Math and Language Arts departments. The District Assessment Survey (DAS) and the LRE were completed by the Director of Educational Services in consultation with the Monterey County Office of Education SELPA Director.

  The State Administrator shared these assessment surveys and findings with the Board of Trustees and the Director of Educational Services for input on the analysis of the results.

- The process for analyzing the findings and determining the appropriate intervention model began with the State Administrator, District staff, and the Board reviewing the above assessments and the intervention model options. This group analyzed the assessment surveys and focused on the District areas for improvement. Also considered was Greenfield High School not meeting growth expectations on the Academic Performance Index (API) and not achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the past 5 years.

In addition to the above assessment information for the school and district, the site performance results suggest that the Greenfield High School Principal was unsuccessful in providing the needed leadership to focus the staff and students on educational achievement.

The school program did not include targeted teaching and interventions appropriate to student needs. Student growth data was not based on multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement. The Principal had not done staff evaluations. Opportunities for teacher professional development and collaboration were minimal.

The State Administrator with Board input analyzed the findings, considered the specific needs of the school and district, reviewed the requirements of each of the four intervention models, and selected the Transformation model as the most appropriate approach for the District and Greenfield High School.

- Findings on school's current practices and potential for improvement:

  - <u>Use of California standards aligned instructional materials and targeted intervention</u>:

    - Standards-aligned core English Language Arts and Mathematics instructional materials were adopted by the Board for Greenfield High School (GHS) prior to the appointment of the State Administrator. Instructional staff are not consistent in the use of these textbooks.

    - Targeted intervention materials for English Learners and English speakers in English Language Arts and Mathematics is limited. A coordinated, congruent program is lacking.

The purchase and consistent use of additional high quality common standards-aligned core curriculum instructional materials for all students standardizes the instructional program. The significant numbers of students below grade level will better access the core curriculum from appropriate lower level textbooks. The purchase of targeted intervention instructional materials in English/ Language Arts and Mathematics provides a coordinated intervention program.

  - <u>Curriculum pacing and appropriate use of instructional time:</u>

    - Curriculum pacing guides for the core content subjects are not evident.

- Appropriate use of instructional time is the decision of the individual teacher.
- Instructional minutes are currently structured at a minimum level.
- In monitoring the appropriate use of instructional time and the instructional minutes, Site and District leadership have been limited time by provisions in the teacher association contract.

Developing curriculum pacing guides in all content area will maximize effective use of instructional time. Instructional staff trained in selecting essential standards, unwrapping standards into common curriculum pacing guides, and developing regular common assessments for learning improves teaching and learning.

The State Administrator is negotiating the increase of instructional minutes. A reform model that requires the increase in instructional time supports this change.

➢ <u>Staff professional development, collaboration and instructional support:</u>

- Professional development activities have been cut due to budget deficits.
- Teachers have no collaboration time to discuss students, curriculum, or assessments.
- Teachers require training on how to collaborate.
- Limited district and site resources (money and personnel) equate to minimal instructional support.

The District needs a high-quality, job-embedded professional development program that is aligned with the school's comprehensive core and intervention program. Training must include subject-specific pedagogy, differentiated instruction, collaboration, coaching, and instruction that reflects a better understanding of the students and the school community. Professional development must include coaching and follow-up instructional support.

➢ <u>Use of student data to inform and modify instruction:</u>

- A data system is in place at the District and site levels that has the capacity to access and analyze student performance data.
- There is a need for more in-depth, comprehensive training. Previous training was limited and voluntary.
- Teachers have not been trained in the student data management system nor trained in the use of data.

Mandated training in the use of the data management system for all staff is a priority. Training in the use of data for student achievement is the next necessary step.

- Alignment of federal, state, and private fiscal resources to support improved school performance, including other district resources:

  - The district does not have systems in place to align federal, state, and private fiscal resources to support improved school performance, including other district resources.

This was a major finding of the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) report, and a priority goal for the State Administrator. The State Administrator will make sure the dollars are following the students that qualify for specific programs, and will ensure legal and ethical fiscal alignment. Funds have not been allocated to the sites for a few years. Sites now have carryover dollars and in 2010-11 will have a site budget to properly align the funds.

- Staff effectiveness:

  - The staff is experienced and is subject-matter knowledgeable, but has not been trained in methods of effective instruction, in using data to inform instruction, in providing intervention support, or in collaborating to improve student achievement.
  - Site leadership has been limited to train and motivate the staff for effective performance.

Job-embedded professional development is needed to improve staff effectiveness. Trained, effective staff will support the intervention reform program, increase teacher effectiveness, and improve student achievement.

ii. Selection of Intervention Models

Response:

The State Administrator, with the Board and District Administrator as an advisory analysis group, focused on the intervention model that would provide substantial change with the least disruption to the school community. The District and Site areas of need coincide with the changes necessary to take the District out of receivership.

The State Administrator reviewed the standards-aligned core curriculum

instructional materials purchased, but not universally used, and the lack of appropriate intervention materials at Greenfield High School. The intervention model would need to address the coordinated use of instructional materials and the development of a consistent, targeted intervention program.

Curriculum pacing guides are limited to specific teachers, not commonly articulated within the departments. Use of instructional time and limited instructional minutes are priority areas to be addressed. The Student Data Management system is not being used to analyze student progress and areas of need in order to modify instruction. The District fiscal operations must align federal, state, private, and district resources to appropriately support the schools and students. The lack of staff professional development and collaboration time limits teacher knowledge and effectiveness.

Reviewing the school assessment information and the site academic performance results suggests the Greenfield High School Principal was unsuccessful in providing the needed leadership to focus the staff and students on educational achievement.

The majority of the staff is experienced and appropriately credentialed and are open to professional development opportunities to improve their practice and increase student achievement.

28% of the teachers have taught 0-5 years
31% have taught 5-10 years
17% have taught -15 yr
14% have taught 15 – 20years
11% more than 20 years

The Intervention model would need to implement targeted teaching and intervention strategies with intense initial program training for all certificated staff, combined with on-going follow-up, coaching, and collaboration opportunities to transition from current practice to a coherent program for teachers and students.

To maximize the use and number of instructional minutes, the model would have to require an increase of time. Additional instructional minutes need be added to the school day and the school year to provide time for core instruction and intervention for all students.

The State Administrator will modify the collective bargaining agreement to incorporate the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). This provides administrators with state approved teaching and learning standards for teacher observations and evaluations. Professional development days and collaboration time will be required for all credentialed staff to improve their teaching practice.

The selected Intervention model would need to require and support these district modifications to provide the required rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation system for teachers and principals using standards, data, and regular assessments of student performance.

Under the leadership of the State Administrator, the models were explained and discussed with the Board. The only district administrator is the Director of Educational Services. There is limited parental and community involvement at the sites and in the District. The State Administrator held four public forums to discuss the intervention options with the school community.

The State Administrator is responsible for district improvement and decisions. He selected the Transformation model as the most effective model for Greenfield High School and the King City Joint Union High School District.

The Turnaround model requires replacing the principal and rehiring no more than 50% of the school's staff. In a rural area, recruiting highly quality teachers is difficult. Therefore, retaining the majority of teachers and restructuring systems, expectations, and providing professional development is a more workable choice. The Turnaround model is not the ideal choice for the District.

The Restart model to reopen as a charter school requires a process that involves more time than available, and would be confusing to a majority of the school community. The Restart model is not an option for the District.

Greenfield and King City are communities that are 10 miles apart. Each community values its own high school. Closing Greenfield High School would leave the Greenfield community without a high school, and would create an overcrowded situation at King City High School. Additionally, the Greenfield HS campus is used as collateral for the $13,000,000, 20-year bail-out loan from the state through the I-BANK (Infrastructure Bank). The School Closure choice is not an option.

The Transformation model is the selected intervention model for Greenfield High School. The Transformation model provided the opportunity to replace the school principal, to assess and develop teacher effectiveness, to increase instructional time, and to focus staff on student learning. The State Administrator is in the process of developing collaborative partners, however, none participated in the intervention model selection.

The Transformation model supports using a more rigorous evaluation system based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession that allows the school and District to identify those teachers who choose not to improve their professional practice after extensive training.

Ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development provides resources for the instructional staff that will facilitate effective teaching and learning strategies. These elements give the school the opportunity to successfully implement the necessary school reform goals and objectives stated in the needs assessments.

This model opens the door to reward instructional staff for increased student achievement, leadership participation in the collaborative PRIDE teams, measured implementation of professional development programs and improved attitudes towards staff, students, and the school community.

The Transformation model supports the comprehensive instructional reform the school and district require.

iii. Demonstration of Capacity to Implement Selected Intervention Models

Response:

1. Needs Analysis:

Greenfield is a persistently low performing Tier I high school, in year 4 of Program Improvement. Greenfield High School

2008 Base API was 617,
2009 Growth API was 604,

a -13 growth, therefore, did not meet 2009 API growth criteria.

The percent of English Language Learners at or above proficient in English Language Arts was 24.7%, and in Mathematics was 23.5%. Greenfield did not meet its AYP criteria.

The 2009 STAR reports in CST English-Language Arts:

9th grade – % Far Below Basic and Below Basic	39%
10th grade - % Far Below Basic and Below Basic	47%
11th grade - % Far Below Basic and Below Basic	50%

Out of 220 9th graders, 71 English Learners were tested on the CELDT. In the remaining group of 149 students, 49 scored Far Below and Below Basic in English Language Arts, and 75 scored Far Below and Below Basic in Mathematics. The academic numbers suggest that more students may be English Learners than are currently designated in each grade level. This may require additional ELD and targeted interventions classes, as well as specific teacher training in ELD and intervention strategies.

The 2009 R-30 reports that out of 420 English Learners at Greenfield High School, the number of students receiving ELD or SDAIE instruction is 0, and the

number of students receiving primary language support is 58. Students not receiving any English Language instruction is 362. Six teachers provide some type of English Language service. All teachers are teachers of English and will benefit from professional development in teaching English Language Development (ELD).

The Fiscal Crisis Management Assessment Team (FCMAT) report compared the results of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) and the California Standards Test (CST) and found inadequate student achievement compared to statewide results. The report noted persistent gaps between the proficiency levels of Hispanic and white students, and that these gaps are significant and growing. The report stated there was no evidence of a coordinated approach to addressing these gaps, and that most district and school staff interviewed did not articulate concerns regarding these gaps. It was reported that the systems in place focused on adults, not students.

The FCMAT report recommended the district and staff understand and implement best practices and systems, to include a defined and monitored intervention system. The district must also establish systems of planning and monitoring to ensure the alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment district-wide, and to establish and use these systems to hold district and site staff accountable. The report requires the district to develop and implement district-wide research-based best practices to ensure all students have access to the core curriculum, to English Language Development, and strategic and intensive interventions. The State Administrator is required to follow through with the FCMAT recommendations.

The District teacher/principal evaluation system needs revision. The development of a rigorous, transparent and equitable evaluation system for teachers and principals is in progress. The California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) will become the basis for teacher evaluation in the contract. Student achievement as documented on regular classroom assessments, the California Content Standards Tests (CST), and the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) will also be considered. The specific design of this new evaluation system will be completed collaboratively with the State Administrator, Site/District administrators and teacher leaders.

The State Administrator is re-negotiating all collective bargaining agreements, and instructional minutes will be added to the 2010-2011 school year, both number of minutes per day and number of days per school year.

Teacher leaders will have the opportunity to lead collaborative PRIDE ((Performance, Rigor, Instructional Determination for Excellence) Teams that will assist with defining specific professional development needs to ensure staff is equipped to make the necessary changes in the school program. Up to 35 collaboration days shall be scheduled during each school year.

The District has hired a second Assistant Principal at Greenfield High to support staff and instructional issues. This grant provides a PRIDE Learning Coordinator to oversee the professional development trainings and ensure the staff implements the requirements of the Transformation intervention model with fidelity to improve the learning environment and student achievement.

2. Process and Rationale for Selection of Intervention Model(s):

When evaluating the needs analysis and school performance trends, the need is evident to provide effective models for English Language Development (ELD), intensive targeted intervention, informed use of student data, collaboration, and strategic teacher professional development. Teacher attitudes and student motivation are also areas of need, as well as strong, collaborative leadership.

The Transformation model focuses on developing teacher and school leader effectiveness. An effective Principal will provide strong leadership and have school leader collaborative teams to transform the school to a more positive learning environment.

Learning time must be increased for students and instructional minutes maximized. Teachers and principals are held more accountable for their practice and for student achievement through a rigorous, equitable evaluation system.

The majority English Learner population of Greenfield High School requires that all teachers are English teachers. All instructional staff must use effective instructional strategies for all students.

The school and District must implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies based on data and research-based programs to improve student achievement. The current student data system is seldom used by teachers and must be incorporated into the reform model.

The District and the staff recognize that high school is not working for many students. More English, math, science, social studies without relevance will not engage students. In order to engage students and make learning more meaningful, Greenfield High School needs to incorporate multiple pathways to prepare students for both college and career.

Teachers are more motivated once they understand that change is a certainty, and when they are part of the change process. The Professional Learning Communities approach trains staff in the collaborative process and how to effectively use this process in the newly established PRIDE teams to participate in this change process.

The Transformation intervention model requires successful implementation of these activities, and is the model that best matches the District resources to improve systems and services for student achievement.

iv. Recruitment, Screening, and Selection of External Providers

Response:

The King City Joint Union High School District recognizes the need for intensive staff professional development and the need to implement more effective approaches to teaching and learning. The District goal is to recruit external providers who will work together to provide an interlocking, integrated, seamless system of coherent change and consistent improvement.

The FCMAT report stated that teacher attitude is a foremost concern. The staff must have a better understanding of the school community it serves and establish on-going family and community engagement.

EdEquity addresses the concern of staff apathy towards working with limited-proficient English Learners. EdEquity is a SAIT provider whose mission is to implement systems of high quality instruction and increased academic achievement through culturally and linguistically conscious staff development. This approach is a "mind-set" to "challenge traditional methodology with a cultural, racial and linguistic lens". Beginning with a transformational change in teacher attitude and approach, the District hopes to improve the quality of instruction and student achievement. .

The master schedule will be restructured to a 6 period day with the focus on English Language Arts, English Language Development (ELD), Mathematics, and targeted Intervention classes. English Learners will be scheduled in English Language Arts and English Language Development classes based on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) levels and California Standards Test (CST) proficiency status.

The CELDT level grouping provides teachers with English Learners at the same level in their language acquisition needs. Teachers focus on the English Language Development Standards that take the student to the next CELDT level which requires focused instruction on specific skills. Similar language level grouping affords this time for targeted instruction strategies that better meet the needs of students. This approach also extends the time students have for receiving language support services while acquiring academic content instruction.

All teachers will be trained in Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). Training in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) program

supports and benefits all content area English Language Development teaching. This Model is a research-based approach to sheltered instruction that has proven effective in addressing the academic needs of English Language Learner's throughout the United States. This model consists of eight components: lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice/application, lesson delivery and review/assessment.

Grades 9 and 10 and grades 11 and 12 students may be combined to provide this specific instruction. Students who performed Far Below Basic and Below Basic on the CST will also be scheduled into targeted intervention classes in English Language Arts, English Language Development and Mathematics before the addition of elective courses in their class schedule.

In order to inform their teaching, teachers will participate in Data PRIDE Teams (Leadership and Learning Center) using the Professional Learning Communities model. Through this model, core content area essential standards are selected from which to develop regular, common assessments for learning that inform instruction. The Professional Learning Communities model will also structure the Tiers of Response to Intervention and the teaching requirements and student expectations of each Tier level.

Leadership and Learning Accountability and Data Teams train the teaching staff to understand and use student data to develop these common, regular assessments for learning. Teacher Professional Learning Communities (PRIDE teams) will collaborate to develop these common regular assessments, based on essential standards and student data, to provide systematic interventions or enrichments and design a system of continuous improvement.

The Accountability and Data Teams professional development training will demonstrate the need for a commitment to understand the connection between instructional strategies and assessment results The purpose of Data Teams collaboration is to focus on improving the effectiveness of teaching and learning with common assessments and goals. Accountability, Data Teams, Common Assessments will facilitate collaborative teams to improve teaching and student progress.

The King City Joint Union High School District serves students in a rural, agricultural area of the southern Salinas Valley. Students need to be introduced to career pathways that motivate and make real life connections to their learning. ConnectEd will assist in developing academic career pathways that integrate with the academic program and student instructional needs.

The King City Joint Union School High School District will develop pathways in the health occupations and public safety careers through collaborative partnerships with Mee Memorial Hospital in King City, the Greenfield and King

City Police Departments, and the King City campus of Hartnell Community College.

The State Administrator and District staff reviewed the available external providers and had initial discussions with the above providers to discuss their programs. A significant factor in the selection is the integration of the external providers to provide a coordinated, congruent professional development program and implementation product. After talking with the above research-based programs, the District selected the following providers to develop an integrated program to implement this Transformation Intervention Model:

- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) (Pearson)
- Leadership and Learning Center (Doug Reeves)
- EdEquity (Edwin Javius)
- ConnectEd multiple career pathways
- Technology Integration included in all content and intervention areas

The above external providers are experienced, recognized research-based organizations. Each element is a current missing piece in the school program. Each has a record of improved student achievement success in school districts around the United States. The district has not previously contracted with any of these providers.

If the District receives this grant, representatives of the provider companies will be invited to discuss their specific plan with the district, and will be asked to meet together to develop an integrated, seamless delivery of professional development for program improvement.

v. Alignment of Other Resources with the Selected Intervention Models

Response:

Federal, State and private resources will be aligned with the intervention programs used to support the Transformation school model.

Title I funds will supplement intervention programs, Title III funds provide additional support for English Learner enrichment/support programs. AVID and GEAR UP will integrate their goals and objectives with the intervention programs and the selected career pathways. Title II funds will support professional development and certificated staff recruitment and retention. The district general funds will coordinate with the SIG funding to ensure maximum effectiveness in the use of all resources.

The State Administrator is charged with the District alignment of budget and curricular resources. His responsibilities include certifying the re-negotiation and ratification of the collective bargaining agreements, certifying that the school board and district personnel have completed specified training, creating and implementing a multiyear fiscal recovery plan, and addressing the health and safety needs of staff and students. Academically, he is to guide the improvement of student achievement and the closing of the achievement gap between English speakers and English Learners. He also has the responsibility to ensure the alignment of other resources with the selected intervention model.

vi. Alignment of Proposed SIG Activities with Current DAIT Process (if applicable)

Response: **Not Applicable**

vii. Modification of LEA Practices or Policies

Response:

The site and District needs analysis and the FCMAT report emphasize the need to modify LEA practices and policies. The requirements and structure of the Transformation intervention model allows the District and the State Administrator to implement the following modifications of LEA practices or policies:

1. LEA will establish specific expectations for administrators as instructional leaders connected to a reported accountability system.

2. Collective Bargaining contract modifications:
   - Teacher observations and evaluations will be based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)
   - Teaching and learning strategies will be included in teacher evaluation
   - Increased instructional days and minutes will be required
   - Required participation in regular collaboration time for all staff
   - Required staff participation in professional development

3. The District will implement a system to identify and reward effective teaching and improved student achievement with input from teacher leaders and district administrators.

4. The District will implement a system to identify and remove staff, after ample opportunities have been provided to improve their professional practice, who have not done so.

5. The State Administrator ensures the equitable distribution of resources to district school sites.

6. The District and school sites will develop more effective parent involvement policies and practices district-wide.

7. The District will implement flexible conditions and develop a program for additional compensation to recruit and retain staff with skills to meet the needs of students in a Transformation School.

8. The District will develop and institute a system for measuring changes in instructional practice resulting from professional development.

9. The District will ensure the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and the principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.

The State Administrator has the responsibility and authority to implement the above modifications of LEA practices or policies. He will work collaboratively with teachers and administrators to develop and implement the above systems and modifications. The Board and appropriate parent and community groups will act as an advisory team to review the modifications.

viii. Sustainment of the Reforms after the Funding Period Ends

Response:

The King City Joint Union High School District is under the control of an appointed State Administrator who will continue in the district after the funding period for the School Improvement Grant ends. The State Administrator ensures the sustainment of the Transformation school reforms and requirements and continued support at Greenfield High School after the funding period ends.

ix. Establishment of Challenging LEA Annual School Goals for Student Achievement

Response:

The needs analysis and District and site performance reports point out the importance of establishing challenging LEA annual school goals for student achievement. The District, the Greenfield administrators and teachers, the

District staff, and the State Administrator will work together to ensure the following goals:

1. Staff will focus instruction on educating students, not just teaching them, as measured by reported student progress on regular common assessments.

2. Students will advance a minimum of one CELDT level each year as measured by annual CELDT testing.

3. Students will gain a minimum of one CST proficiency level each year in reading/language arts and mathematics as reported on annual CST results.

4. Staff will demonstrate more cultural awareness of the students and the school community, and will use this awareness to support culturally responsive school and classroom instruction, as observed by the implementation of equity-based and culturally responsive instructional strategies.

5. The mindset of instructional staff will change from a focus of accommodating adults to a focus on improved student learning, as demonstrated by teacher active participation in professional learning communities that gathers specific evidence of student achievement, to conduct regular common assessments for learning, to motivate students to learn, and to make informed instructional decisions.

6. The school and district will implement accountability systems and measures to ensure all staff are accountable for all students to exceed achievement and performance targets, as demonstrated by the developed systems and measures.

7. The school and district will establish Professional Learning Community data and PRIDE teams that develop and implement effective English Language Development and Intervention strategies to teach all students, as measured by SIOP observation guidelines.

x. Inclusion of Tier III Schools (if applicable)

Response:

King City High School is a Tier III school. The modifications of the LEA practices and policies will also affect King City High School. The King City High School staff will participate in professional development activities and collaboration opportunities incorporated into this grant.

xi. Consultation with Relevant Stakeholders

Response:

The King City Joint Union School High School District (KCJUHSD) has been under the control of a State Appointed Administrator since July 2009. This appointment is a result of the absence of leadership, ineffective communication, inadequate budget development, lack of budget monitoring, and other deficiencies in operational systems and structures. Engaging parents and the community in supporting and advising the schools had not been a District priority.

The State Administrator has held four community forums to discuss the needed changes for KCJUHSD. Included at the forums were a presentation of the intervention models and the reasons for the selection of the Transformation model.

The State Administrator will establish relevant stakeholder groups to solicit their input for the further development and implementation of this Transformation school model for Greenfield High School. The State Administrator ensures the participation of the School Site Council, the English Language Advisory Committee and the District English Language Advisory Committee in the implementation process, and will consult with students and parents and the community in future forums.

The Board of Trustees and the bargaining units have been advised of the importance of fully implementing with fidelity the requirements and activities of this improvement model.

SIG Form 4a–LEA Projected Budget

LEA Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2010–11

Name of LEA: King City Joint Union High School District	
County/District (CD) Code: 2766068	
County: Monterey	
LEA Contact: Dr. John Bernard	Telephone Number: 831.385.0606
E-Mail: jbernard@kingcity.k12.ca.us	Fax Number: :831.385.0695
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000–1999	Certificated Personnel Salaries			
1100	PRIDE Learning Coordinator	85,000	85,000	85,000
1100	Professional Development Days for certificated staff	190,000	190,000	190,000
1900	Substitutes for certificated Professional Development and additional Collaboration days	64,125	64,125	64,125
2000–2999	Classified Personnel Salaries			
2200	Translators - Triqui, Spanish, Mixteco, Zapoteca (hourly)	13,950	13,950	13,950
3000–3999	Employee Benefits			
3101	Certificated	10,000	10,000	10,000
	Classified	----	----	----
4000–4999	Books and Supplies			
4100	Standards aligned R/LA and Math textbooks	70,000	70,000	70,000
4100	R/LA and Math intervention Materials	110,000	110,000	110,000
4100	English Language Development Materials	110,000	110,000	110,000

4200	Professional Development resource materials for instructional staff to support external provider programs	20,000	20,000	20,000
4200	Professional resource materials earned as teacher incentives	9500	9500	9500
4300	Materials and office supplies for program operation	10,000	10,000	10,000
4300	Teacher incentive for classroom supplies from approved vendors	9500	9500	9500
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures			
5100	*Professional Development providers:*			
	Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (Pearson)	155,000	155,000	155,000
	Lead and Learn (Reeves) Accountability/Data Teams Leadership/Coaching Technology Integration	153,000	153,000	153,000
	EdEquity	42,500	42,500	42,500
	Connect Ed	37,000	41,500	37,000
5200	Travel/Conference incentive for instructional leaders	17,500	17,500	17,500
6000–6999	Capital Outlay			
6400	Computers	43,333	43,333	43,333
6400	Classroom printers	5,000	——	——
6400	Smart Boards	15,250	15,250	——
6400	Classroom Projectors	10,000	10,000	——
6400	Cables and Speakers for purchased equipment	8750	8750	

6400	Equipment purchase incentive for teachers through approved vendors	11,875	11,875	11,875
6400	(3) Portable computer lab for classrooms to share	20,000	20,000	20,000
6500	Replace old computers (120) (40) each year	52,000	52,000	52,000
7310 &7350	Indirect Costs	833	833	807
7370 & 7380	Transfers of Direct Support Costs	———	———	———
Total Amount Budgeted		1,274,116	1,273,616	1,235,090

SIG Form 4b–School Projected Budget ***See School Budget Narrative***

School Projected Budget

Fiscal Year 2010–11

Name of School: Greenfield High School	
County/District/School (CDS) Code: 27660682730174	
LEA: King City Joint Union High School District	
LEA Contact: Dr. John Bernard	Telephone Number: 831.385.0606
E-Mail: : jbernard@kingcity.k12.ca.us	Fax Number: 831.385.0695
SACS Resource Code: 3180 Revenue Object: 8920	

Object Code	Description of Line Item	SIG Funds Budgeted		
		FY 2010–11	FY 2011–12	FY 2012–13
1000–	Certificated Personnel Salaries			
1999				
2000–	Classified Personnel Salaries			
2999				
3000–	Employee Benefits			
3999				
4000–	Books and Supplies			
4999				
5000–5999	Services and Other Operating Expenditures			
6000–	Capital Outlay			
6999				
7370 &	Transfers of Direct Support Costs			
7380				
Total Amount Budgeted				

SIG Form 5a–LEA Budget Narrative

LEA Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the LEA budget. The LEA budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include LEA budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
1000-1999		
PRIDE Leader – Program Learning Coordinator 210 days on Assistant Principal salary schedule $85,000 x 3 years	85,000 x 3 years = $255,000	1100
Professional Development Days for certificated Staff – 5 days x 95 teachers x $400 = $190,000 for each of the 3 years	190,000 x 3 years = $570,000	1100
Substitutes for certificated staff professional Development days – 3 days x 95 teachers x $135 = 38,475 for each of the 3 years	38,475 x 3 years = $115,425	1300
Substitutes for additional staff collaboration days 2 days x 95 teachers x $135 =25,650 for each of the 3 years	25,650 x 3 years = $476,950	1300
2000-2999		
Classified Program Translators for Triqui, Spanish, Mextico, Zapoteca (hourly) 93 hrs/month x $15/hr = $1395 x 10 months for each of the 3 years	1,395 x 10 = 13,950 x 3 years = $41,850	2200
3000-3999		
Certificated Benefits for PRIDE Leader 10,000/year for each of the 3 years	10,000 x 3 = $30,000	3101
4000-4999		
Standards-aligned Reading/Language Arts and Math textbooks – high quality additional lower level appropriate texts to supplement current textbooks 70,000/yr x 3 years = $210,000	70,000 x 3 years = $210,000	4100

SIG Form 5a–LEA Budget Narrative

LEA Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the school budget. The school budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
4000-4999		
English Language Development materials -- additional high quality materials to support Targeted ELD and content classes 110,000/yr x 3 years = $330,000	110,000 x 3 years = $330,000	4100
Reading and Language Arts and Math intervention Materials – additional high quality materials to support implemented intervention program and Intervention tiers 110,000/yr x 3 years = $330,000	110,000 x 3 years = $330,000	4100
Professional Development materials for Instructional staff to support and supplement external provider programs 20,000/yr x 3 years - $60,000	20,000 x 3 years = $60,000	4100
Instructional Leader professional development materials incentive from approved vendors 95 teachers x $100/yr = $9500 x 3 years = $28,500	9500 x 3 years = $28,500	4200
Program Materials and Office Supplies 1000/month x 10 months = $10,000 x 3 years = $30,000	10,000 x 3 years = $30,000	4300
Instructional leader materials and supplies incentive from approved vendors 95 teachers x $100/yr = $9500 x 3 years= $28,000	9500 x 3 years = $28,500	4300

SIG Form 5a- LEA Budget Narrative

LEA Budget Narrative

Activity Description (See Instructions)	Subtotal (For each Activity)	Object Code
5000-5999 Professional Development Providers:		
Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (Pearson) Teacher training 3 session @ $45,000 each = $135,000 x 3 years = $607,500 Administrator training @ $5000/yr x 3 years – $15,000 Coach training @ $10,000/yr x 3 years = $30,000 10 days on site support @ $500/day per year = $5000 x 3 years = $15,000	Each year: 135,000 + 5,000 + 10,000 + 5,000 = $155,000 155,000 x 3 years = $465,000	5100
The Leadership and Learning Center - (Doug Reeves) Training on: Decision Making for Results and Data Teams; Common Formative Assessments; Response to Intervention; Effective Grading Practices; Leadership Performance Coaching; Transformational School Seminar 35 days @ $3700/day = $129,000 35 days onsite coaching = 7,200 Support resources investment - $4500 Travel expenses = $19,000 Total $153,000/yr x 3 years = $459,000	153,000/yr x 3 years = $459,000	5100
Ed Equity – Edwin Javius Training on: Culturally Conscious Strategies and Training; Equity Walks; Student Voice 17 days @ $2500/day = $42,000/year x 3 years = $127,000	42,500/yr x 3 years = $127,500	5100

SIG Form 5a- LEA Budget Narrative

LEA Budget Narrative

Activity Description (See Instructions)	Subtotal (For each Activity)	Object Code
5000-5999		
School Leaders Travel & Conference Incentive 50 Leaders @ $350 each = $17,500/yr X 3 years = $52,500	17,500 x 3 years = $52,500	5200
6000-6999		
Classroom Computers to support program technology integration and intervention programs- 100 classroom computers x $1300 = $130,000 divided into 3 years = $43,333 each year	43,000 x 3 years = $130,000	6400
Classroom printers to support classroom computers 50 printers x $100 each = $5000 in year 1	Year 1 – $5,000	6400
Smart Boards to support classroom instruction and motivate learning 20 Smart Boards x $1525 = $30,500 across Year 1 and Year 1 = $15,250/yr	Year 1 and 2 15,250/yr= $30,500	6400
Cables and speakers for purchased equipment 25 x $700 = $17,500 across Year 1 and Year 2= $8750/yr	Year 1 and 2 8750/year = $17,500	6400
Equipment incentive for teacher leaders through approved vendors (digital camera, TV, camcorder, etc.) 95 teachers x $125/yr = $11875/year x 3 years = $35,625	11,8875 x 3 years = $35,625	6400
Portable computer lab for entire classroom use Lab with 25 computers X $800/computer = $20,000 x 3 labs = $60,000 across 3 years	20,000 x 3 years = $60,000	6400

SIG Form 5a- LEA Budget Narrative

LEA Budget Narrative

Activity Description (See Instructions)	Subtotal (For each Activity)	Object Code
6000-6999		
Equipment Replacement Replace old computers 120 computers x $1300 each = $156,000 Replace across 3 years = $52,000/yr	52,000 x 3 years = $156,000	6500
7310 & 7350		
Transfer of Indirect Costs $833 Year 1 + $833 Year 2 + $807 Year 3 = $2473 total indirect costs	833 + 833 + 807 = $2473	7310

SIG Form 5b–School Budget Narrative

School Budget Narrative

Provide sufficient detail to justify the school budget. The school budget narrative page(s) must provide sufficient information to describe activities and costs associated with each object code. Include budget items that reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models and other activities described for each participating school. Please duplicate this form as needed.

School Name: Greenfield High School

Activity Description (See instructions)	Subtotal (For each activity)	Object Code
The State Administrator is responsible for the fiscal and curricular operations and decisions of the District. The State Administrator as the LEA will direct and oversee the Transformation Intervention model fiscal and curricular implementation for Greenfield High School . The LEA Budget and Budget Narrative are the same as the School Budget and Budget Narrative. The District (State Administrator) will be responsible for the distribution of funds in the appropriate budget categories for Greenfield High School. The LEA/School Budget will serve Greenfield High School. Professional Development opportunities will also be offered to King City High School (Tier III).		

SIG Form 6–General Assurances and Certifications

General Assurances

(Required for all Applicants)

Note: All sub-grantees are required to retain on file a copy of these assurances for your records and for audit purposes. Please download the General Assurances form at http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/. Your agency should **not** submit this form to the CDE.

Certifications Regarding Drug-Free Workplace, Lobbying, and Debarment and Suspension

Download the following three forms from http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/, and obtain the necessary signatures and include the original forms with your application submission.

1. Drug-Free Workplace
2. Lobbying
3. Debarment and Suspension

California Department of Education (http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/drug.asp)
Page Generated: 5/26/2010 3:05:42 PM

Drug-Free Workplace

Certification regarding state and federal drug-free workplace requirements.

Note: Any entity, whether an agency or an individual, must complete, sign, and return this certification with its grant application to the California Department of Education.

Grantees Other Than Individuals

As required by Section 8355 of the *California Government Code* and the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 *Code of Federal Regulations* (*CFR*) Part 84, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 *CFR* Part 84, Sections 84.105 and 84.110

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:
   a. Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition
   b. Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:
      1. The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace
      2. The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace
      3. Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs
      4. The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace
   c. Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a)
   d. Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:
      1. Abide by the terms of the statement
      2. Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction
   e. Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to every grant officer or other designee. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.
   f. Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:
      1. Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or
      2. Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a federal, state, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency
   g. Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (street address. city, county, state, zip code)

Greenfield High School

2025 El Camino

Greenfield, Monterey, CA 93927

Check [ ] if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

Grantees Who Are Individuals

As required by Section 8355 of the *California Government Code* and the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 34 *CFR* Part 84, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 34 *CFR* Part 84, Sections 84.105 and 84.110

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and
B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction to every grant officer or designee, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

Name of Applicant: King City Joint Union High School District

Name of Program: ARRA School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Printed Name and Title of Authorized Representative: Dr. John Bernard State Administrator

Signature: _____ Date: _____

CDE-100DF (May-2007) - California Department of Education

Questions: Funding Master Plan | fmp@cde.ca.gov | 916-323-1544

Last Reviewed: Wednesday, May 05, 2010

California Department of Education (http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/lobby.asp)
Page Generated: 5/26/2010 3:05:26 PM

Lobbying

Certification regarding lobbying for federal grants in excess of $100,000.

Applicants must review the requirements for certification regarding lobbying included in the regulations cited below before completing this form. Applicants must sign this form to comply with the certification requirements under 34 *Code of Federal Regulations* (*CFR*) Part 82, "New Restrictions on Lobbying." This certification is a material representation of fact upon which the Department of Education relies when it makes a grant or enters into a cooperative agreement.

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the *U.S. Code*, and implemented at 34 *CFR* Part 82, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over $100,000, as defined at 34 *CFR* Part 82, Sections 82.105 and 82.110, the applicant certifies that:

a. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;
b. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," (revised Jul-1997) in accordance with its instructions;
c. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

Name of Applicant: King City Joint Union High School District

Name of Program: ARRA School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Printed Name and Title of Authorized Representative: Dr. John Bernard, State Administrator

Signature: John Bernard Date: _____

ED 80-0013 (Revised Jun-2004) - U. S. Department of Education

California Department of Education (http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/debar.asp)
Page Generated: 5/26/2010 2:59:49 PM

Debarment and Suspension

Certification regarding debarment, suspension, ineligibility and voluntary exclusion--lower tier covered transactions.

This certification is required by the U. S. Department of Education regulations implementing Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, 34 *Code of Federal Regulations* Part 85, for all lower tier transactions meeting the threshold and tier requirements stated at Section 85.110.

Instructions for Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below.
2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.
3. The prospective lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
4. The terms "covered transaction," "debarred," "suspended," "ineligible," "lower tier covered transaction," "participant," " person," "primary covered transaction," " principal," "proposal," and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the person to which this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.
6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled A Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transactions, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may but is not required to, check the Nonprocurement List.
8. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.
9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

Certification

1. The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
2. Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

Name of Applicant: King City Joint Union High School District

Name of Program: ARRA School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Printed Name and Title of Authorized Representative: ~~Dr. John Bernard State~~ Administrator

Signature: John Bernard Date: _____

ED 80-0014 (Revised Sep-1990) - U. S. Department of Education

Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances

As a condition of the receipt of funds under this sub-grant program, the applicant agrees to comply with the following Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances:

1. Use its SIG 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 of SIG;

2. Establish challenging annual goals for student achievement on the state's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds;

3. If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and

4. Report to the CDE the school-level data as described in this RFA.

5. The applicant will ensure that the identified strategies and related activities are incorporated in the revised LEA Plan and Single Plan for Student Achievement.

6. The applicant will follow all fiscal reporting and auditing standards required by the CDE.

7. The applicant will participate in a statewide evaluation process as determined by the SEA and provide all required information on a timely basis.

8. The applicant will respond to any additional surveys or other methods of data collection that may be required for the full sub-grant period.

9. The applicant will use funds only for allowable costs during the sub-grant period.

10. The application will include all required forms signed by the LEA Superintendent or designee.

The applicant will use fiscal control and fund accountability procedures to ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, federal funds paid under the sub-grant, including the use of the federal funds to supplement, and not supplant,

1. The applicant hereby expresses its full understanding that not meeting all SIG requirements will result in the termination of SIG funding.

2. The applicant will ensure that funds are spent as indicated in the sub-grant proposal and agree that funds will be used **only** in the school(s) identified in the LEA's AO-400 sub-grant award letter.

3. All audits of financial statements will be conducted in accordance with Government Auditing Standards (GAS) and with policies, procedures, and guidelines established by the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), Single Audit Act Amendments, and OMB Circular A-133.

4. The applicant will ensure that expenditures are consistent with the federal Education Department Guidelines Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) under Title 34 Education. http://www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.html (Outside Source)

5. The applicant agrees that the SEA has the right to intervene, renegotiate the sub-grant, and/or cancel the sub-grant if the sub-grant recipient fails to comply with sub-grant requirements.

6. The applicant will cooperate with any site visitations conducted by representatives of the state or regional consortia for the purpose of monitoring sub-grant implementation and expenditures, and will provide all requested documentation to the SEA personnel in a timely manner.

7. The applicant will repay any funds which have been determined through a federal or state audit resolution process to have been misspent, misapplied, or otherwise not properly accounted for, and further agrees to pay any collection fees that may subsequently be imposed by the federal and/or state government.

8. The applicant will administer the activities funded by this sub-grant in such a manner so as to be consistent with California's adopted academic content standards.

9. The applicant will obligate all sub-grant funds by the end date of the sub-grant award period or re-pay any funding received, but not obligated, as well as any interest earned over one-hundred dollars on the funds.

10. The applicant will maintain fiscal procedures to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of the funds from the CDE and disbursement.

1. The applicant will comply with the reporting requirements and submit any required report forms by the due dates specified.

I hereby certify that the agency identified below will comply with all sub-grant conditions and assurances described in items 1 through 22 above.

Agency Name:	King City Joint Union High School District
Authorized Executive:	Dr. John Bernard
Signature of Authorized Executive	

SIG Form 8–Waivers Requested

Waivers Requested

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement (see page 28 for additional information). If the LEA does not intend to implement a waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which school(s) it will implement the waiver on:

- ❑ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

  Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the LEA to September 30, 2013.

Note: If the SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs receiving SIG funds.

- ❑ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

  Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit the LEA to allow its Tier I and Tier II schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline. (**Note**: This waiver applies to Tier I and Tier II schools only)

- ❑ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

  Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit the LEA to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II school that does not meet the poverty threshold. (**Note**: This waiver applies to Tier I and Tier II schools only)

SIG Form 9–Schools to Be Served

Schools to be Served

Indicate which schools the LEA commits to serve, their Tier, and the intervention model the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school. For each school, indicate which waiver(s) will be implemented at each school. **Note**: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools can only use the transformation model in 50 percent or less of those schools. (Attach as many sheets as necessary.)

SCHOOL NAME	CDS Code	NCES Code	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)				WAIVER(S) TO BE IMPLEMENTED		PROJECTED COST
						Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation	Start Over	Implement SWP	
Greenfield High School	27660682730174	0619650	X						X			$1,183,316 year 1 $1,182,816 year 2 $1,144,290 year 2
King City High School	2766082732170	0619650			X							$90,800/yr each of 3 years = $272,400

SIG Form 10–Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School

Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School

Complete this form for each identified Tier I and Tier II school the LEA intends to serve. List the intervention model to be implemented. Include the required component acronym, actions and activities required to implement the model, a timeline with specific dates of implementation, the projected cost of the identified activity, the personnel and material federal, local, private and other district resources necessary, and the position (and person, if known) responsible for

School: **Greenfield High School** **Tier:** I or II (circle one)

Intervention Model: □ Turnaround □ Restart □ Closure □X **Transformation**

Total FTE required: ___2__LEA ___58__ School _____ Other

Required Component Acronym	Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs **School**	**LEA**	Resources	Oversight
RP	Principal replaced	5/15/10	-----	----	State Admin to recruit new principal	State Administrator
ES	Currently in negotiations; teachers beginning to understand State Admin will implement rigorous evaluation system	7/1/10		___	State Admin with teacher leaders District funding	State Admin
IRR	Collaborative group to set rewards expectations beginning 10/10, evaluation will select out those to remove	5/1/11 rewards 3/15/11 removal		Rewards: $38,875/ year	State Admin, Teacher Leaders, Admin Time to collaborate District funding & support	State Admin PRIDE Coord District and Site Admin
PD	Pre-service and during the school year; regular collaboration time and	8/25/10		$502,125/ year to providers	State Admin, Teacher Leaders, Admin, Pride Coord	State Admin Dist Admin Site Admin

	follow-up coaching; substitutes provided			for training and follow-up $38,475 for subs	Title II and District funding to support SIG funds	PRIDE Coord
RPR	State Admin begins discussions with new site administrators to recruit, place and retain staff; teacher leaders, board, advise on strategies	6/1/10		$38,875 for staff incentives	State Admin, Admin, teacher leaders, board Title II to fund recruit and retention	State Admin Dist Admin
IP	Pre-service Leadership and Learning Center data training for staff; use data to inform instruction	8/25-27/10 Followup & regular coaching each month		$153,000/ year for training and followup	State Admin, District/Site Admin PRIDE Coord	State Admin Dist/Site Admin
SD	Expectations set at pre-service; weekly observations of use of data; provider monthly follow-up; weekly collaborative PRIDE team meetings	6/15/10 Planning 8/25-27/10 training		$153,000/ yr for training & follow-up $38,475/ Yr for subs	State Admin, Dist/Site Admin Pride Coord PRIDE teams	State Admin Dist/Site Admin PRIDE Coord
ILT	Begins with planning for 2010/2011 school year; implement 8/30/10	7/1/10 8/30/10		Cost NA Required	State Admin Dist/Site Admin District funding	State Admin

FCE	Develop plans for family & community engagement; implement monthly	8/26/10		Undeter-mined at this time	State Admin Dist/Site Admin Dist/School funding	State Admin Dist/Site Admin
OF	Schools will receive own funding and operational flexibility to implement new instructional program; carryover funding to begin school year	8/1/10		Will be decided by 7/15/10	State Admin Chief Bus Officer District budget	State Admin
TA	Ensure school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from external providers; 2nd Assistant Principal hired for each high school; LEA to hire additional District Administrator for Curriculum and Human Services.	8/1/10 7/1/10 hire dates		Budgeted cost of external providers includes support; Additional staff funded by the District	State Admin PRIDE Coord	State Admin

SIG Form 11–Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)

Implementation Chart for a Tier III School

Complete this form for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. Identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is opting to implement one of the four intervention models, indicate which model will be selected. If the LEA has opted to implement other services or activities, provide a brief description at the top of the chart where indicated.

School: King City High School

Intervention Model: □ Turnaround □ Restart □ Closure □**X Transformation**

□ Other _____

Total FTE required: __1___LEA __40___ School _____ Other

Services & Activities	Timeline	Projected Costs School	Projected Costs LEA	Other Resources	Oversight (LEA / School)
Professional Development training - 3 days pre-service days + 2 days during the school year	August 2010		$80,000	Title II	LEA/State Administrator
Substitutes required for the 2 days during the school year	October 2010 February 2011		$10,800	District	LEA/State Administrator

SIG Application Checklist

Required Components

The following components must be included as part of the application. Check or initial by each component, and include this form in the application package. These forms can be downloaded at http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/regsig09rfa.asp. Please compile the application packet in the order provided below.

Include this completed checklist in the application packet

✓ Form 1 Application Cover Sheet
(Must be signed in **blue ink** by the LEA Superintendent or Designee)

✓ Form 2 Collaborative Signatures
(Must be signed in **blue ink** by the appropriate personnel at each school selected for participation and by the LEA Superintendent or Designee)

✓ Form 3 Narrative Response

✓ Form 4a LEA Projected Budget

✓ Form 4b School Projected Budget

✓ Form 5a LEA Budget Narrative

✓ Form 5b School Budget Narrative

✓ Form 6 General Assurances
- Drug Free Workplace Certification
- Lobbying Certification
- Debarment and Suspension Certification

✓ Form 7 Sub-grant Conditions and Assurances (three pages)

✓ Form 8 Waivers Requested

✓ Form 9 Schools to Be Served Chart

✓ Form 10 Implementation Chart for a Tier I or Tier II School

✓ Form 11 Implementation Chart for a Tier III School, (if applicable)