

# **U.S. Department of Education**

**Washington, D.C. 20202-5335**

## **OSEP FY 2017 Grant Performance Report**

**CFDA # 84.323A**

**PR/Award # H323A170015**

**Budget Period # 1**

**Report Type: Annual Performance**

## Table of Contents

Sl#	Title	Page#
1.	Project Narrative - Optional attachment for additional Section A text -----	3
2.	Project Narrative - Signed Cover Sheet -----	4
3.	signed_cover_sheet.pdf -----	5
4.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Cover Sheet - Revised 2015 -----	7
5.	Executive_Summary.pdf -----	9
6.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 1 -----	12
7.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 2 -----	14
8.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section A - 3 -----	16
9.	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Project Status Chart - Section B & C -----	17
10.	Section_C_Final.pdf -----	18
11.	Section_B_Final.pdf -----	20

**Project Narrative - Optional attachment for additional Section A text**

**Title :** Optional attachment for additional Section A text

**Attachment:**

File :  
1

**Project Narrative - Signed Cover Sheet**

**Title :** Signed Cover Sheet

**Attachment:**

File :

1 [signed\\_cover\\_sheet.pdf](#)



**Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)**

11. Performance Measures Status

- a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart?  Yes  No
- b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ (mm/dd/yyyy)

No data has been collected at this time because this is our planning year.

12. By signing this report, I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the report is true, complete, and accurate and the expenditures, disbursements, and cash receipts are for the purposes and objectives set forth in the terms and conditions of the Federal award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information, or the omission of any material fact, may subject me to criminal, civil or administrative penalties for fraud, false statements, false claims or otherwise. (U.S. Code Title 18, Section 1001 and Title 31, Sections 3729-3730 and 3801-33812).

Furthermore, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true, complete, and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of data reported.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Authorized Representative: Tamara Darnall

Title: Chief Financial Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: 

Date: 05 / 03 / 2018

**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report  
Cover Sheet (ED 524B)**

**Check only one box per  
Program Office instructions.**

**Annual  
Performance  
Report**                       **Final  
Performance  
Report**

**General Information**

1. PR/Award #: H323A170015

*(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification - 11 Characters.)*

2. Grantee NCES ID#: 46

*(See instructions. Up to 12 Characters.)*3. Project Title: SD Cohesive Model for Literacy Support  
*(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)*4. Grantee Name: EDUCATION, SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF  
*(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.)*5. Grantee Address:  
*(See instructions.)*

Street: 800 GOVERNORS DRIVE

City: PIERRE

State: SD Zip: 57501 Zip+4: 2291

6. Project Director:  
*(See instructions.)*

First Name: Rebecca

Last Name: Cain

Title: Special Education Representative

Phone #: 6052803568

Fax #: 6057736139

Email Address: Rebecca.Cain@state.sd.us

**Reporting Period Information (See instructions.)**7. Reporting Period: From: 10/01/2017 To: 09/30/2018  
*(mm/dd/yyyy)***Budget Expenditures (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)**

8. Budget Expenditures:

	<b>Federal Grant Funds</b>	<b>Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share)</b>
a. Previous Budget Period	0	0
b. Current Budget Period	15,149	0
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>		

**Indirect Cost Information (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)**

9. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?  
If yes, please indicate which of the following applies to your grant?       Yes  No
- b. The grantee has an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal Government:       Yes  No  
The period covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement is : From: 07/01/2017 To: 06/30/2018  
*(mm/dd/yyyy)*  
The approving Federal agency is :  ED  Other *(Please specify):* fixed
- The Indirect Cost Rate is : 8.7 %  
Type of Rate  Provisional *(Please specify):*  
*(For Final Performance Reports Only):*  Final  Other
- c. The grantee is not a State, local government, or Indian tribe, and is using the de minimus rate of 10% of modified total direct costs (MTDC) in compliance with 2 CFR 200.414(f)       Yes  No
- d. The grantee is funded under a Restricted Rate Program and is you using a restricted indirect cost rate that either :  
 Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement  Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?
- e. The grantee is funded under a Training Rate Program and:  
 Is recovering indirect cost using 8 percent of MTDC in compliance with 34 CFR 75.562(c)(2)  
 Is recovering indirect costs using its actual negotiated indirect cost rate

**Human Subjects (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) (See instructions.)**10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached?  Yes  No  N/A**Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)**

11. Performance Measures Status

- a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart?  Yes  No

b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? (mm/dd/yyyy)

12. By signing this report, I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the report is true, complete, and accurate and the expenditures, disbursements, and cash receipts are for the purposes and objectives set forth in the terms and conditions of the Federal award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information, or the omission of any material fact, may subject me to criminal, civil or administrative penalties for fraud, false statements, false claims or otherwise. (U.S. Code Title 18, Section 1001 and Title 31, Sections 3729-3730 and 3801-33812). Furthermore, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true, complete, and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of data reported.

Name of Authorized Representative: Tamara Darnall

Title: Director, Division of Finance and Management

Signature:

Date:

**Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Executive Summary Attachment:**

Title : Annual Performance Report

File : [Executive\\_Summary.pdf](#)





**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Executive Summary**

PR/Award # (11 characters):  
H323A170015

In the following Project Objective tables, we report on three Performance Measures (these are OSEP-defined and OSEP-required measures) and several project-specific measures. Here, we provide all the Performance Measure targets that we will strive to achieve each year of the grant.

**In September 2017, the South Dakota Department of Education began recruitment for districts to begin implementation of the SD SPDG. Districts meeting the following requirements were contacted and invited to join a webinar giving an overview of the grants benefits and requirements.**

- 1) Serve at least 20% students who qualify for free and reduced lunch**
- 2) Serve at least 10 students with a specific learning disability**
- 3) Demonstrate needed support for students with disabilities and specifically students with a specific learning disability based upon the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC)**
  - a) 0 to 30% of students with a specific learning disability met SBAC proficiency**

**SD DOE also considered the distance between schools and school readiness for implementation when targeting schools.**

**Of the 22 districts contacted, 16 participated in the webinar to receive more information. SD SPDG state team members followed up with each district to see if they needed further information before sending out the SPDG application on November 1, 2017. Applications were due by November 22, 2017. At this time, the DOE had received applications from three districts. Due to the low numbers, SD SPDG state team members attempted follow-up calls with each of the districts. At this time, SD's second largest district, Rapid City, put in their application for consideration. Three other districts also submitted applications, bringing the total to seven. After reviewing the applications, the SD SPDG state team accepted six of the seven applications, denying one that did not meet all the necessary requirements of the application. The SPDG allows for nine literacy coaches. Two smaller districts in the same region opted to share a coach, one district was given funding for two coaches and another was given funding for four due to the number of elementary buildings, and one district received funding for one coach. These coaches have been hired internally by each district. The last district will be using an out of district coach provided by the SD DOE. The SD DOE provided guidance and criteria to all of the districts to ensure the coaches hired were qualified to provide the necessary guidance and support to all the K-5 teachers in their district.**

**During the time districts were hiring coaches, they were also assembling their building level MTSS teams. These teams consist of the building principal, general and special education staff, as well as counselors, title teachers, school psychologists, and other schools staff. These teams are expected to attend two trainings to create their SPDG action plan. These plans need to contain plans on how they will begin implementation of the MTSS structure, how they will include families in their literacy plan, and how they will schedule and roll out the literacy coach initiative in their building. The SPDG launch training was held in an east river location on April 10 and a west river location on April 11. Each building sent their team members and they received information on each of the components of the SPDG grant. Teams were given homework and instructed to begin work on their action plan. These plans were to be sent to the SD SPDG director for approval by April 20. These plans are working documents, and teams have been instructed to continue to add to and change these plans as needed. The second training is scheduled for June 1 west river and June 11 east river. The teams will come back together to receive more information as well as ask questions and create a plan to roll out the information to all the school staff at the beginning of the school year.**

**Literacy trainings have been scheduled for all nine coaches to attend over the summer. Coaches will receive five full days of training with Jill Jackson which they will use when coaching the teachers in their assigned buildings during the 2018-2019 school year.**

**The State SPDG leadership team met on December 18, 2017 to discuss and formalize the SPDG state plan. The team also discussed next steps and planned for the trainings SPDG districts would receive. The second State SPDG meeting is scheduled for August 15, 2018.**

**The SD SPDG co-directors met with the SPDG evaluator to discuss the evaluations to be used for the grant.**

SD will be using an online professional development tracking system to ensure high quality PD is delivered. Schools will be using the Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI) to determine if MTSS-Literacy is being implemented with fidelity. We will also be using literacy observation checklist pre and post- tests, intervention tracking forms, coaching surveys, focus groups and coaching surveys to ensure the fidelity of the SD SPDG.

**Performance Measure 1:**

In 2018-19, 50% of evidence-based professional development components will score a 3 or 4 on the Rubric of State-wide Professional Development.

2017-18 Target: Baseline

2018-19 Target: 50%

2019-20 Target: 70%

2020-21 Target: 80%

2021-22 Target: 80%

**Performance Measure 2:**

In 2018-19, 50% of the participating schools will receive a score of 70% or higher on the appropriate fidelity of implementation checklist.

2017-18 Target: Baseline

2018-19 Target: 50%

2019-20 Target: 70%

2020-21 Target: 70%

2021-22 Target: 70%

**Performance Measure 3:**

In 2018-19, 50% of the SPDG funds will be used for activities designed to sustain the use of practices on which TA/PD is focused. Measure: Analysis of budget expenditures (Cost of ongoing TA divided by cost of all PD activities for the initiative)

2017-18 Target: Baseline

2018-19 Target: 50%

2019-20 Target: 60%

2020-21 Target: 70%

2021-22 Target: 80%

**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

**PR/Award #: H323A170015**

**SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

SPDG Program Measure 1: Projects use evidenced-based professional development practices to support the attainment of identified competencies

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
1.a.  In 2017-18, baseline information was collected on the PD components. (In 2018-19, 50% of evidenced-base professional development components will score 3 or 4 on the SPDG Evidenced-Based Professional Development Components rubric.)	PROGRAM		8 / 16	50		4 / 16	25
1.b.  In 2018-19, 80% of workshop participants will report that their knowledge increased.	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	
1.c.  In 2018-19, 80% of workshop participants will report that their skills increased.	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	
1.d.  In 2018-19, 80% of workshop participants will report that they will change what they do on the job.	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	
1.e.  In 2018-19, 70% of workshop participants will report that that the trainings impact students.	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	
1.f.  In 2018-19, 70% of staff participating in the Literacy Strategies training will score 70% or higher on each post-test.	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	

**Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)**

1a. Table 1 illustrates how the SD SPDG Leadership Team scored the 16 professional development components on the PD Worksheet. Detailed information is included in the PD Worksheet. We will focus on implementing and enhancing all Components in the 2018-19 school year. Our ?pre-baseline? score is 25%. We expect our score to increase in 2018-19 to 50%. 1b. ? 1e. All PD/TA activities are tracked in terms of who delivered the training, to whom was the training delivered, date, and how the training was delivered. At the end of each training, participants complete an end-of-PLD training evaluation. We will generate quarterly reports on this collected data. Because we believe strongly that the PD/TA delivered to the SPDG schools must have an impact on participant knowledge, skills, and job behaviors, and in turn on students, we have set project goals surrounding these areas for both state- and local-level PD and TA. 1f. Participants at the Literacy Strategies trainings take a pre- and post-test to assess their improvement in knowledge as a result of the training. Table 1: Self-Ratings on the 16 Professional Development Components Professional Development Component Self-Rating A(1) Selection Clear expectations are provided for PD participants and for schools,districts, or other agencies. 2 A(2) Selection Clear expectations are provided for SPDG trainers and SPDG coaches/mentors. 3 B(1) Training Accountability for the delivery and quality of training. 3 B(2) Training Effective research-based adult learning strategies are used. 2 B(3) Training Training is skill-based (e.g., participant behavior rehearsals

to criterion with an expert observing). 1 B(4) Training Training outcome data are collected and analyzed to assess participant knowledge and skills. 2 B(5) Training Trainers (the people who trained PD participants) are trained, coached, and observed. 2 C(1) Coaching Accountability for the development and monitoring of the quality and timeliness of SPDG coaching services. 3 C(2) Coaching SPDG coaches use multiple sources of information in order to provide assistive feedback to those being coached and also provide appropriate instruction or modeling. 1 D(1) Performance Assessment (Data-based Decision Making) Accountability for fidelity measurement and reporting system is clear (e.g., lead person designated). 3 D(2) Performance Assessment Coherent data systems are used to make decisions at all education levels (SEA, regional, LEA, school). 2 D(3) Performance Assessment Implementation fidelity and student outcome data are shared regularly with stakeholders at multiple levels (SEA, regional, local, individual, community, other agencies). 2 D(4) Performance Assessment Goals are created with benchmarks for implementation and student outcome data, and successes are shared and celebrated. 1 D(5) Performance Assessment Participants are instructed in how to provide data to the SPDG Project. 2 E(1) Facilitative Administrative Support /Systems Intervention Administrators are trained appropriately on the SPDG-supported practices and have knowledge of how to support its implementation. 1 E(2) Facilitative Administrative Support / Systems Intervention Leadership at various education levels (SEA, regional, LEA, school, as appropriate) analyzes feedback regarding barriers and successes and makes the necessary decisions and changes, including revising policies and procedures to alleviate barriers and facilitate implementation 2 ? ?

**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

**PR/Award #: H323A170015**

**SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**2 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Participants in SPDG professional development demonstrate improvement in implementation of SPDG supported practices over time.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.a.  In 2018-19, 50% of the SPDG schools will receive a score of 70% or higher on those sections of the R-TFI on which they have received training.	PROGRAM	0	/		0	/	
2.b.  In 2018-19, 50% of participating instructional staff will be observed implementing new strategies, skills, and/or knowledge with fidelity from the training they received, as observed by the Literacy Observation Checklist.	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	
2.c.  In spring 2019, 70% of SPDG coaches will receive a favorable rating on the Coaching Survey.	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	
2.d.  In spring 2019, 70% of staff at the SPDG schools will respond positively on the Family Engagement Survey (for staff members).	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	
2.e.  In spring 2019, 70% of family members at the SPDG schools will respond positively on the Family Engagement Survey.	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	
2.f.  After three years of training, 10% of students with disabilities in the SPDG schools will show an increase in their district-level benchmark reading scores.	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	
2.g.  After three years of training, the state reading proficiency rates of students with disabilities in	PROJECT	0	/		0	/	

the SPDG schools will increase by 5 percentage points over the spring 2018 baseline

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

The evaluation measures that pertain to Project Objective 2 and that will be administered in 2018-19 include: Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI), an implementation survey completed by SPDG Coaches/Team members at each school who are responsible for monitoring school-level fidelity of SPDG implementation. In addition, a trained external observer will complete this on at least 20% of SPDG schools. Literacy Observation Checklist, a checklist used to determine if instructional staff are implementing the core reading strategies with fidelity; SPDG Coaches will use with teachers; a trained external observer will use with coaches. Coaching Survey, a questionnaire that measures satisfaction with the coaching activities provided to districts and schools; all K-5 general education and special education teachers in the SPDG schools will complete this. Family Engagement Survey, a written questionnaire about the extent to which the school encourages family involvement; to be completed by family members at SPDG schools and by staff members at SPDG schools.

U.S. Department of Education  
 Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
 Project Status Chart

**PR/Award #: H323A170015**

**SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**3 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Projects use SPDG professional development funds to provide follow-up activities designed to sustain the use of SPDG-supported practices.

Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.a.  In 2017-18, baseline information is reported.  (In 2018-19, 50% of the SD SPDG funds will be used for activities designed to sustain the use of practices on which PD/TA is focused.)	PROGRAM	0	/		0	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

3.a. South Dakota will be funding the following activities to begin building the system that is designed to sustain the use of practices outlined in the SD SPDG. 1. District MTSS team members attend a national MTSS conference to gain knowledge on the MTSS implementation \$150,000 2. Training Materials \$45,000 3. Parent Resource \$45,000 4. Coaches' salaries and benefits \$153,000 5. Effective Coaching Training \$60,000 6. Literacy Training \$70,000 7. Data Driven Instruction Training \$30,000 Total \$581,000



U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart

PR/Award #: **H323A170015**

**SECTION B - Budget Information** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title : Section B

File : [Section\\_B\\_Final.pdf](#)

**SECTION C - Additional Information** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title : Section C

File : [Section\\_C\\_Final.pdf](#)



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003  
Exp. 08/31/2020

PR/Award # (11 characters):   H323A170015  

**SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)**

Currently the SD SPDG is partnering with SD Parent Connection, Birth to Three (Part C), Utah State University for our evaluator and facilitator.

Grant partners change: When the grant was written, Northern State University was originally selected to be our IHE, but due to conflicts with time and scheduling the decision was made by the State SD SPDG team to use Katie Anderson, an instructor of reading and language arts, from Dakota State University (DSU) as the literacy supports person for the SD literacy coaches. This change will not impact the SD SPDG in carrying out our approved project objectives and activities.

Project personnel change: At the time the grant was written, Ambrea Sikes was employed by the SD DOE as the SSIP and RtI state coordinator. Shortly after the grant was written, Ms. Sikes moved out-of-state leaving her position open. Currently, the DOE is trying to hire for this open position. No percentage of this position is paid for out of SPDG funds.

SD currently has no changes needed for our grant's activities.

SD currently has no changes to the approved Project Director list

SD has chosen the project districts/schools to partner with for the SPDG. These districts and schools are:

Rapid City, Knollwood Elementary

Rapid City, South Park Elementary

Rapid City, South Canyon Elementary

Rapid City, Rapid Valley Elementary

Rapid City, Valley View Elementary

Rapid City, Black Hawk Elementary

Rapid City, Grandview Elementary

Rapid City, Meadowbrook Elementary

Watertown, Jefferson Elementary

Watertown, Lincoln Elementary

Watertown, McKinley Elementary

Watertown, Mellette Elementary

Watertown, Roosevelt Elementary

Watertown, Intermediate

Hot Springs Elementary

Sisseton Westside Elementary

Milbank Koch Elementary

Iroquois Elementary

The eight Rapid City schools will be sharing four coaches, the five Watertown schools will be sharing two coaches, Hot Springs will have its own in district coach, Milbank and Sisseton will share a coach and Iroquois will be contracting with an out of district coach.



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003  
Exp. 08/31/2020

PR/Award # (11 characters): H323A170015

**SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)**

Instructions for Section B – Budget Information

**-- Annual and Final Performance Reports:**

- Report budget expenditure data in items 8a. – 8c. of the ED 524B Cover Sheet, as applicable. Please follow the instructions for completing items 8a. – 8c. included in this instruction sheet
- For budget expenditures made with Federal grant funds, you must provide an explanation if funds have not been drawn down from the G5 System to pay for the budget expenditure amounts reported in items 8a. – 8c of the ED 524B Cover Sheet.
  - \$15,149.06 has been drawn down from the G5 system.
- Provide an explanation if you *did not* expend funds at the expected rate during the reporting period.
  - South Dakota has not expended funds as soon as expected since it took longer to get year one components of the grant off and running. For example, school districts that are participating in the grant needed time to recruit and hire an instructional literacy coach and the training that needed to take place had to wait until the end of the school year due to other obligations the participating districts had.
- Describe any significant changes to your budget resulting from modification of project activities.
  - The significant changes to the budget are due to the explanation provided in the previous question. The project activities themselves have not changed, just the timing of when the activities will take place has changed. Also, the training for instructional coaching and explicit instruction for year one came in under. Therefore, South Dakota will request to carry over the funds to year two.
- Describe any changes to your budget that affected your ability to achieve your approved project activities and/or project objectives.
  - NA

**-- Annual Performance Reports Only:**

- Do you expect to have any unexpended funds at the end of the current budget period? If you do, explain why, provide an estimate, and indicate how you plan to use the unexpended funds (carryover) in the next budget period.

South Dakota expects to have unexpended funds at the end of grant year one. This is due to a few different reasons. Overall, South Dakota used year one as a planning year to get all the pieces in place for the grant. This meant that we did not have as many expenditures as expected. Schools participating in the grant were not able to hire an instructional coach mid-year and therefore funds that were earmarked for training, substitutes, and salary for the instruction coach will not be expended. Also, the estimations for training costs in year one came in under budget. South Dakota expects to have unexpended funds at the end of year one. Also, due to the dates for available MTSS conferences for district MTSS teams to attend taking place after the conclusion of the 2017-2018 grant year, some of the \$150,000 budgeted dollars may need to be carried over into the 2018-2019 grant year. The funds will be used in year two to carry-out the intended year one activities.