



**south dakota**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**Learning. Leadership. Service.**

## **School Improvement Grants LEA Application**

**Section 1003(g) of the  
Elementary and Secondary Education Act**

**CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A**



U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, D.C. 20202  
OMB Number: 1810-0682  
Expiration Date: 06/30/2010

**South Dakota Department of Education**  
 Kneip Office Building, Title I Office  
 700 Governors Drive  
 Pierre, SD 57501

**FY 2009**  
**School Improvement Grant (SIG)**  
**Cover page**

Legal Name of Applicant:  Sioux Falls School District 49-5	Applicant's Mailing Address: Instructional Planning Center 201 E. 38 <sup>th</sup> Street Sioux Falls, SD 57105
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant  Name: Ann Smith  Position and Office: Federal Programs Coordinator  Contact's Mailing Address: 201 E. 38 <sup>th</sup> Street Sioux Falls, SD 57105	Telephone: 605.367.7923  Fax: 605.367.7906  Email address: Ann.Smith@k12.sd.us
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name): Dr. Pam Homan	Telephone: 605.367.7920
<b>I certify that the program person identified above is authorized to act on behalf of the institution with regard to the School Improvement Grants.</b>  X _____ Signature of the LEA Superintendent	Date:  April 9, 2010
The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

**ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION STATEMENT:** The above named applicant assures the South Dakota Department of Education that these projects will be administered in compliance with the assurances contained in its current consolidated application for the Title I part A program, with state and federal laws and regulations applicable to the use of these funds, that the information contained in this application is accurate and complete.

Name of Authorized Representative (Type or Print): Ann Smith

**Original** Signature of Authorized Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

SD Department of Education use only	
Date Received:	_____ Signature of authorized SD DOE staff person

**Guidelines**

***Purpose of Grant***

The School Improvement Grants (SIG) program is authorized by section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Under section 1003(g)(1) of the ESEA, the Secretary must “award grants to States to enable the States to provide subgrants to local educational agencies for the purpose of providing assistance for school improvement consistent with section 1116.” From a grant received pursuant to that provision, a State educational agency (SEA) must subgrant at least 95 percent of the funds it receives to its local educational agencies (LEAs) for school improvement activities. In awarding such subgrants, an SEA must “give priority to the local educational agencies with the lowest-achieving schools that demonstrate — (A) the greatest need for such funds; and (B) the strongest commitment to ensuring that such funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the goals under school and local educational improvement, corrective action, and restructuring plans under section 1116.” The regulatory requirements expand upon these provisions, further defining LEAs with the “greatest need” for SIG funds and the “strongest commitment” to ensuring that such funds are used to raise substantially student achievement in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State.

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010, which was signed into law by President Obama on December 16, 2009, included two critical changes to the SIG program. First, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 allows SEAs and LEAs to use SIG funds to serve certain “newly eligible” schools (*i.e.*, certain low-achieving schools that are not Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring). Second, the law increases the amount that an SEA may

award for each school participating in the SIG program from \$500,000 annually to \$2 million annually.

The final requirements for the SIG program, set forth in 74 FR 65618 (Dec. 10, 2009), and amended by the interim final requirements, set forth in 75 FR 3375 (Jan. 21, 2010) (final requirements), implement both the requirements of section 1003(g) of the ESEA and the flexibilities for the SIG program provided through the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

### ***Clarification of Available School Improvement Funds***

There are two opportunities for additional funding for Title I schools in improvement status. These funds are distributed according to statute in Title I Part A 1003(a) and 1003(g).

The funds available under School Improvement 1003(a) - Formula grants have been and will continue to be allocated on a formula basis to all districts with Title I schools in improvement. These funds are to be used at each Title I school in school improvement based on the allocation for that school.

School Improvement Grants 1003(g) are additional funds available to districts with Tier I, II or III schools as identified as Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) schools. Districts may apply for these grants on behalf of Title I school in improvement, corrective action, restructuring, or alternative governance designated as Tier I schools. The remaining Title I schools in improvement status listed as Tier III schools may be served with SIG funds after priority schools are served. Districts may also apply for Tier II schools which are high schools eligible for, but not receiving Title I funds..

### ***Eligible Applicants***

An LEA that receives Title I, Part A funds and that has one or more Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools may apply for a SIG grant. Note that an LEA that is in improvement but that does not have any Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools is not eligible to receive SIG funds.

### ***Allocations***

The minimum award for each school will be \$50,000 per school for each of the three years (unless a shorter time period is needed). An LEAs maximum award will be no more than \$2 million per year for a three year period for each Tier I, II, or III school served.

If an SEA does not have sufficient SIG funds to support fully and effectively each school for which its LEAs have applied throughout the period of availability, an SEA must give priority to LEAs seeking to fund Tier I or Tier II schools.

### ***Based on Need and Commitment***

In addition to the objective measures used to determine need for the 1003(a) funds (poverty, enrollment, and level of need), each DISTRICT with eligible schools applying for funds under section SIG 1003(g) must demonstrate the need for the additional school improvement funds

and commitment to carry out the requirements. Greatest need. An LEA with the greatest need for a School Improvement Grant must have one or more schools in Tier I, II, or III. Strongest Commitment. An LEA with the strongest commitment is an LEA that agrees to implement, and demonstrates the capacity to implement fully and effectively, one of the following rigorous interventions in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve: Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, or Transformational Models.

**Conditions of Eligibility**

SDDOE will consider applications from districts with Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) Tier I, II, or III schools.

**Budget and Accounting**

The SIG 1003(g) awards must be used to **supplement** the level of funds available for the education of children in these schools. Therefore, these funds can supplement, but they **cannot be used to replace existing funding or services.**

The School Improvement Grant 1003(g) funds *must be tracked separately* from the Title I, Part A Basic Grant and the other Title I School Improvement funds distributed by formula under Section 1003(a). School Improvement funds are awarded for individual schools, therefore these funds must be accounted for at the individual school level.

Districts are to receipt improvement funds in the Title I revenue account and track each award separately by using a sub account number (operational unit and/or sub-object) for each Title I program. Expenditures for the School Improvement Grant 1003(g) funds should be tracked using the same sub account identifier.

**Duration**

Grant Periods:

Project Year 1: July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011

Project Year 2: July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012

Project Year 3: July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013

The SEA must renew the LEA’s SIG grant with respect to each Tier I or Tier II school that meets the annual student achievement goals established by the LEA and makes progress on the leading indicators. The SEA may renew the LEA’s SIG grant with respect to a school that does not meet its annual goals as it has discretion to examine factors such as the school’s progress on the leading indicators or the fidelity with which it is implementing the model in deciding whether to renew the LEA’s SIG grant. For a grant to be renewed with respect to a Tier III school, the school must meet the goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA, or make progress toward meeting those goals. See section II.C(a)(i)-(ii) of the final requirements. If a the SEA determines that one or more of an LEA’s schools do not warrant renewed funding, the SEA may continue to award the LEA SIG funds for other eligible schools. The SEA would reduce the LEA’s grant, however, by the amount allocated for the schools for which funding is not being renewed.

### ***The Application Process***

*Review and Approval Process:* EA applications will undergo review by a panel with facilitation. The panel will consist of members of the Committee of Practitioners and the School Support Team. Additional panel members will be recruited with expertise in curriculum, administration, and teacher evaluation. A rubric will be used to determine if LEA applications meet the requirements of the grant and warrant approval. Each element will be scored based on the following scoring rubric:

**Comprehensive:** Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points)

**Clarifications:** Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point)

**Incomplete:** Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points)

The department will notify the LEAs of the day their application will be reviewed and will be asked to be available for a conference call if the panel has questions about their application. This will be an opportunity for districts to clarify the intent of their applications. Final scoring of the rubric and recommendations to the department will conclude the panel review process. LEAs with applications that are promising but do not fully meet each requirement will be contacted by the department for technical assistance in bringing the application into full compliance. LEA applications will not be approved unless all requirements are fully met.

*Timeline:* LEAs were given a copy of the draft application package on Friday, February 19<sup>th</sup>. A Live Meeting was held at that time to go over the application and grant requirements. The SIG will be submitted to ED on February 22, 2010. The final LEA application package will be forwarded to the districts upon ED approval. Another Live Meeting will be conducted for all districts involved. Districts will be asked to indicate their intent to apply for Tier I and II schools by March 12<sup>th</sup>. Tier III applications will be sent out by March 19<sup>th</sup> if warranted, based upon the number of Tier I and II schools LEAs intend to commit to serve and the amount of funding available. EA applications must be submitted by April 9<sup>th</sup>. Applications will be reviewed by April 23<sup>rd</sup>. Awards are expected to be announced by May 7, 2010. Districts receiving grant awards may begin implementation immediately, but no later than the first contract day for the 2010-2011 school year.

Applications may be submitted electronically by email. The application may be single spaced with appropriate spacing between sections, with font size of 12 or greater. Electronic submissions may be sent to Betsy Chapman. A follow-up paper copy of the cover page signed by the authorized representative and the school principal must be sent.

**Technical Assistance**

A Live Meeting was held on February 19, 2010 to provide LEAs with the draft LEA application and School Sections. An over view of PLA identification, SIG requirements, the four intervention models, and application procedures was provided. Another Live Meeting will be scheduled once the State and LEA applications and School Sections have been federally approved.

SEA staff are available to provide technical assistance at the request of the district. School Support Team members may also be assigned to help districts as they design their SIG applications.

**Contact Information**

For grant application questions:

Diane Lowery (773-6509)  
Beth Schiltz (773-4716)  
Betsy Chapman (773-4712)

[Diane.Lowery@state.sd.us](mailto:Diane.Lowery@state.sd.us)  
[Beth.Schiltz@state.sd.us](mailto:Beth.Schiltz@state.sd.us)  
[Betsy.Chapman@state.sd.us](mailto:Betsy.Chapman@state.sd.us)

For fiscal questions:

Rob Huffman (773-4600)  
Paul Schreiner (773-7108)

[Robyn.Huffman@state.sd.us](mailto:Robyn.Huffman@state.sd.us)  
[Paul.Schreiner@state.sd.us](mailto:Paul.Schreiner@state.sd.us)

## LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation
Axtell Immersion Center	466627001170	X			X			
Laura B. Anderson	466627000597			X				
Cleveland	466627000581			X				
Garfield	466627000587			X				
Hawthorne	466627000936			X				
Hayward	466627000590			X				
Longfellow	466627000601			X				
Lowell	466627000602			X				
Terry Redlin	466627000579			X				
Anne Sullivan	466627000770			X				

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

Specific information for each Tier I, II, and III school that the district applies to serve will be addressed in each school level section. Please answer these questions from a district perspective, taking into consideration each of the district's Tier I, II, and III schools.

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school
  - a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome. *(Your answer must include the following: A list of the names of the members of the committee. The position within the district that each person is representing, The committee must include a broad range of stakeholders including administrators, teachers, program directors, community members, and parents).*

Dr. Pam Homan, Superintendent  
 Dr. Fred Aderhold, Assistant Superintendent  
 Ann Smith, Federal Programs Coordinator  
 Kevin Dick, District ELL Coordinator

Dr. Sandra Leonard, Middle School Curriculum Coordinator  
Rich Meier, Elementary Curriculum Coordinator  
Steve Cain, Axtell Park Middle School Principal  
Sue McAdaragh, District Math Leader  
Kirk Zeeck, Laura B. Anderson Principal  
Jackie McNamara, Cleveland Elementary Principal  
Nancy Duncan, Garfield Principal  
Cheryl Larson, Hawthorne Principal  
Kiersta Machacek, Hayward Principal  
Jeff Sheets, Longfellow Principal  
Twaine Fink, Lowell Principal  
Tara Eckstaine, Horace Mann Principal  
Mitch Sheaffer, Terry Redlin Principal  
Lois Running, Anne Sullivan Principal  
Wade Helleson, District Instructional Coach  
Christina Miller, Instructional Coach  
Jodi Larsen, Special Education Teacher  
Carol Pipgras, Education Assistant  
Becky Bray, Teacher  
Donna Magnusson, Community  
Doug Simmons, School Resource Officer  
Adil Abdulhassan, Parent  
Jean-Claude Diaminda, Parent

- b. Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district's comprehensive needs assessment designed for the purpose of the SIG application. *(Your answer must address data within the four lenses of the Data Retreat<sup>SM</sup>, process: Student, Professional Practices, Programs & Structures, and Family & Community Data. Include an evaluation of current practices and programs as required in the third lens of data review. If any of the schools involved have had a school level audit based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSSO, the results must be included in the data analysis.)*

To complete this application, the District analyzed student academic progress as measured by District end-of-year math and reading assessments, Dakota STEP scores in reading and math, and SAT scores at 5<sup>th</sup> grade. To analyze LEP student progress, the District used scores on the state's test of English Language Proficiency (the DELP through 2008 and the WIDA ACCESS beginning in 2009) correlated with the length of time the student has been enrolled in the District's ELL program. Administrators use the McREL PowerWalkthrough system to collect data from Classroom walkthroughs. This data is used to analyze teachers' instructional practices. Board reports from studies conducted in the past years were reviewed, including a comprehensive study of the District's ELL Program, an evaluation of the District's Stability Bus pilot, the annual AYP reports, and an evaluation of the District's Instructional Coaching Program which was implemented as a corrective action following the audit conducted by the SD DOE using the CCSSO District audit tool. The results of the Community Climate Survey conducted in January, 2010 provided data related to Family & Community, as did the audit report from the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

The results from the school level audits based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSO for the following schools were analyzed:

- Hawthorne – audit conducted January, 2007
- Laura B Anderson – audit conducted October, 2007
- Longfellow – audit conducted February, 2008
- Cleveland – audit conducted April, 2008
- Lowell – audit conducted March, 2009
- Hayward – audit conducted January, 2010
- Garfield – audit conducted February, 2010

- c. Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) conducted for the purpose of the SIG application. *(Your answer must include the following: **WHEN** the comprehensive needs assessment was conducted, give date (must be completed between February and application submission); **WHO** was involved with the analysis of the data; and **HOW** the comprehensive needs assessment was accomplished.*

Superintendent Pam Homan, Assistant Superintendent Fred Aderhold, and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith met on Feb. 26 to discuss the SIG requirements and what needs exist that this funding could address. Superintendent Pam Homan, Assistant Superintendent Fred Aderhold, ELL Coordinator Kevin Dick, Principal Steve Cain, and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith met on March 2, 2010 to discuss the 4 required interventions and reviewed options for serving the District's Tier I school. Building subcommittees involving principals, teachers, parents and community members met between March 18 and 26 to analyze the data from a building perspective, then a committee consisting of representatives from all of the schools met on April 8 to analyze the needs and prioritize the interventions. The final recommendations were reviewed by Superintendent Homan and Assistant Superintendent Aderhold on April 9<sup>th</sup>.

- d. Broadly describe the results of that review (specifics for each school will be outlined in the school sections). *Summarize the results of the CNA for each school.*

The **Axtell Immersion Center** is a Tier I school. All students enrolled in the Axtell Park Immersion Center are LEP students and 99% of the students have been in the United States for less than 2 years. The Immersion Center program was implemented in 2000 and has evolved and changed as the number of refugee and immigrant students increased and the national origins and educational backgrounds of the new arrivals changed. Axtell Immersion Center is currently on Level 1 school improvement for reading. None of the students who have been in the United States for more than a year scored proficient on the Dakota STEP in Reading. Student progress in reading is improving following the implementation of System 44 in 2009-2010. When students reach a second grade reading level or have been in the Immersion Center for 2 years, they exit the Immersion Center and enroll in either Axtell Park Middle School or Whittier Middle School. This year, about 50% of the students are on track to achieve a 2<sup>nd</sup> grade reading level within a year. None of the Immersion Center teachers are highly qualified to teach math or science. The Immersion Center language acquisition-focused curriculum is not aligned with middle school content standards.

Tier III schools:

**Laura B. Anderson Elementary** was first identified for School Improvement in 2003 and is currently on Level 5 Improvement for Math and Reading. The SST led a school improvement audit, based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSO, in October of 2007. LBA's overall total was 3.387. Recommendations from that audit included 1) emphasizing strategies and interventions designed collaboratively between regular classroom teachers and/or SPED and ELL teachers. One recommended strategy was the effective use of **co-teaching through a push-in model** rather than student pullouts. 2) staff development focusing on **differentiation** to meet the needs of all students 3) **use of assessment data** to guide instruction.

**Longfellow Elementary** was first identified for School Improvement in 2004 and is currently on Level 5 improvement for Reading and Level 2 improvement for Math. The SST led a school improvement audit, based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSO, in February of 2008. Longfellow's overall total was 3.53. Recommendations from that audit included 1) assure that instructional needs of ELL students are being met. This could involve FTE utilization or scheduling of ELL students in **push-in vs pullout instruction**. 2) create a unified focus schoolwide for high expectations that are related to state goals. This should clearly address how to **zero in on the skills needed to build on** to become proficient. 3) include a focus on moving from "knowing to doing" during staff meetings and collaboration.

**Lowell MST Elementary** was first identified for School Improvement in 2004 and is currently on Level 4 Improvement for Math and Reading. Since being transformed in 2007 into a specialized elementary school focusing on math, science and technology, Lowell has experienced a high rate of staff turnover. The SST led a school improvement audit, based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSO, in March of 2008. Lowell's overall total was 3.30. Recommendations from that audit included 1) expand the criteria for the systemic Collaboration process that is in place to more effectively document and monitor the progress being made at each session. Outcomes for collaboration include development of common formative assessments so results can be analyzed both vertically and horizontally to support lesson planning for re-teaching skills and additional support needed for the new teachers in the school 2) implement a transition plan for the increasing mobility rate among students 3) increase ELL FTE to support the increasing number of ELL students.

**Hawthorne Elementary** was first identified for School Improvement in 2001 and is currently on Level 5 Improvement for Reading Level 1 Improvement for Math. The SST led a school improvement audit, based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSO, in January of 2007. Hawthorne's overall total was 3.656. Recommendations from that audit included 1) **align the District essentials focus and state standards into ELL program delivery** 2) Address case load equity and service delivery with SPED using strategies such as **class within a class and push-in scheduling** 3) In all grades continue to strive for having all activities and lessons tied to standards and essential guides.

**Cleveland Elementary** was first identified for School Improvement in 2004 and is currently on Level 4 Improvement for Reading and Level 3 Improvement for Math. The SST led a school improvement audit, based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSO, in April of 2008. Cleveland's overall total was 3.24. Recommendations from that audit included 1) focus on

moving from “knowing to doing” consistently in all activities used in the classroom 2) consider scheduling and placement options for SPED, including an emphasis on “push-in” vs. “pull-out” and co-teaching 3) strengthen the Collaboration Plan currently being implemented

**Hayward Elementary** was first identified for School Improvement in 2006 and is currently on Level 3 Improvement for Reading and Level 2 Improvement for Math. Hayward will become a center-base ELL site in the fall of 2010. The SST led a school improvement audit, based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSSO, in January of 2010. Hayward’s overall total was 3.16. Recommendations from that audit included 1) review the current collaboration structure, refining agendas and placing more focus on student work and strategies for those not making progress. Make sure staff in all programs are included these discussions. 2) adopt a common lesson plan format to facilitate monitoring to ensure the focus for instruction matches identified needs 3) complete a thorough needs assessment to identify the areas of focus for professional development. A strategy to consider building-wide would be differentiation of instruction. 4) develop common formative assessments to guide instruction and monitor student growth 5) review student math data and math curriculum/instruction and work to develop a common approach to instruction across the building.

**Garfield Elementary** was first identified for School Improvement in 2006 and is currently on Level 3 Improvement for Math. The SST led a school improvement audit, based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSSO, in February of 2010. Garfield’s overall total was 3.44. Recommendations from that audit included 1) strengthen collaboration through a focus on the following: a) a sustained effort on analyzing student work b) a systematic way to include the specialty staff (SPED, EIS, RR, Tutor, etc) in all collaboration sessions c) create time for K-2 and 3-5 teachers to collaborate to enhance vertical alignment 2) develop more common formative assessments to support instruction in the classroom and, continuous lesson plan development.

**Terry Redlin Elementary** was first identified for School Improvement in 2008 and is currently on Level 1 Improvement for Math and Reading. District assessment results show that students in grades 3-5 have the greatest gap between the 23<sup>rd</sup> and 77<sup>th</sup> percentiles in performance on the District end-of-year reading assessment. 69% of ELL students were not proficient on the 2009 Dakota STEP Reading test. Less than 50% of the students in the Hispanic, Native American, Special Education, and ELL subgroups were proficient in math on the 2009 Dakota STEP test. Teachers need further training in best practices in math instruction and strategies for identifying gaps in student understanding of fundamental math concepts.

**Anne Sullivan Elementary** exited School Improvement in 2007, then was identified for School Improvement again in 2009 and is currently on Level 1 Improvement for Math. During the fall data retreat, areas identified for improvement in program structure include increased time for collaboration and coordination with grade levels and all programs. Data also shows that ELL students need additional support services. First grade ELL students scored an average of 85.8% on the District end-of-year math assessment compared to 91% for non-ELL students. The difference is greatest at 4<sup>th</sup> grade, where ELL students scored an average of 54.2% compared to the non-ELL average of 76.1%.

- e. List the strengths and weaknesses for each school based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment. *These should be brief statements or phrases. Prioritize the areas that will be addressed with SIG funds.*

An \* indicates this is a priority to be addressed with SIG funds.

	Strengths	Weakness
Axtell Immersion Center	<p>Language Acquisition focus and expertise to distinguish language barriers from learning disabilities;</p> <p>Integration with Axtell Park Middle School for art, music, PE, Family and Consumer Science, Physical Education classes, lunch;</p> <p>Reading interventions including System 44 and guided reading groups*</p> <p>Parent attendance at Parent Teacher Conferences</p>	<p>No highly qualified math instructor</p> <p>No highly qualified science instructor</p> <p>ELL (language acquisition) curriculum and instruction not aligned with middle school content standards*</p> <p>Professional development for staff on differentiation and integrating language acquisition with content instruction*</p> <p>Lack of training for staff on manifestations of trauma*</p> <p>Parent ability to support their child's learning and maintain effective parental supervision*</p> <p>Interrupted learning during the summer months*</p>
Laura B. Anderson	<p>Leadership for School Improvement</p> <p>Scientifically researched-based methodologies and instructional strategies used in classroom*</p> <p>Job-embedded professional development (District Instructional Coach)*</p> <p>Building-wide Responsive Classroom model to promote positive social interactions</p>	<p>Assignments of students to classrooms based on teacher qualifications*</p> <p>High percentage of non-proficient ELL and SPED students*</p> <p>Interrupted learning during the summer months*</p> <p>Parent Involvement</p>

<p>Longfellow</p>	<p>Scientifically researched-based methodologies and instructional strategies used in classroom (push-in model of ELL)*</p> <p>Building collaboration model</p> <p>Professional development for all staff in instructional strategies for ELL students</p>	<p>Address how to <b>zero in on the skills needed to build on</b> to become proficient*</p> <p>Larger class sizes at the upper grades where students have a wide range of skills*</p> <p>Interrupted learning during the summer months*</p> <p>Parent Involvement</p>
<p>Lowell MST</p>	<p>School culture &amp; climate</p> <p>Smaller class sizes in primary grades</p> <p>Inquiry-based approach to learning</p> <p>Push-in model for SPED instruction*</p> <p>Math Recovery Instructional Coach*</p> <p>District Instructional Coach to support integrating technology</p>	<p>Gaps in skill levels for students in intermediate grades*</p> <p>Students entering school with significant language, social, emotional, and cognitive needs*</p> <p>Number of students with a low socio economic status and limited parent involvement which places them at risk of gang influence*</p> <p>Interrupted learning time during the summer months*</p>
<p>Hawthorne</p>	<p>Leadership for School Improvement</p> <p>Collaboration with a strong focus on instructional strategies</p> <p>Direct vocabulary instruction</p> <p>Coaching for teachers in differentiation strategies for ELL students*</p> <p>Class size reduction in primary grades</p>	<p>Class size fluctuation due to student mobility*</p> <p>Behavioral and emotional needs of students*</p> <p>Assessments to determine gaps in student mathematical understanding*</p> <p>Interrupted learning time during the summer months*</p>
<p>Cleveland</p>	<p>ELL and SPED Curriculum coordinated with Language Arts Curriculum</p>	<p>*Teachers lack training in small group math instruction*</p> <p>Variation in student skills at 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades, especially</p>

	<p>Math Curriculum effectively spirals concepts</p> <p>Reading Recovery as an intervention at 1<sup>st</sup> Grade</p> <p>Class size reduction in primary grades</p>	<p>between ELL and non-ELL students*</p> <p>Insufficient amount of leveled reading materials for 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> graders reading significantly below grade level, especially ELL students*</p> <p>No support for students after they are dismissed from Reading Recovery*</p> <p>Interrupted learning time during the summer months*</p>
Hayward	<p>School Culture &amp; Climate</p> <p>Assessment/Accountability</p> <p>Common planning time</p> <p>Behavior Facilitator to support positive learning environment and time on task*</p> <p>Professional development in scientifically research-based strategies*</p> <p>Class size reduction in the primary grades</p>	<p>Professional development for staff in differentiating for ELL students (will become center-base ELL site in the fall)*</p> <p>Unit/lesson planning based on common formative assessments aligned with content standards*</p> <p>No common approach to math instruction*</p> <p>Parent Involvement</p>
Garfield	<p>Leadership for School Improvement</p> <p>Clear vision and mission</p> <p>Professional development in scientifically research-based strategies*</p> <p>Professional development through coaching*</p> <p>Scientifically research-based instructional strategies</p>	<p>Unit/lesson planning based on student results*</p> <p>Support for at-risk students*</p> <p>Lack of formative assessments to support Cognitively Guided Instruction in math*</p> <p>High student mobility*</p> <p>Interrupted learning during the summer months*</p>

	Safe and drug-free learning environment	Parent Involvement
Terry Redlin	<p>Class size reduction at the primary level</p> <p>Job-embedded professional development through a half-time instructional coach</p> <p>Student achievement in the primary grades, especially first grade</p>	<p>Reading achievement at grades 3-5*</p> <p>Variation in student skills in intermediate grades, especially between ELL and non-ELL students*</p> <p>Interrupted learning during the summer months*</p> <p>Effective assessments to identify student learning gaps in mathematical concepts*</p>
Anne Sullivan	<p>Standards-based curriculum and District Essentials guide</p> <p>Class size reduction in grades K-1</p> <p>Push-in ELL math support*</p> <p>Small group tutorial support through Title teachers*</p> <p>Flexible math groups to accommodate all levels of learning*</p> <p>Strong focus on math problem solving</p>	<p>Gaps in student understanding of basic math concepts*</p> <p>Effective assessments to identify student learning gaps in mathematical concepts*</p> <p>Insufficient FTE to provide ELL push-in services and tutorial support at all grade levels*</p> <p>Interrupted learning during the summer months*</p>

- f. Provide the rationale the district used to determine which schools to serve with SIG funds and which schools not to serve. *Must address each Tier I and II school first, and then address each of the district's Tier III schools, if applicable.*

The district has one Tier I school. This school serves newly arrived refugee and immigrant students, the most at-risk population in the District. Over the years, the educational and language acquisition needs of these students has changed as families with different cultural and educational background are resettled in Sioux Falls. SIG funds will allow the District to implement an instructional program focused on content-based language acquisition, which research shows is the most effective approach to ELL instruction when bilingual instruction is not an option.

In addition to serving the Tier I school, the District will serve 9 Tier III schools.

**Laura B. Anderson Elementary** is currently on Level 5 Improvement for Math and Reading, placing it at the highest designation possible. Laura B Anderson is an ELL Center-Base site and needs to build their capacity to support ELL students. LBA has strong instructional leadership that will use these interventions to leverage a change in instruction.

**Longfellow Elementary** is currently on Level 5 improvement for Reading and Level 2 improvement for Math. Longfellow has the highest percentage of ELL students of any school other than the District's Immersion Centers. Building teacher capacity to support this at-risk population will make a significant difference.

**Lowell MST Elementary** is currently on Level 4 Improvement for Math and Reading. The District transformed Lowell into a specialized math, science and technology elementary school in 2007-08. Lowell has had a new principal each year since then. A strong principal and effective instructional coaches have made a significant difference this year and Lowell will have the lowest rate of staff turnover in the last 3 years. The District wants to provide additional support to maintain the progress that Lowell is making. Lowell is an ELL Center-Base site and needs to build their capacity to support ELL students.

**Hawthorne Elementary** is currently on Level 5 Improvement for Reading Level 1 Improvement for Math and has been on School Improvement longer than any other school in the District. In 2009, Hawthorne would have made AYP if only 1 or 2 more students had scored proficient. Hawthorne has effectively closed the achievement gap for Hispanic students. The District wants to provide additional support to maintain the progress that Hawthorne is making. Hawthorne is an ELL Center-Base site and needs to build their capacity to support ELL students.

**Cleveland Elementary** is currently on Level 4 Improvement for Reading and Level 3 Improvement for Math. Cleveland is an ELL Center-Base site and needs to build their capacity to support ELL students.

**Hayward Elementary** is currently on Level 3 Improvement for Reading and Level 2 Improvement for Math. Hayward will become a center-base ELL site in the fall of 2010 and needs to build their capacity to support ELL students..

**Garfield Elementary** is currently on Level 3 Improvement for Math. They have a new principal who is a strong instructional leader. The District wants to support this principal's efforts to improve achievement at Garfield and Title I formula funds are insufficient to implement the required interventions.

**Terry Redlin Elementary** is currently on Level 1 Improvement for Math and Reading. Terry Redlin is an ELL Center-Base site and needs to build their capacity to support ELL students. In spite of having the third-highest percentage of students in poverty in the District, Terry Redlin has maintained high academic achievement. The District wants to support Terry Redlin's success and Title I formula funds are insufficient to implement the required interventions.

**Anne Sullivan Elementary** exited School Improvement in 2007, then was identified for School Improvement again in 2009 and is currently on Level 1 Improvement for Math. Anne Sullivan is an ELL Center-Base site and needs to build their capacity to support ELL students. The District wants to support Anne Sullivan's success and Title I formula funds are insufficient to implement the required interventions.

- (2) The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- a. Describe the LEA's capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application. *What capacity does the district have to execute and support a turnaround or transformational model? Will the district contract with any person or organization to assist with the implementation of the turnaround or transformational model? What resources does the district have in terms of staffing, funding, support, partnerships, etc. that will assist the district in successfully implementing the chosen interventions? Differentiate what has already taken place and detailed plans for the future.*

The following resources are available within the District and will support the Turnaround model at the Axtell Immersion Center:

1. A pool of highly qualified, highly effective teachers to select from
2. Experience with job-embedded professional development through instructional coaches.
3. An established ELL program with over 30 teachers with the ENL endorsement and experienced curriculum specialists to support aligning language acquisition curriculum with content standards.
4. Central Administrative staff with a depth of expertise in Curriculum, Instruction, Special Education, and Student Support Services.
5. An Assessment Coordinator to assist with collecting and analyzing student achievement data
6. A new governance structure which was planned prior to the decision to implement the turnaround model. By adding an Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources and Legal Services on July 1, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction will have more time to devote to monitoring and supporting Turnaround activities
7. A data warehouse system to facilitate collecting, monitoring, and analyzing achievement data

In addition, the following will support the turnaround model:

8. A well-established partnership with Lutheran Social Services and community health professionals
9. An attractive community with a variety of amenities to attract and retain quality staff
10. Administrative salaries that are among the highest in the region to attract high quality candidates for principal
11. A progressive Superintendent with a commitment to results

- b. Describe district administrative oversight. *(Your answer must include who from the district will provide oversight of the SIG and how that will be accomplished.)*

The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction will have ultimate responsibility for oversight of School Improvement Grant, meeting with principals at the schools that are receiving SIG funds at least quarterly. The Assistant Superintendent will ensure that principals establish short-term and long-term goals and monitor progress toward achieving those goals, taking appropriate steps if there is no progress. The Assistant Superintendent will be assisted by the Federal Programs Coordinator who will ensure that all reports are completed and submitted in a timely fashion, the Middle School Curriculum Coordinator who will oversee aligning the Immersion Center curriculum, and the Elementary Curriculum Coordinator who will assist with identifying and implementing effective interventions. SIG funds will be used to hire an evaluator to determine what kind of impact interventions are having so the District can focus on those interventions that are clearly effective and discontinue ineffective interventions.

- (3) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school. *The LEA must indicate the barriers or reasons why it lacks the capacity to serve all Tier I schools. Examples might be funding, minimum staffing for oversight, inability to close schools, geography or rural nature of district, lack of charter schools in the state, lack of qualified principals applying over the past years, district improvement, school improvement, multiple requirements to address.*

The district is serving all Tier I schools.

- (4) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take.
  - a. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. *Districts must describe what has been done to this point to design the interventions described in the school level sections. Plans for future action must be indicated. Broadly address all of the schools the district has committed to serve. School level sections will contain specific actions and timelines the district will meet in implementing the interventions for each school.*

The Federal Programs Coordinator attended the National Title I Conference in January and participated in the breakout sessions pertaining to the SIG process. Subsequently, the Coordinator studied the School Improvement Guidance and participated in the Live Meetings conducted by the SD DOE. The Coordinator presented an overview of the SIG process on Feb. 5 and encouraged all principals of potential Tier I and Tier III schools to begin thinking about their priorities for using SIG funds. After the Superintendent was notified that the district had a Tier I school, the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and Federal Programs Coordinator met to review the four models and examine strategies for implementing them. Following further research and consultation with other educational experts including the Ombudsman Educational Services, the district determined that the Turnaround Model could be effectively implemented at the Immersion Center. Reviewing data from the Tier III schools, the district determined that it did not have the capacity to fully implement one of the four models in the Tier III schools but that implementing elements from the Transformational Model would support a systemic approach to building the District's capacity to support the growing number of ELL students. The comprehensive needs analysis from the Tier III schools showed a common need for some kind of math intervention. The District believes that the Math Recovery model that Lowell MST is implementing shows promise but warrants careful evaluation before launching a broader

implementation. The District will conduct a thorough evaluation of Math Recovery's impact at Lowell and will also investigate other options for math intervention during 2010-11. The District implemented extending student learning time by extending the day 20 minutes as a corrective action at Hawthorne, LBA, and Lowell, but subsequent evaluation does not show that this intervention is having a significant impact on student achievement. The District has chosen to discontinue this intervention and instead focus on increasing teacher capacity to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of students through reducing class sizes in the intermediate grades, providing additional FTE to for flexible grouping in reading and math, and increasing the Instructional Coach FTE available to provide job-embedded professional development. The District will continue to use McREL Power Walkthrough software to collect data from informal classroom observations to evaluate the impact of professional development on classroom instructional practice.

- b. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. *Indicate the process used up to this point for selection of external providers. Provide a detailed plan for this process in the future. Who will be involved in the selection procedure? What criteria have been set?*

The district is not planning to select any external providers.

- c. Align other resources with the interventions. *Describe other resources available to the district that will be leveraged to assist with interventions under SIG. Include participation in SDI+, RtI, Reading First, etc. Address resources in terms of funding, staffing, partnerships, and support.*

The District currently supports Reading Recovery at 1<sup>st</sup> grade through local funds and additional Reading Recovery teachers funded by Title I in Title I buildings. This intervention will be enhanced by providing reading support through additional FTE to provide flexible grouping for reading instruction.

The District receives Title III funds to supplement and enhance the core ELL program. These funds provide introductory training in *Classroom Instruction That Works for English Language Learners*, additional FTE at the middle schools and high schools to reduce class sizes in Sheltered Classes and provide FAME reading instruction for ELL students at Washington High School. Title III funds also provide a .3 FTE ELL Coordinator. A Refugee Impact Grant provides support for School Home Liaisons to help with ELL Parent Involvement and Title I funds provide additional ELL FTE in Title I Schools. Formulas derived from Dr. Catherine Collier's work on "Separating Difference from Disability" suggest we should have 20.7 FTE ELL teachers in our elementary schools to meet the existing needs. SIG funds will allow us to increase to 19.2 FTE and build the capacity of all ELL Teachers in Tier I and III schools to more effectively support both ELL students and the classroom teachers that work with those students.

Special Education funds provide Early Intervening Services (EIS) for students who are struggling but who may respond to more significant interventions. Additional FTE funded through SIG will allow us to reach even more struggling students.

The District uses Title IIA funds and Title I funds to reduce class sizes in Kindergarten and 1<sup>st</sup> grade. SIG funds will allow us to reduce class sizes in grades 2 – 5, where data shows a greater variance in student skill levels.

- d. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. *Describe policies and practices that will need to be changed in order to fully implement the selected interventions. What barriers exist? Indicate the willingness of the district to modify procedures along the way if needed.*

Research shows that the effectiveness of the classroom teacher is the most significant factor in student achievement. Hiring additional staff will make no difference if those staff members are ineffective teachers. In order to fully implement these interventions, it is critical that the principals conduct regular classroom observations and provide teachers timely and meaningful feedback. If principals observe average or below average instruction, they need to follow up and provide effective coaching, maintaining documentation along the way to support nonrenewal when warranted.

Recognizing that ensuring that the best possible candidates get hired in the first place, the District has implemented Gallup’s “Teacher Insight” tool to identify applicants who demonstrate the greatest potential to become outstanding teachers. The District is establishing strict policies to follow when hiring candidates and has established follow-up measures to assist in ensuring that only the highest quality teachers receive tenure.

Under the current Superintendent, the District has established systematic procedures for implementing new programs, monitoring their effectiveness, and continuing or discontinuing them based on the evidence of their effectiveness. The district is more than willing to modify procedures along the way to ensure greater student success.

- e. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. *Describe how the district will continue the reform efforts once the SIG funds no longer exist. Address funding, staffing, and other resources that will be needed to sustain the reforms.*

The focus of the ELL Instructional Coach and additional ELL FTE is to increase the capacity of regular classroom teachers to differentiate instruction for ELL students. At the end of 3 years, this increased capacity should reduce the need for pull-out ELL services and establish an environment where all teachers see themselves as ELL teachers. Similarly, math and reading coaches will build the capacity of the classroom teacher to identify gaps in learning and deliver effective instruction to increase those gaps. Sustaining the additional FTE for class size reduction will be a challenge without a change in our state’s formula for funding for K-12 education. If the requirement that District’s spend 20% of their Title I funds on Supplemental Education Services is eliminated with the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we may have additional Title I funds to support reduced class sizes.

By restructuring the Axtell Immersion Center so that students receive language-acquisition skills through content instruction and improving instruction through job-embedded professional development for the Immersion Center teachers, students will develop language skills more

quickly and exit the Immersion Center sooner better prepared to succeed in a sheltered ELL classroom. As students exit more quickly, the number of students in the Immersion Center will decrease, requiring fewer FTE.

- (5) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application. *Highlight major events and benchmarks for all schools over the three year implementation time period. The timeline should be from the district perspective.*

#### 2010-2011 (Year 1)

- May: Screen and hire principal and staff, including ELL Instructional Coach  
July: Principal contract begins; Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction begins  
Aug: First day for staff that are new to the District  
Aug: First day for veteran teaching staff  
Aug: Inservice – ELL Instructional Coach meet with staff  
Aug – June: Instructional Coach provides ongoing support through modeling and feedback  
  
Sept: First parent night and schedule established for 5 subsequent meetings  
Sept: Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction meets with principal to establish benchmarks and dates for 3 future meetings  
Oct – Jan: Revise and align Immersion Center Curriculum  
February: Principal determines summer school schedule  
February: WIDA testing  
March: Principal completes summative teacher evaluation, determines any teachers who will be transferred or non-renewed  
March: Recommendations for math resources completed  
April: Dakota STEP testing  
April: New staff screened and hired, if necessary  
May: Assistant Superintendent has summative review with principal  
May-June: Staff complete professional development plan for 2011-2012  
June: Staff attend System 44 training  
June: Summer school session

#### 2011-2013 (Years 2 & 3)

- July: Receive WIDA and Dakota STEP scores  
July/Aug: Summer school session  
Aug-June: ELL Instructional Coach supports teachers through modeling and feedback  
Sept: First parent night and schedule established for 5 subsequent meetings  
Sept: Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction meets with principal to establish benchmarks and dates for 3 future meetings  
Sept: Data Retreat, begin revising School Improvement Plan  
February: WIDA testing  
February: Principal determines summer school schedule  
March: Principal completes summative teacher evaluation, determines any teachers who will be transferred or non-renewed

March: Staff attend TESOL conference  
April: Dakota STEP testing  
May: Assistant Superintendent has summative review with principal  
May-June: Staff complete professional development plan for 2012-2013  
June: Summer school session

- (6) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds. *List the reading and math annual goals for each of the Tier I and II schools the district commits to serve. The goal must be measurable and specify the indicator (Dakota STEP) that will be used during each of the grant years. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year).*

2010-2011 Reading Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2010-2011 Math Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

(In 2010, 16 students will have scores that count toward Adequate Yearly Progress)

2011-2012 Reading Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2011-2012 Math Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2012-2013 Reading Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2012-2013 Math Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

(We anticipate that as instruction improves at the Immersion Center, students will exit the program sooner. Since scores for ELL students only count toward AYP after the students have been in the country for a year, our goal would be that no student stays in the Immersion Center long enough for their score to count for AYP)

- (7) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. *Briefly describe the activities for all Tier III schools served. Specifics of the activities will be provided in each school section.*

1. Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs. Provide job-embedded professional development designed to build capacity and support staff.

- a) Provide an ELL Instructional Coach to train all ELL teachers in the Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol (SIOP) model of language acquisition instruction.
- b) Provide additional ELL FTE to support push-in ELL support and instructional coaching in differentiation strategies to build the classroom teacher's capacity to meet ELL student needs.
- c) Provide Math Teachers to build teacher capacity to differentiate instruction for individual student needs and support flexible grouping for math instruction.
- d) Provide Reading Teachers to build teacher capacity to differentiate instruction for individual student needs and support flexible grouping for reading instruction.

2. Continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction.

- a) Provide uninterrupted time for teachers to collaborate and focus on developing common formative assessment and using assessment data to guide instruction

3. Increased learning time for students

- a) Provide summer school for nonproficient students to mitigate summer learning loss

4. Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

- a) Stability Bus to reduce student mobility at all Tier III schools

4. Option Instructional Reform Strategy

- a) Class Size Reduction in grades 2-5
- b) Reading coaches to support flexible grouping and increase teacher capacity to differentiate instruction for individual student needs.

- (8) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds. *List the reading and math annual goals for each of the Tier I and II schools the district commits to serve. The goal must be measurable and specify the indicator (Dakota STEP) that will be used during each of the grant years. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year).*

Laura B. Anderson Elementary

**2010-11 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 79% of students in Laura B. Anderson Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2010-11 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 76% of students in Laura B. Anderson Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2011-12 Math Goal:** We will improve mathematics instruction so that 86% of students in Laura B. Anderson Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.

**2011-12 Reading Goal:** We will improve mathematics instruction so that 84% of students in Laura B. Anderson Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.

**2012-13 Math Goal:** We will improve mathematics instruction so that 93% of students in Laura B. Anderson Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.

**2012-13 Reading Goal:** We will improve mathematics instruction so that 92% of students in Laura B. Anderson Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.

Longfellow Elementary

**2010-11 Math Goal:** We will improve mathematics instruction so that 79% of students in Longfellow Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.

**2010-11 Reading Goal:** We will improve mathematics instruction so that 76% of students in Longfellow Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.

**2011-12 Math Goal:** We will improve mathematics instruction so that 86% of students in Longfellow Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.

**2011-12 Reading Goal:** We will improve mathematics instruction so that 84% of students in Longfellow Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.

**2012-13 Math Goal:** We will improve mathematics instruction so that 93% of students in Longfellow Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.

**2012-13 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 92% of students in Longfellow Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

Lowell MST Elementary

**2010-11 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 79% of students in Lowell Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2010-11 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 76% of students in Lowell Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2011-12 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 86% of students in Lowell Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2011-12 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 84% of students in Lowell Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2012-13 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 93% of students in Lowell Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

**2012-13 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 92% of students in Lowell Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

Hawthorne Elementary

**2010-11 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 79% of students in Hawthorne Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2010-11 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 76% of students in Hawthorne Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2011-12 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 86% of students in Hawthorne Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2011-12 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 84% of students in Hawthorne Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2012-13 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 93% of students in Hawthorne Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

**2012-13 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 92% of students in Hawthorne Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

Cleveland Elementary

**2010-11 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 79% of students in Cleveland Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2010-11 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 76% of students in Cleveland Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2011-12 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 86% of students in Cleveland Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2011-12 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 84% of students in Cleveland Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2012-13 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 93% of students in Cleveland Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

**2012-13 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 92% of students in Cleveland Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

Hayward Elementary

**2010-11 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 79% of students in Hayward Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2010-11 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 76% of students in Hayward Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2011-12 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 86% of students in Hayward Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2011-12 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 84% of students in Hayward Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2012-13 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 93% of students in Hayward Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

**2012-13 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 92% of students in Hayward Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

Garfield Elementary

**2010-11 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 79% of students in Garfield Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2010-11 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 76% of students in Garfield Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2011-12 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 86% of students in Garfield Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2011-12 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 84% of students in Garfield Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2012-13 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 93% of students in Garfield Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

**2012-13 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 92% of students in Garfield Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

Terry Redlin Elementary

**2010-11 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 79% of students in Terry Redlin Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2010-11 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 76% of students in Terry Redlin Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2011-12 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 86% of students in Terry Redlin Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2011-12 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 84% of students in Terry Redlin Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2012-13 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 93% of students in Terry Redlin Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

**2012-13 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 92% of students in Terry Redlin Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

Anne Sullivan Elementary

**2010-11 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 79% of students in Anne Sullivan Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2010-11 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 76% of students in Anne Sullivan Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2011.**

**2011-12 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 86% of students in Anne Sullivan Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2011-12 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 84% of students in Anne Sullivan Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2012.**

**2012-13 Math Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 93% of students in Anne Sullivan Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

**2012-13 Reading Goal: We will improve mathematics instruction so that 92% of students in Anne Sullivan Elementary School will demonstrate proficiency in reading as measured by the Dakota STEP test by July 1, 2013.**

- (9) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. *Describe consultation with school administration, teachers and other staff, and parents and community members. Indicate when and how the consultation took place.*

All Title I principals met with the Federal Programs Coordinator on February 5 for an overview of the School Improvement Grant process and the 4 models required for Tier 1 or Tier 2 schools. On March 2, following word from the state that the Axtell Immersion Center had been placed on the list of Persistently Lowest Achieving schools, Dr. Pam Homan, Dr. Fred Aderhold, Kevin Dick, Steve Cain, and Ann Smith met to discuss the four models required for Tier 1 schools as defined in the School Improvement Grant. Following further review of the models and research into the feasibility of implementing them, Dr. Homan determined that the Turnaround Model would be most appropriate.

On March 19, 2010, Ann Smith and JoJean Callison met with the staff of the Immersion Center to explain the 4 models and how the decision was made to implement the Turnaround Model. On March 29, 2010, a committee consisting of Immersion Center teachers Susan Torres, Melissa Honkomp-Grogan, and Stephanie Ayers; Parents Jean-Claude Diaminda and Adil Abdulkhassan; Axtell Park Middle School Assistant Principal JoJean Callison and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith analyzed student and teacher data, program data, and parent and community data to establish appropriate measures for student progress and ongoing program evaluation. On April 8, 2010, ELL Coordinator Kevin Dick and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith met with Donna Magnusson to review the report from the Office of Refugee Resettlement audit conducted in November 2009 and discuss opportunities for addressing the mental health and acculturation needs of students and their parents.

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

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

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

Note: An LEA’s budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

**District Budget categories for consideration in required budget narrative.**

Personnel: Salaries; paid to certificated individuals (i.e., certified teachers); staff that are not certificated (i.e., paraprofessionals, secretaries, teachers’ aides, bus drivers).

Examples: Teacher: \$40,000 @ .5 FTE = \$20,000  
 Paraprofessional: \$15,000 @ 1 FTE = \$15,000

Employee Benefits: Payments made on behalf of employees that are not part of gross salary (i.e., insurance, Social Security, retirement, unemployment compensation, workers compensation, annual leave, sick leave).

Examples:  $\$20,000 \times 7.65\%$  (Social Security-Medicare) = \$1,530  
 $\$15,000 \times 7.65\%$  (Social Security-Medicare) = \$3,000

Travel: Expenditures for staff travel, including mileage, airline tickets, taxi fare, meals, lodging, student transportation.

Examples: 3 trips X 400 miles X .37= \$4,440  
Bus - 5 days per week X \$20 per day X 20 weeks = \$2,000

Equipment: Equipment should include tangible, nonexpendable personal property that has a useful life of more than one year. This should include all electronic equipment such as laptop and desktop computers. The grantee will be expected to maintain an equipment inventory list.

Examples: Desktop computers @ \$1200 = \$3600  
Laptop computer -1 @ \$900 = \$900

Supplies: Consumable supplies include materials, software, videos, textbooks, etc.

Examples: Reading books - \$300  
Software for Math assistance program - \$175

Contractual: (Purchased Services) Personal services rendered by personnel who are not employees of Local Education Agency (LEA), and other services the LEA may purchase; workshop & conference fees, tuition, contracted services, consultants, scoring services, rent, travel, etc.

Example: Company A – Provide professional development workshop - \$1,200

Professional Development: Include these professional development related costs in your annual budgets and budget narratives.

Example: Professional development conference – New York  
Airfare - \$550  
Registration - \$250  
Meals – 3 days @ \$36 per day = \$108  
Lodging – 2 days @ \$175 = \$350  
Miscellaneous – Cab - \$50

Indirect Costs: Grantees must have an approved restricted indirect cost rate before indirect cost may be charged to this program.

**Include a budget description for each year of the proposed 3 year project. Provide details linking expenditures to requirements of the intervention selected for Tiers I and II. Indicate expenses related to strategies to be used in Tier III schools.**

**Grant Periods:**

Project Year 1: July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011

**Tier I – Turnaround**

**\* indicates expense is District-level and will support Tier III schools as well**

Personnel:

Use locally adopted competencies to review and select staff

Teacher: \$41,540 @ .5 FTE = \$20,770

Provide job-embedded PD designed to build capacity and support staff

ELL Instructional Coach: \$41,540 @ 1 FTE = \$41,540\*

Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

Teacher hourly for Parent Nights 24 hours @ \$19.59 = \$ 470

Increase learning time for students

Summer School Teachers 98 hours X \$26.29 X 3 teachers = \$ 7,729

Summer School – School Home Liaison 60 hours X \$24 = \$ 1,440

Summer School – Paraprofessionals 80 hours X \$10.00 X 2 paras = \$ 1,600

Increase learning time for staff

Time beyond the contract day 88 hours X \$26.29 X 4 = \$ 9,254

Employee Benefits:

Use locally adopted competencies to review and select staff

Teacher

Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare \$20,770 X 30% = \$ 6,231

Provide job-embedded PD designed to build capacity and support staff

ELL Instructional Coach

Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare \$41,540 X 30%= \$12,462\*

Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

Teacher hourly for Parent Nights

Social Security, Medicare \$470 X 13.65% = \$ 64

Increase learning time for students

Summer School Teachers

Social Security, Medicare \$ 7,729 X 13.65% = \$ 1,055

Summer School – School Home Liaison

Social Security, Medicare \$ 1,440 X 13.65% = \$ 197

Summer School – Paraprofessionals

Social Security, Medicare \$ 1,600 X 13.65% = \$ 218

Increase learning time for staff

Time beyond the contract day

Social Security, Medicare \$ 9,254 X 13.65% \$ 1,263

Travel:

Increase learning time for students

Summer School Transportation	\$180 X 20 days	\$ 1,600
Summer School Field Trips	\$100 X 5	\$ 500

Equipment:

**Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs**

Computers to support math and science		\$10,000
---------------------------------------	--	----------

Supplies:

**Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs**

Supplies to implement SIOP instruction		\$ 8,000
(e.g. leveled nonfiction reading materials for math and science; software)		
Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports		
Food, books, paper and resources to support parent nights		\$ 9,600

Contractual:

Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

Interpreters for Parent Nights	24 hours X \$25 X 5 interpreters	\$ 3,000
--------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------

Professional Development:

Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

Staff Training for manifestations of trauma	trainer fee	\$ 2,000
---	-------------	----------

**Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs**

SIOP Institute training	(Pearson fee)	\$ 15,000*
Supplies to support SIOP Training	(100 books @ \$50)	\$ 5,000*
Teacher hourly for time beyond contract	(180 hours X \$19.59)	\$ 3,526*
Social Security, Medicare for hourly	(\$3,134 X .1365)	\$ 481*

Tier III

Personnel:

Teachers	\$41,540 @ 8.25 FTE =	\$342,705
ELL Teachers	\$41,540 @ 3.7 FTE =	\$153,698
Instructional Coaches	\$41,540 @ 3.0 FTE =	\$124,620
Math Teacher & Math Coach	\$41,540 @ 1.5 FTE =	\$ 62,310
Reading Teachers	\$41,540 @ 2.0 FTE =	\$ 83,080
Summer School Teachers	(49 x 68 hours @ \$26.29)	\$ 87,598
Summer School Home Liaisons	(4 x 60 hours @ \$24)	\$ 5,760
Summer School Paraprofessionals	(2 x 60 hours @ \$10)	\$ 1,200
Summer School Secretaries	(6 X 25 hours @ \$15)	\$ 2,250
Summer School Administrator	(1 x 25 hours @ \$50)	\$ 1,250

Employee Benefits:

Insurance, retirement, Social Security, Medicare

Teachers	\$342,705 X 30% =	\$102,812
ELL Teachers	\$153,698 X 30% =	\$ 46,109
Instructional Coaches	\$124,620 X 30% =	\$ 37,386

Math Teacher & Math Coach	\$ 62,310 X 30% =	\$ 18,693
Reading Teachers	\$145,390 X 30% =	\$ 24,924
<u>Social Security, Medicare</u>		
Summer School Teachers	\$ 87,598 @ 13.65%	\$ 11,957
Summer School Home Liaisons	\$ 5,760 @ 13.65%	\$ 786
Summer School Paraprofessionals	\$ 1,200 @ 13.65%	\$ 164
Summer School Secretaries	\$ 2,250 @ 13.65%	\$ 307
Summer School Administrator	\$ 1,250 @ 13.65%	\$ 171
<u>Travel:</u>		
Stability Bus		\$18,000
Summer School Transportation		6,000
<u>Equipment:</u>		
Ipods to support instruction and assessment	18 sets of 22 @ \$199	\$78,804
Accessories for Ipods		\$ 2,175
<u>Supplies:</u>		
Summer School Supplies		\$29,950
<u>Professional Development:</u>		
<b>Math intervention instructor fees</b>		<b>\$ 6,819</b>
<b>Collaboration (Teacher hourly beyond contract, Substitutes)</b>		<b>\$26,071</b>
<u>Indirect Costs</u>		
Indirect Cost rate is 2.02%		\$29,060

Project Year 2: July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012

**Tier I – Turnaround**

**\* indicates expense is District-level and will support Tier III schools as well**

Personnel:

Use locally adopted competencies to review and select staff

Teacher: \$42,786 @ .5 FTE = \$21,393

Provide job-embedded PD designed to build capacity and support staff

ELL Instructional Coach: \$42,786 @ 1 FTE = \$42,786\*

Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

Teacher hourly for Parent Nights 24 hours @ \$19.79 = \$ 475

Increase learning time for students

Summer School Teachers 98 hours X \$26.55 X 3 teachers = \$ 7,806

Summer School – School Home Liaison 60 hours X \$24.72 = \$ 1,483

Summer School – Paraprofessionals 80 hours X \$10.30 X 2 paras = \$ 1,648

Increase learning time for staff

Time beyond the contract day 88 hours X \$26.55 X 4 = \$ 9,346

Employee Benefits:

Use locally adopted competencies to review and select staff

Teacher

Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare \$21,393 X 30% = \$ 6,418

Provide job-embedded PD designed to build capacity and support staff

ELL Instructional Coach

Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare \$42,786 X 30%= \$ 12,836\*

Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

Teacher hourly for Parent Nights

Social Security, Medicare \$475 X 13.65% = \$ 65

Increase learning time for students

Summer School Teachers

Social Security, Medicare \$ 7,806 X 13.65% = \$ 1,065

Summer School – School Home Liaison

Social Security, Medicare \$ 1,483 X 13.65% = \$ 202

Summer School – Paraprofessionals

Social Security, Medicare \$ 1,648 X 13.65% = \$ 225



Social Security, Medicare		
Summer School Teachers	\$117,351 @ 13.65%	\$ 16,018
Summer School Home Liaisons	\$ 5,933 @ 13.65%	\$ 810
Summer School Paraprofessionals	\$ 3,708 @ 13.65%	\$ 506
Summer School Secretaries	\$ 3,090 @ 13.65%	\$ 422
Summer School Administrator	\$ 1,288 @ 13.65%	\$ 176
<u>Travel:</u>		
Stability Bus		\$18,540
Summer School Transportation		8,652
<u>Supplies:</u>		
Summer School Supplies		\$38,500
<u>Professional Development:</u>		
<b>Math intervention instructor fees</b>		<b>\$ 6,819</b>
<b>Collaboration (Teacher hourly beyond contract; substitutes)</b>		<b>\$21,158</b>
<u>Indirect Costs</u>		
Indirect Cost rate is 2.02%		\$28,683

Project Year 3: July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013

### Tier I – Turnaround

**\* indicates expense is District-level and will support Tier III schools as well**

#### Personnel:

Use locally adopted competencies to review and select staff		
Teacher:	\$44,070 @ .5 FTE =	\$22,035
Provide job-embedded PD designed to build capacity and support staff		
ELL Instructional Coach:	\$44,070 @ 1 FTE =	\$44,070*
Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports		
Teacher hourly for Parent Nights	24 hours @ \$19.99 =	\$ 480
Increase learning time for students		
Summer School Teachers	98 hours X \$26.81 X 3 teachers =	\$ 7,882
Summer School – School Home Liaison	60 hours X \$25.46=	\$ 1,528
Summer School – Paraprofessionals	80 hours X \$10.61 X 2 paras =	\$ 1,698
Increase learning time for staff		
Time beyond the contract day	88 hours X \$26.81 X 4 =	\$ 9,437

Employee Benefits:

Use locally adopted competencies to review and select staff

Teacher  
Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare  $\$22,035 \times 30\% =$  \$ 6,611

Provide job-embedded PD designed to build capacity and support staff

ELL Instructional Coach  
Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare  $\$44,070 \times 30\% =$  \$ 13,221

Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

Teacher hourly for Parent Nights  
Social Security, Medicare  $\$480 \times 13.65\% =$  \$ 66

Increase learning time for students

Summer School Teachers  
Social Security, Medicare  $\$ 7,882 \times 13.65\% =$  \$ 1,076

Summer School – School Home Liaison  
Social Security, Medicare  $\$ 1,528 \times 13.65\% =$  \$ 209

Summer School – Paraprofessionals  
Social Security, Medicare  $\$ 1,698 \times 13.65\% =$  \$ 232

Increase learning time for staff

Time beyond the contract day  
Social Security, Medicare  $\$ 9,437 \times 13.65\%$  \$ 1,288

Travel:

Increase learning time for students

Summer School Transportation  $\$180 \times 20$  days \$ 1,600  
Summer School Field Trips  $\$100 \times 5$  \$ 500

Supplies:

**Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs**

Supplies to implement SIOP instruction \$ 8,000  
(e.g. leveled nonfiction reading materials for math and science; software)

Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

Food, books, paper and resources to support parent nights \$ 9,600

Contractual:

Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

Interpreters for Parent Nights 24 hours  $\times \$25 \times 5$  interpreters \$ 3,000

Professional Development:

**Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs**

Teacher hourly for time beyond contract	(180 hours X \$19.99)	\$ 3,598*
Social Security, Medicare for hourly	(\$3,598 X .1365)	\$ 491*
Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports		
Staff Training for manifestations of trauma	trainer fee	\$ 2,000

Tier III

Personnel:

Teachers	\$44,070 @ 8.25 FTE =	\$363,578
ELL Teachers	\$44,070 @ 3.7 FTE =	\$163,059
Instructional Coaches	\$44,070 @ 3.0 FTE =	\$132,210
Math Teacher & Math Coach	\$44,070 @ 1.5 FTE =	\$ 66,105
Reading Teachers	\$44,070 @ 2.0 FTE =	\$ 88,140
Summer School Teachers	(56 x 68 hours @ \$26.81)	\$102,092
Summer School Home Liaisons	(4 x 60 hours @ \$25.46)	\$ 6,110
Summer School Paraprofessionals	(6 x 60 hours @ \$10.61)	\$ 3,820
Summer School Secretaries	(6 X 25 hours @ \$15.91)	\$ 3,182
Summer School Administrator	(1 x 25 hours @ \$53)	\$ 1,325

Employee Benefits:

Insurance, retirement, Social Security, Medicare

Teachers	\$363,578 X 30% =	\$109,073
ELL Teachers	\$163,059 X 30% =	\$ 48,918
Instructional Coach	\$132,210 X 30% =	\$ 39,663
Math Teacher & Math Coach	\$ 66,105 X 30% =	\$ 19,832
Reading Teachers	\$ 88,140 X 30% =	\$ 26,442

Social Security, Medicare

Summer School Teachers	\$102,092 @ 13.65%	\$ 13,936
Summer School Home Liaisons	\$ 6,110 @ 13.65%	\$ 834
Summer School Paraprofessionals	\$ 3,820 @ 13.65%	\$ 521
Summer School Secretaries	\$ 3,182 @ 13.65%	\$ 434
Summer School Administrator	\$ 1,325 @ 13.65%	\$ 181

Travel:

Stability Bus	\$19,096
Summer School Transportation	8,911

Supplies:

Summer School supplies	\$38,500
------------------------	----------

Professional Development:

<b>Collaboration (Teacher hourly beyond contract; substitutes)</b>	<b>\$21,367</b>
--	-----------------

Indirect Costs

Indirect Cost rate is 2.02%	\$28,979
-----------------------------	----------

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

Name of School: Sioux Falls School District

**Budget Summary**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)
1. Personnel	\$ 947,275	\$1,005,707	\$1,033,158
2. Employee Benefits	\$264,798	\$276,840	\$284,776
3. Travel	\$26,100	\$29,292	\$30,107
4. Equipment	\$90,979	\$0	\$0
5. Supplies	\$ 47,550	\$56,100	\$56,100
6. Contractual	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000
7. Professional Development	\$58,898	\$49,027	\$27,456
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	\$1,438,600	\$1,419,966	\$1,434,597
9. Indirect Costs*	\$29,060	\$28,683	\$28,979
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	\$1,467,660	\$1,448,649	\$1,463,576

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

## School Improvement Grants

**School Level Section  
Tiers I, II, and III**

Name of School: Axtell Park Immersion Center				Grades Served: 6-8			
TIER I	TIER II	INTERVENTION				Tier III	Intervention
		turnaround	restart	closure	transformation		
X		<u>X</u>					

### DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of the school and selected an intervention for the school
- List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome. *(Your answer must include the following: A list of the names of the members of the committee. The position within the district that each person is representing, The committee must include a broad range of stakeholders including administrators, teachers, program directors, community members, and parents);*

Dr. Pam Homan, Superintendent  
Dr. Fred Aderhold, Assistant Superintendent  
Steve Cain, Immersion Center Principal  
JoJean Callison, Axtell Park Middle School Assistant Principal  
Kevin Dick, District ELL Coordinator  
Ann Smith, Federal Programs Coordinator  
Susan Torres, Immersion Center Teacher  
Melissa Grogan-Honkomp, Immersion Center Teacher  
Stephanie Ayers, Immersion Center Teacher  
Adil Abdulhassan, Parent  
Jean-Claude Diaminda, Parent  
Donna Magnusson, Lutheran Social Services

- Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district's comprehensive needs assessment designed for the purpose of the SIG application. *(Your answer must address data within each of the four lenses: Student, teacher, program, and community and parent.*

Student data: Demographic information including years in US and Ethnicity/national origin; Achievement data including 1) most recent WIDA Placement score or WIDA ACCESS score 2) DRA scores 3) Lexile scores from System 44; social skills factors as reported by classroom teachers; SPED referrals

Teacher data: certification of existing staff; professional development completed and survey of needs

Program data: daily class schedule; District AMAO performance; Axtell Immersion Center Schoolwide plan

Community and Parent: report from Office of Refugee Resettlement audit conducted November 2009; parent interviews; attendance at parent-teacher conferences

- Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) conducted for the purpose of the SIG application. *(Your answer must include the following: **WHEN** the comprehensive needs assessment was conducted, give date (must be completed between February and application submission); **WHO** was involved with the analysis of the data; and **HOW** the comprehensive needs assessment was accomplished.*

Dr. Pam Homan, Dr. Fred Aderhold, Kevin Dick, Steve Cain, and Ann Smith met on March 2, 2010 to discuss the four models required for Tier 1 schools as defined in the School Improvement Grant. At this meeting, the group reviewed the Immersion Center's current staffing and instructional program. On March 29, 2010, a committee consisting of Immersion Center teachers Susan Torres, Melissa Honkomp-Grogan, and Stephanie Ayers; Parents Jean-Claude Diaminda and Adil Abdulhassan; Axtell Park Middle School Assistant Principal JoJean Callison and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith analyzed student and teacher data. On April 8, 2010, ELL Coordinator Kevin Dick and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith met with Donna Magnusson to review the report from the Office of Refugee Resettlement audit conducted in November 2009.

- Broadly describe the results of that review (specifics for each school will be outlined in the school sections). *Summarize the results of the CNA for this school.*

Student data: Most students have been in the US for the same number of years that they have been in school and in the Immersion Center. Students show growth in reading performance after one year of instruction, with an average increase on the DRA of 2.3. The 20 students who have participated in System 44 show an average increase in Lexile score of 75.3, which is slightly less than one full grade level. 75% of the students are from African, East Asian or Pacific Island countries, which means they are least likely to have a formal experience with school. 90% of the students have a WIDA score of less than 2, placing them at an emergent or pre-emergent level of language acquisition. Students whose progress is delayed beyond what is expected due to language barriers are referred for testing to determine if there is a learning disability.

Teacher data: One teacher has an ENL endorsement. All three teachers are highly qualified to teach language arts. One teacher will complete her ENL endorsement this summer. Two teachers have participated in System 44 training. Professional Development needs include Differentiation; Strategies for hands-on, project-based learning; and ongoing training with System 44.

Program data: Students are integrated with the Axtell Park Middle School students for PROtime, art, music, information and computer technology, and physical education classes. The Immersion Center curriculum is a thematic curriculum focusing on vocabulary and language acquisition. It includes math and science vocabulary, but is not aligned to middle school math, science or social studies standards. Students showing the greatest gap in reading skills are placed in System 44. Teachers use guided reading groups. When students achieve a 2<sup>nd</sup> grade reading level and have achieved the necessary language and social skills or after 2 years, whichever comes first, they "graduate" from the Immersion Center to Sheltered ELL classes at Whittier and Axtell Park Middle Schools. 20% of the students are in their second year at the Immersion Center.

Community and Parent data: The audit from the Office of Refugee Resettlement commended the school district for excellent intra-school and interschool collaboration as well as effective partnership between the school and Lutheran Social Services. Two concerns that were noted included a serious need to mental health services for refugee students and a need to help refugee parents develop a greater understanding of the purpose of parent teacher conferences. Over 95% of the parents attend conferences, but they need to be encouraged to speak up about their needs. Parents encouraged using community leaders within the various immigrant communities to help further communication with ELL families.

- List the strengths and weaknesses for this school based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment. *These should be brief statements or phrases. Prioritize the areas that will be addressed with SIG funds.*

The \* indicates areas that will be addressed with SIG funds.

Strengths: \*System 44 and guided reading/pull-out groups; integration with Axtell Park Middle School students; parent attendance at conferences; ability to distinguish language barriers from learning barriers so students are appropriately identified for special education services.

Weaknesses: \*no highly qualified math instructor; \*no highly qualified science instructor; \*ELL curriculum not aligned with middle school standards; \*lack of training for staff on manifestations of trauma; mentor program for ELL students within refugee/immigrant community; \*need for more training on differentiation and integrating language acquisition with content standards; \*parent ability to support their child's learning and maintain effective parental supervision.

- Provide the rationale the district used to commit to serve this school with SIG funds. *Why is this school served?*

The Axtell Park Immersion Center is a Title I school that has been identified by the state as "Persistently Lowest Achieving".

- (2) The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected. *Describe the district's capacity to implement the selected intervention model. Indicate resources available to the district such as human capital, funding sources, partnerships, etc. that ensure the district's capacity to implement the chosen model for this school. Differentiate what has already taken place and detailed plans for the future.*

The Sioux Falls School District has selected the Turnaround Model as the intervention for the Axtell Immersion Center. As the largest school district in the state, the District attracts high quality candidates for teaching and administrative positions. Augustana College is

located nearby and offers the coursework for the ENL endorsement and resources for ongoing professional development. In addition, the District partners with the University of South Dakota, South Dakota State University, Dakota State University, Augustana College and the University of Sioux Falls for professional development, including offering graduate credit to teachers at a reduced rate.

The District is working with Lutheran Social Services to develop a plan for training staff in the manifestations of trauma and providing counseling to students who are impacted by experiences of trauma.

The District will interview and select a highly qualified math teacher and a highly qualified science teacher from among the pool of applicants to serve the Immersion Center students. The Middle School Curriculum Coordinator will work with the Immersion Center teachers to revise and align the Immersion Center curriculum with middle school math, science, and social studies standards.

The District will continue to leverage funding from local, state and federal sources to meet the needs of the Immersion Center program. Currently a United Way grant provides funding for a School Home liaison and local and state funds provide teaching staff for the Immersion Center at a 24:1 ratio. The District will increase oversight efforts of the Immersion Center program due to a reorganization of Administrative responsibilities.

- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. *Indicate the process used up to this point for selection of external providers. Provide a detailed plan for this process in the future. Who will be involved in the selection procedure? What criteria have been set?*

Not Applicable.

The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Check the intervention model and answer the questions pertaining to the intervention model chosen for this Tier I or II school. If this is a Tier III school, complete if using one of the four intervention models or skip to question #7.

## ➤ **The Turnaround Model**

### *Section I.A.2(a)*

1. Describe the process the district will use to replace the principal and the operational flexibility the new principal will be given. [Section I.A.2(a)(i)]
  - *When will the contract with the current principal end?*
  - *What criteria will be used in selecting a new principal?*
  - *What is the process that will be used to select the new principal?*
  - *Who will be involved in the decision making?*
  - *When will the process take place? If the principal has been replaced recently, describe the circumstances and process.*
  - *How will the principal be Included in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting*
  - *How will this flexibility help the new principal implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates?*

The contract with the current principal will end July 1. A new principal, who will also serve as the Assistant Principal of Axtell Park Middle School, will be selected based on his or her ability as an instructional leader including a commitment to frequent informal observations in the classroom with quality feedback to teachers. Candidates with experience with English Language Learners will be preferred. A minimum of four years of teaching at the middle school level will be required.

The position is currently posted and interviews will be conducted in early April. The Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Middle School Curriculum Coordinator, a middle school principal, a middle school instructional coach and representatives from the middle school staff will assist with interviewing and selecting. The final selection decision will be made by the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent.

The principal will assume responsibility for the Immersion Center program when his or her contract begins on July 1. The calendar and hours for the 2010-11 school year will already be in place, but the new principal will have the ability to determine summer school schedules, determine if extending the day during the school year is appropriate, and work with the ELL Coordinator, Federal Programs Coordinator, and Middle School Curriculum Coordinator to adjust budget allocations as appropriate. The principal will evaluate staff and make recommendations for transfers or dismissal if performance is not up to standard. As the Assistant Principal of Axtell Park Middle School, the principal will work closely with the Principal of Axtell Park Middle School to integrate students with their English-speaking peers when appropriate. Formerly the Principal of

Axtell Park Middle School was also the principal of the Axtell Immersion Center. The Assistant Principal will have more time to spend in the Immersion Center classrooms and will have the opportunity to demonstrate their leadership in running a challenging program. The new principal will bring a fresh outlook to the Immersion Center program and will have the flexibility to develop the schedule and implement a fully aligned curriculum to best meet the needs of the students. The principal will have the flexibility to adjust schedules as the makeup of the students change as new refugee students arrive and current students graduate to the Sheltered ELL program.

2. Describe the process the district will use to replace staff and refresh the teacher pool for this school. [Section I.A.2(a)(ii)]
  - *What locally adopted competencies will be used to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment ?*
  - *What is the district's definition of "staff"? Does this include both teachers and paraprofessionals?*
  - *How will the district screen all existing staff ?*
  - *What is the process for determining which staff remains in the school? No more than 50 percent of existing staff can be rehired. What is the current pool of teachers and paras? Determine the 50% threshold of staff in each category that can be rehired.*
  - *How will new staff be selected? Describe criteria used to determine the most effective staff. Describe criteria used in selecting/hiring effective staff.*

Locally adopted competencies include the ability to plan, implement and evaluate curriculum using research-based strategies to improve student learning and the ability to maintain a safe, orderly and positive learning environment. The District's definition of staff includes the teachers who teach the core content subjects of language arts, math, science and social studies. Non-core subjects such as art, music, information and computer technology, and physical education are taught by Axtell Park Middle School staff. There are currently 3 FTE teachers assigned to core content instruction at the Immersion Center.

The District has notified all existing staff that they must reapply for the positions at the Immersion Center. The District has posted openings for a 1.0 FTE highly qualified math teacher, a .5 FTE highly qualified science teacher, and 2.0 FTE highly qualified reading/language arts teachers. After screening and interviewing staff, the District will hire at least 1.5 FTE teachers who are new to the Immersion Center, which will replace 50% of the existing staff.

New staff will be selected based on their certification, their demonstrated ability to individualize instruction, and their interest in working with English Language Learners. Candidates will be asked to bring examples of student work that demonstrate how they individualize and differentiate instruction to match student needs. At least one staff

member must have completed the ENL endorsement. Preference for the other positions will be given to candidates who are willing to complete the ENL endorsement.

3. What strategies are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school? [Section I.A.2(a)(ii)] *(Examples include: financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions.)*

Teachers will receive reimbursement for coursework for their ENL endorsement. Teachers will receive pay for time beyond the contract day to participate in collaboration, professional development, curriculum alignment, and extended learning time for students. Teachers will be supported by an ELL Instructional Coach and will have the opportunity to attend at least one national conference every other year.

4. How will the district provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development?
  - *List resources available to new staff.*
  - *Will there be mentoring program or, literacy and/or math coaches available?*
  - *How will the professional development be aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program?*
  - *Indicate how the professional development will be designed in collaboration with school staff.*

The District will hire an ELL Instructional Coach with experience and expertise in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model for teaching language acquisition while also teaching grade level content standards. The Instructional Coach will model and provide feedback for teachers. In addition, the district's middle school math and literacy instructional coaches will provide support for the teachers both in classroom instruction and in aligning the curriculum to content standards. Staff who teach System 44 will have opportunities to collaborate with the other teachers in the District who teach System 44 and its companion program, Read 180. Staff will have the opportunity to attend Scholastic's System 44/Read 180 conference in the summer. Staff will also have the opportunity to attend the Teaching English as a Second or Other Language (TESOL) national conference.

Staff will work with their principal to develop a professional development plan to address other areas of need as part of their annual school improvement plan.

5. Describe the new governance structure that will be adopted for this school.
  - *The structure may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the district, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent.*

- *What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) will be provided to the school?*
- *What changes in operational practices will be made?*

The District is reorganizing the Central Administration structure. The current Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Human Resources will become the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction and a new Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources and Legal Services will be hired. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, who reports directly to the Superintendent, will oversee the turnaround efforts in the District, meeting with the principal at least quarterly to review established performance benchmarks.

Currently, the Immersion Center program is seen as a component of the ELL Program and responsibility for oversight has fallen to the District ELL Coordinator and the District Middle School Curriculum Coordinator. Under the new structure, the principal of the Immersion Center will have greater authority over the daily schedule, the best utilization of staff, and will be given flexibility to determine the timing and amount of summer school and to explore various resources to supplement instruction to increase language acquisition while developing content knowledge.

6. Describe how an instructional program will be determined and designed.
  - *What data will be used to identify the instructional program to be used? How will it be used?*
  - *How will the district ensure that the instructional program is research-based?*
  - *How will vertical alignment from one grade to the next be determined and ensured?*
  - *How will the district ensure alignment with State academic standards?*

In 2009, the District conducted an extensive study of promising practices for English Language instruction. The research revealed that programs that incorporate bilingual instruction where students receive at least part of their content instruction in their native language are the most effective. However, the District's ELL students speak over 52 different languages, making bilingual instruction impractical. Furthermore, new refugee students may speak languages for which there are no interpreters in the region nor written materials available, e.g. Kayah or Karen. Considering this, the most successful instructional method available is Content-based ELL instruction, where all instruction is delivered in English and English language acquisition is integrated with content area instruction. Research shows that one of the most successful methods for delivering this type of instruction is the SIOP model. (Guarino, A.J., Echevarria, J., Short, D., Schick, J.E., Forbes, S. & Rueda, R. (2001). The Sheltered Instruction Observation: Reliability and Validity Assessment. *Journal of Research Education*, 11(1):138-140; Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., and Short, D. 2004. *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.)

Immersion Center teachers will work with their middle school counterparts to review the existing Immersion Center thematic curriculum and determine the most effective way to align English language acquisition goals with grade level content. The state's content standards have been vertically aligned, so by aligning Immersion Center curriculum with the state's content standards, vertical alignment from one grade to the next will be ensured. The Middle School Curriculum Coordinator, supported by the District's instructional coaches, will oversee the curriculum alignment to ensure that it is properly aligned with State academic standards.

7. Describe the process the district will use to promote the continuous use of student data.
  - *Indicate the use of student data such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments*
  - *How will student data be used to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students?*

DRA scores, taken at least twice a year, will be used to monitor student progress in reading and place students in appropriate guided reading groups. Students at the lowest reading levels will receive instruction through System 44. The reports that System 44 generates will be used to monitor student progress in decoding and comprehension. Student writing samples will be evaluated at least once a year to determine written language proficiency.

The math teacher will be trained to use Math Recovery assessments to identify gaps in mathematical conceptual development and adjust instruction accordingly. Instructional staff will continue to look for effective ways to determine student mathematical skills, separating math understanding from language proficiency. Staff will also look for additional instructional resources to support students at various stages of math and language proficiency.

All teachers will track individual student progress and will use collaboration time to examine student work and help each other determine the most effective way to address individual student needs.

Summative assessments, the WIDA ACCESS test in February and the Dakota STEP math and reading tests in April, will be used to determine annual progress toward learning goals.

8. Describe how the district will increase learning time.
  - *Indicate how learning time will be increased such as using a longer school day, week, or year schedule.*
  - *Describe the current learning time and the amount of time to be added to significantly increase the total number of school hours (a minimum of 300 additional hours per school year is supported by research) .*

- *Indicate what the additional time will be used for (a) instruction in core academic subjects (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education,, and/or (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.*
- *If extended learning time also includes a before- or after-school instructional program, indicate how the program will be available to all students in the school and provided at a time when most students would be able to participate.*

Learning time for students will be increased by adding 6 weeks of summer school beginning with the 2011-12 school year. Summer School will include a minimum of 4 hours of instruction each day focusing on math, reading, science and language acquisition. The new principal will have the flexibility to determine if the summer school day should be increased beyond 4 hours. Adding summer school will increase student learning time by 120 – 180 hours. Staff will have an additional 3 hours per week during the school year to collaborate, plan and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects. This will result in 108 hours of additional learning time. In all, learning time will be increased by 228 – 288 hours.

9. How will the school provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students?
- *Describe how the needs of students in this school were analyzed to determine which social-emotional and community-oriented services will be appropriate and useful under the circumstances.*
  - *Indicate services offered to students such as: include health, nutrition, or social services that may be provided in partnership with local service providers.*
  - *Indicate other services that may be offered such as a family literacy program for parents who need to improve their literacy skills in order to support their children’s learning.*

Teacher interviews, discipline and behavior referrals, school home liaison reports, and the Office of Refugee Resettlement audit report were analyzed to determine the social-emotional and community-oriented services that will be appropriate.

The District will partner with Lutheran Social Services (LSS) to provide training for staff on manifestations of trauma. In addition, the District will work with LSS to provide counseling and mental health services for children who exhibit evidence of Post Traumatic stress disorder.

Immersion Center staff will work with the School Home Liaison assigned to the Immersion Center, the District’s ELL Coordinator, and LSS caseworkers to develop monthly parent nights specifically for Immersion Center parents. The purpose of these parent nights will be to help parents understand the role that parents play in American education and how that might differ from the expectations in other countries. Parents will be encouraged to speak up about their challenges in supporting their children’s

educational progress even as they struggle to master the English language themselves. Interpreters will facilitate communication and the content of future meetings will be adjusted according to the needs expressed by parents themselves. District and LSS staff will work together to connect parents and children to existing services including Adult Basic Education, community health services, and job skills training.

The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application.

- Describe the timeline that addresses the steps the district will take for this school, if it is a Tier I or II school. *Indicate major events and benchmarks for this school over the three year implementation time period, unless a shorter time period is needed and reflected in the budget as well.*

#### 2010-2011 (Year 1)

- May: Screen and hire principal and staff, including ELL Instructional Coach
- July: Principal contract begins; Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction begins
- Aug: First day for staff that are new to the District
- Aug: First day for veteran teaching staff
- Aug: Inservice – ELL Instructional Coach meet with staff
- Aug – June: Instructional Coach provides ongoing support through modeling and feedback
- Sept: First parent night and schedule established for 5 subsequent meetings
- Sept: Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction meets with principal to establish benchmarks and dates for 3 future meetings
- Oct – Jan: Revise and align Immersion Center Curriculum
- February: Principal determines summer school schedule
- February: WIDA testing
- March: Principal completes summative teacher evaluation, determines any teachers who will be transferred or non-renewed
- March: Recommendations for math resources completed
- April: Dakota STEP testing
- April: New staff screened and hired, if necessary
- May: Assistant Superintendent has summative review with principal
- May-June: Staff complete professional development plan for 2011-2012
- June: Staff attend System 44 training
- June: Summer school session

#### 2011-2013 (Years 2 & 3)

- July: Receive WIDA and Dakota STEP scores
- July/Aug: Summer school session
- Aug-June: ELL Instructional Coach supports teachers through modeling and feedback
- Sept: First parent night and schedule established for 5 subsequent meetings
- Sept: Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction meets with principal to establish benchmarks and dates for 3 future meetings
- Sept: Data Retreat, begin revising School Improvement Plan
- February: WIDA testing
- February: Principal determines summer school schedule

March: Principal completes summative teacher evaluation, determines any teachers who will be transferred or non-renewed  
March: Staff attend TESOL conference  
April: Dakota STEP testing  
May: Assistant Superintendent has summative review with principal  
May-June: Staff complete professional development plan for 2012-2013  
June: Summer school session

- (4) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- List the reading and math annual goals for this Tier I or II school, if applicable. *The goal must be measurable and specify the indicator (Dakota STEP) that will be used during each of the grant years. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year).*

2010-2011 Reading Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2010-2011 Math Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

(In 2010, 16 students will have scores that count toward Adequate Yearly Progress)

2011-2012 Reading Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2011-2012 Math Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2012-2013 Reading Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2012-2013 Math Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

- (5) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. *Describe in detail how the SIG funds will be used*

*to improve academic achievement in this school, if it is a Tier III school. Indicate how these activities are designed to meet the specific needs of this school, its teachers, and its students.*

Not applicable.

- (6) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. Identify the stakeholders for this school and describe the consultation that took place. *Describe consultation with school administration, teachers and other staff, and parents and community members. Indicate when and how the consultation took place within the timeframe of February and March while developing the LEA application for SIG funds.*

All Title I principals met with the Federal Programs Coordinator on February 5 for an overview of the School Improvement Grant process and the 4 models required for Tier 1 or Tier 2 schools. On March 2, following word from the state that the Axtell Immersion Center had been placed on the list of Persistently Lowest Achieving schools, Dr. Pam Homan, Dr. Fred Aderhold, Kevin Dick, Steve Cain, and Ann Smith met to discuss the four models required for Tier 1 schools as defined in the School Improvement Grant. Following further review of the models and research into the feasibility of implementing them, Dr. Homan determined that the Turnaround Model would be most appropriate. On March 19, 2010, Ann Smith and JoJean Callison met with the staff of the Immersion Center to explain the 4 models and how the decision was made to implement the Turnaround Model. On March 29, 2010, a committee consisting of Immersion Center teachers Susan Torres, Melissa Honkomp-Grogan, and Stephanie Ayers; Parents Jean-Claude Diaminda and Adil Abdulhassan; Axtell Park Middle School Assistant Principal JoJean Callison and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith analyzed student and teacher data, program data, and parent and community data to establish appropriate measures for student progress and ongoing program evaluation. On April 8, 2010, ELL Coordinator Kevin Dick and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith met with Donna Magnusson to review the report from the Office of Refugee Resettlement audit conducted in November 2009 and discuss opportunities for addressing the mental health and acculturation needs of students and their parents.

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

**Please refer to the individual school applications for a breakdown of budget categories and further information.**

# School Improvement Grants

## School Level Section

### Tiers I, II, and III

Name of School: Axtell Park Immersion Center				Grades Served: 6-8			
TIER I	TIER II	INTERVENTION				Tier III	Intervention
		turnaround	restart	closure	transformation		
X		<u>X</u>					

#### DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of the school and selected an intervention for the school
- List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome. *(Your answer must include the following: A list of the names of the members of the committee. The position within the district that each person is representing, The committee must include a broad range of stakeholders including administrators, teachers, program directors, community members, and parents);*

Dr. Pam Homan, Superintendent  
 Dr. Fred Aderhold, Assistant Superintendent  
 Steve Cain, Immersion Center Principal  
 JoJean Callison, Axtell Park Middle School Assistant Principal  
 Kevin Dick, District ELL Coordinator  
 Ann Smith, Federal Programs Coordinator  
 Susan Torres, Immersion Center Teacher  
 Melissa Grogan-Honkomp, Immersion Center Teacher  
 Stephanie Ayers, Immersion Center Teacher  
 Adil Abdulhassan, Parent  
 Jean-Claude Diaminda, Parent  
 Donna Magnusson, Lutheran Social Services

- Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district’s comprehensive needs assessment designed for the purpose of the SIG application. *(Your answer must address data within each of the four lenses: Student, teacher, program, and community and parent.*

Student data: Demographic information including years in US and Ethnicity/national origin; Achievement data including 1) most recent WIDA Placement score or WIDA ACCESS score 2) DRA scores 3) Lexile scores from System 44; social skills factors as reported by classroom teachers; SPED referrals

Teacher data: certification of existing staff; professional development completed and survey of needs

Program data: daily class schedule; District AMAO performance; Axtell Immersion Center Schoolwide plan

Community and Parent: report from Office of Refugee Resettlement audit conducted November 2009; parent interviews; attendance at parent-teacher conferences

- Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) conducted for the purpose of the SIG application. (*Your answer must include the following: **WHEN** the comprehensive needs assessment was conducted, give date (must be completed between February and application submission); **WHO** was involved with the analysis of the data; and **HOW** the comprehensive needs assessment was accomplished.*)

Dr. Pam Homan, Dr. Fred Aderhold, Kevin Dick, Steve Cain, and Ann Smith met on March 2, 2010 to discuss the four models required for Tier 1 schools as defined in the School Improvement Grant. At this meeting, the group reviewed the Immersion Center's current staffing and instructional program. On March 29, 2010, a committee consisting of Immersion Center teachers Susan Torres, Melissa Honkomp-Grogan, and Stephanie Ayers; Parents Jean-Claude Diaminda and Adil Abdulhassan; Axtell Park Middle School Assistant Principal JoJean Callison and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith analyzed student and teacher data. On April 8, 2010, ELL Coordinator Kevin Dick and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith met with Donna Magnusson to review the report from the Office of Refugee Resettlement audit conducted in November 2009.

- Broadly describe the results of that review (specifics for each school will be outlined in the school sections). *Summarize the results of the CNA for this school.*

Student data: Most students have been in the US for the same number of years that they have been in school and in the Immersion Center. Students show growth in reading performance after one year of instruction, with an average increase on the DRA of 2.3. The 20 students who have participated in System 44 show an average increase in Lexile score of 75.3, which is slightly less than one full grade level. 75% of the students are from African, East Asian or Pacific Island countries, which means they are least likely to have a formal experience with school. 90% of the students have a WIDA score of less than 2, placing them at an emergent or pre-emergent level of language acquisition. Students whose progress is delayed beyond what is expected due to language barriers are referred for testing to determine if there is a learning disability.

Teacher data: One teacher has an ENL endorsement. All three teachers are highly qualified to teach language arts. One teacher will complete her ENL endorsement this summer. Two teachers have participated in System 44 training. Professional Development needs include Differentiation; Strategies for hands-on, project-based learning; and ongoing training with System 44.

Program data: Students are integrated with the Axtell Park Middle School students for PROtime, art, music, information and computer technology, and physical education classes. The Immersion Center curriculum is a thematic curriculum focusing on vocabulary and

language acquisition. It includes math and science vocabulary, but is not aligned to middle school math, science or social studies standards. Students showing the greatest gap in reading skills are placed in System 44. Teachers use guided reading groups. When students achieve a 2<sup>nd</sup> grade reading level and have achieved the necessary language and social skills or after 2 years, whichever comes first, they “graduate” from the Immersion Center to Sheltered ELL classes at Whittier and Axtell Park Middle Schools. 20% of the students are in their second year at the Immersion Center.

Community and Parent data: The audit from the Office of Refugee Resettlement commended the school district for excellent intra-school and interschool collaboration as well as effective partnership between the school and Lutheran Social Services. Two concerns that were noted included a serious need to mental health services for refugee students and a need to help refugee parents develop a greater understanding of the purpose of parent teacher conferences. Over 95% of the parents attend conferences, but they need to be encouraged to speak up about their needs. Parents encouraged using community leaders within the various immigrant communities to help further communication with ELL families.

- List the strengths and weaknesses for this school based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment. *These should be brief statements or phrases. Prioritize the areas that will be addressed with SIG funds.*

The \* indicates areas that will be addressed with SIG funds.

Strengths: \*System 44 and guided reading/pull-out groups; integration with Axtell Park Middle School students; parent attendance at conferences; ability to distinguish language barriers from learning barriers so students are appropriately identified for special education services.

Weaknesses: \*no highly qualified math instructor; \*no highly qualified science instructor; \*ELL curriculum not aligned with middle school standards; \*lack of training for staff on manifestations of trauma; mentor program for ELL students within refugee/immigrant community; \*need for more training on differentiation and integrating language acquisition with content standards; \*parent ability to support their child’s learning and maintain effective parental supervision.

- Provide the rationale the district used to commit to serve this school with SIG funds. *Why is this school served?*

The Axtell Park Immersion Center is a Title I school that has been identified by the state as “Persistently Lowest Achieving”.

- (2) The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in

order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected. *Describe the district's capacity to implement the selected intervention model. Indicate resources available to the district such as human capital, funding sources, partnerships, etc. that ensure the district's capacity to implement the chosen model for this school. Differentiate what has already taken place and detailed plans for the future.*

The Sioux Falls School District has selected the Turnaround Model as the intervention for the Axtell Immersion Center. As the largest school district in the state, the District attracts high quality candidates for teaching and administrative positions. Augustana College is located nearby and offers the coursework for the ENL endorsement and resources for ongoing professional development. In addition, the District partners with the University of South Dakota, South Dakota State University, Dakota State University, Augustana College and the University of Sioux Falls for professional development, including offering graduate credit to teachers at a reduced rate.

The District is working with Lutheran Social Services to develop a plan for training staff in the manifestations of trauma and providing counseling to students who are impacted by experiences of trauma.

The District will interview and select a highly qualified math teacher and a highly qualified science teacher from among the pool of applicants to serve the Immersion Center students. The Middle School Curriculum Coordinator will work with the Immersion Center teachers to revise and align the Immersion Center curriculum with middle school math, science, and social studies standards.

The District will continue to leverage funding from local, state and federal sources to meet the needs of the Immersion Center program. Currently a United Way grant provides funding for a School Home liaison and local and state funds provide teaching staff for the Immersion Center at a 24:1 ratio. The District will increase oversight efforts of the Immersion Center program due to a reorganization of Administrative responsibilities.

- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. *Indicate the process used up to this point for selection of external providers. Provide a detailed plan for this process in the future. Who will be involved in the selection procedure? What criteria have been set?*

Not Applicable.

The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Check the intervention model and answer the questions pertaining to the intervention model chosen for this Tier I or II school. If this is a Tier III school, complete if using one of the four intervention models or skip to question #7.

## ➤ **The Turnaround Model**

### *Section I.A.2(a)*

1. Describe the process the district will use to replace the principal and the operational flexibility the new principal will be given. [Section I.A.2(a)(i)]
  - *When will the contract with the current principal end?*
  - *What criteria will be used in selecting a new principal?*
  - *What is the process that will be used to select the new principal?*
  - *Who will be involved in the decision making?*
  - *When will the process take place? If the principal has been replaced recently, describe the circumstances and process.*
  - *How will the principal be Included in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting*
  - *How will this flexibility help the new principal implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates?*

The contract with the current principal will end July 1. A new principal, who will also serve as the Assistant Principal of Axtell Park Middle School, will be selected based on his or her ability as an instructional leader including a commitment to frequent informal observations in the classroom with quality feedback to teachers. Candidates with experience with English Language Learners will be preferred. A minimum of four years of teaching at the middle school level will be required.

The position is currently posted and interviews will be conducted in early April. The Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Middle School Curriculum Coordinator, a middle school principal, a middle school instructional coach and representatives from the middle school staff will assist with interviewing and selecting. The final selection decision will be made by the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent.

The principal will assume responsibility for the Immersion Center program when his or her contract begins on July 1. The calendar and hours for the 2010-11 school year will already be in place, but the new principal will have the ability to determine summer school schedules, determine if extending the day during the school year is appropriate, and work with the ELL Coordinator, Federal Programs Coordinator, and Middle School Curriculum Coordinator to adjust budget allocations as appropriate. The principal will evaluate staff and make recommendations for transfers or dismissal if performance is not up to standard. As the Assistant Principal of Axtell Park Middle School, the principal will work closely with the Principal of Axtell Park Middle School to integrate students with their English-speaking peers when appropriate. Formerly the Principal of

Axtell Park Middle School was also the principal of the Axtell Immersion Center. The Assistant Principal will have more time to spend in the Immersion Center classrooms and will have the opportunity to demonstrate their leadership in running a challenging program. The new principal will bring a fresh outlook to the Immersion Center program and will have the flexibility to develop the schedule and implement a fully aligned curriculum to best meet the needs of the students. The principal will have the flexibility to adjust schedules as the makeup of the students change as new refugee students arrive and current students graduate to the Sheltered ELL program.

1. Describe the process the district will use to replace staff and refresh the teacher pool for this school. [Section I.A.2(a)(ii)]
  - *What locally adopted competencies will be used to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment ?*
  - *What is the district's definition of "staff"? Does this include both teachers and paraprofessionals?*
  - *How will the district screen all existing staff ?*
  - *What is the process for determining which staff remains in the school? No more than 50 percent of existing staff can be rehired. What is the current pool of teachers and paras? Determine the 50% threshold of staff in each category that can be rehired.*
  - *How will new staff be selected? Describe criteria used to determine the most effective staff. Describe criteria used in selecting/hiring effective staff.*

Locally adopted competencies include the ability to plan, implement and evaluate curriculum using research-based strategies to improve student learning and the ability to maintain a safe, orderly and positive learning environment. The District's definition of staff includes the teachers who teach the core content subjects of language arts, math, science and social studies. Non-core subjects such as art, music, information and computer technology, and physical education are taught by Axtell Park Middle School staff. There are currently 3 FTE teachers assigned to core content instruction at the Immersion Center.

The District has notified all existing staff that they must reapply for the positions at the Immersion Center. The District has posted openings for a 1.0 FTE highly qualified math teacher, a .5 FTE highly qualified science teacher, and 2.0 FTE highly qualified reading/language arts teachers. After screening and interviewing staff, the District will hire at least 1.5 FTE teachers who are new to the Immersion Center, which will replace 50% of the existing staff.

New staff will be selected based on their certification, their demonstrated ability to individualize instruction, and their interest in working with English Language Learners. Candidates will be asked to bring examples of student work that demonstrate how they individualize and differentiate instruction to match student needs. At least one staff member must have completed the ENL endorsement. Preference for the other positions will be given to candidates who are willing to complete the ENL endorsement.

2. What strategies are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school? [Section I.A.2(a)(ii)] *(Examples include: financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions.)*

Teachers will receive reimbursement for coursework for their ENL endorsement. Teachers will receive pay for time beyond the contract day to participate in collaboration, professional development, curriculum alignment, and extended learning time for students. Teachers will be supported by an ELL Instructional Coach and will have the opportunity to attend at least one national conference every other year.

3. How will the district provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development?
  - *List resources available to new staff.*
  - *Will there be mentoring program or, literacy and/or math coaches available?*
  - *How will the professional development be aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program?*
  - *Indicate how the professional development will be designed in collaboration with school staff.*

The District will hire an ELL Instructional Coach with experience and expertise in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model for teaching language acquisition while also teaching grade level content standards. The Instructional Coach will model and provide feedback for teachers. In addition, the district's middle school math and literacy instructional coaches will provide support for the teachers both in classroom instruction and in aligning the curriculum to content standards. Staff who teach System 44 will have opportunities to collaborate with the other teachers in the District who teach System 44 and its companion program, Read 180. Staff will have the opportunity to attend Scholastic's System 44/Read 180 conference in the summer. Staff will also have the opportunity to attend the Teaching English as a Second or Other Language (TESOL) national conference.

Staff will work with their principal to develop a professional development plan to address other areas of need as part of their annual school improvement plan.

4. Describe the new governance structure that will be adopted for this school.
  - *The structure may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the district, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent.*
  - *What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) will be provided to the school?*
  - *What changes in operational practices will be made?*

The District is reorganizing the Central Administration structure. The current Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Human Resources will become the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction and a new Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources and Legal Services will be hired. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, who reports directly to the Superintendent, will oversee the turnaround efforts in the District, meeting with the principal at least quarterly to review established performance benchmarks.

Currently, the Immersion Center program is seen as a component of the ELL Program and responsibility for oversight has fallen to the District ELL Coordinator and the District Middle School Curriculum Coordinator. Under the new structure, the principal of the Immersion Center will have greater authority over the daily schedule, the best utilization of staff, and will be given flexibility to determine the timing and amount of summer school and to explore various resources to supplement instruction to increase language acquisition while developing content knowledge.

5. Describe how an instructional program will be determined and designed.
  - *What data will be used to identify the instructional program to be used? How will it be used?*
  - *How will the district ensure that the instructional program is research-based?*
  - *How will vertical alignment from one grade to the next be determined and ensured?*
  - *How will the district ensure alignment with State academic standards?*

In 2009, the District conducted an extensive study of promising practices for English Language instruction. The research revealed that programs that incorporate bilingual instruction where students receive at least part of their content instruction in their native language are the most effective. However, the District's ELL students speak over 52 different languages, making bilingual instruction impractical. Furthermore, new refugee students may speak languages for which there are no interpreters in the region nor written materials available, e.g. Kayah or Karen. Considering this, the most successful instructional method available is Content-based ELL instruction, where all instruction is delivered in English and English language acquisition is integrated with content area instruction. Research shows that one of the most successful methods for delivering this type of instruction is the SIOP model. (Guarino, A.J., Echevarria, J., Short, D., Schick, J.E., Forbes, S. & Rueda, R. (2001). The Sheltered Instruction Observation: Reliability and Validity Assessment. *Journal of Research Education*, 11(1):138-140; Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., and Short, D. 2004. *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.)

Immersion Center teachers will work with their middle school counterparts to review the existing Immersion Center thematic curriculum and determine the most effective way to align English language acquisition goals with grade level content. The state's content standards have been vertically aligned, so by aligning Immersion Center

curriculum with the state's content standards, vertical alignment from one grade to the next will be ensured. The Middle School Curriculum Coordinator, supported by the District's instructional coaches, will oversee the curriculum alignment to ensure that it is properly aligned with State academic standards.

6. Describe the process the district will use to promote the continuous use of student data.
  - *Indicate the use of student data such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments*
  - *How will student data be used to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students?*

DRA scores, taken at least twice a year, will be used to monitor student progress in reading and place students in appropriate guided reading groups. Students at the lowest reading levels will receive instruction through System 44. The reports that System 44 generates will be used to monitor student progress in decoding and comprehension. Student writing samples will be evaluated at least once a year to determine written language proficiency.

The math teacher will be trained to use Math Recovery assessments to identify gaps in mathematical conceptual development and adjust instruction accordingly. Instructional staff will continue to look for effective ways to determine student mathematical skills, separating math understanding from language proficiency. Staff will also look for additional instructional resources to support students at various stages of math and language proficiency.

All teachers will track individual student progress and will use collaboration time to examine student work and help each other determine the most effective way to address individual student needs.

Summative assessments, the WIDA ACCESS test in February and the Dakota STEP math and reading tests in April, will be used to determine annual progress toward learning goals.

7. Describe how the district will increase learning time.
  - *Indicate how learning time will be increased such as using a longer school day, week, or year schedule.*
  - *Describe the current learning time and the amount of time to be added to significantly increase the total number of school hours (a minimum of 300 additional hours per school year is supported by research) .*
  - *Indicate what the additional time will be used for (a) instruction in core academic subjects (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education,, and/or (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.*

- *If extended learning time also includes a before- or after-school instructional program, indicate how the program will be available to all students in the school and provided at a time when most students would be able to participate.*

Learning time for students will be increased by adding 6 weeks of summer school beginning with the 2011-12 school year. Summer School will include a minimum of 4 hours of instruction each day focusing on math, reading, science and language acquisition. The new principal will have the flexibility to determine if the summer school day should be increased beyond 4 hours. Adding summer school will increase student learning time by 120 – 180 hours. Staff will have an additional 3 hours per week during the school year to collaborate, plan and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects. This will result in 108 hours of additional learning time. In all, learning time will be increased by 228 – 288 hours.

8. How will the school provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students?
  - *Describe how the needs of students in this school were analyzed to determine which social-emotional and community-oriented services will be appropriate and useful under the circumstances.*
  - *Indicate services offered to students such as: include health, nutrition, or social services that may be provided in partnership with local service providers.*
  - *Indicate other services that may be offered such as a family literacy program for parents who need to improve their literacy skills in order to support their children's learning.*

Teacher interviews, discipline and behavior referrals, school home liaison reports, and the Office of Refugee Resettlement audit report were analyzed to determine the social-emotional and community-oriented services that will be appropriate.

The District will partner with Lutheran Social Services (LSS) to provide training for staff on manifestations of trauma. In addition, the District will work with LSS to provide counseling and mental health services for children who exhibit evidence of Post Traumatic stress disorder.

Immersion Center staff will work with the School Home Liaison assigned to the Immersion Center, the District's ELL Coordinator, and LSS caseworkers to develop monthly parent nights specifically for Immersion Center parents. The purpose of these parent nights will be to help parents understand the role that parents play in American education and how that might differ from the expectations in other countries. Parents will be encouraged to speak up about their challenges in supporting their children's educational progress even as they struggle to master the English language themselves. Interpreters will facilitate communication and the content of future meetings will be adjusted according to the needs expressed by parents themselves. District and LSS staff will work together to connect parents and children to existing services including Adult

Basic Education, community health services, and job skills training.

The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application.

- Describe the timeline that addresses the steps the district will take for this school, if it is a Tier I or II school. *Indicate major events and benchmarks for this school over the three year implementation time period, unless a shorter time period is needed and reflected in the budget as well.*

#### 2010-2011 (Year 1)

- May: Screen and hire principal and staff, including ELL Instructional Coach  
July: Principal contract begins; Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction begins  
Aug: First day for staff that are new to the District  
Aug: First day for veteran teaching staff  
Aug: Inservice – ELL Instructional Coach meet with staff  
Aug – June: Instructional Coach provides ongoing support through modeling and feedback
- Sept: First parent night and schedule established for 5 subsequent meetings  
Sept: Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction meets with principal to establish benchmarks and dates for 3 future meetings  
Oct – Jan: Revise and align Immersion Center Curriculum  
February: Principal determines summer school schedule  
February: WIDA testing  
March: Principal completes summative teacher evaluation, determines any teachers who will be transferred or non-renewed  
March: Recommendations for math resources completed  
April: Dakota STEP testing  
April: New staff screened and hired, if necessary  
May: Assistant Superintendent has summative review with principal  
May-June: Staff complete professional development plan for 2011-2012  
June: Staff attend System 44 training  
June: Summer school session

#### 2011-2013 (Years 2 & 3)

- July: Receive WIDA and Dakota STEP scores  
July/Aug: Summer school session  
Aug-June: ELL Instructional Coach supports teachers through modeling and feedback  
Sept: First parent night and schedule established for 5 subsequent meetings  
Sept: Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction meets with principal to establish benchmarks and dates for 3 future meetings  
Sept: Data Retreat, begin revising School Improvement Plan  
February: WIDA testing  
February: Principal determines summer school schedule  
March: Principal completes summative teacher evaluation, determines any teachers who will be transferred or non-renewed

March: Staff attend TESOL conference  
April: Dakota STEP testing  
May: Assistant Superintendent has summative review with principal  
May-June: Staff complete professional development plan for 2012-2013  
June: Summer school session

- (4) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- List the reading and math annual goals for this Tier I or II school, if applicable. *The goal must be measurable and specify the indicator (Dakota STEP) that will be used during each of the grant years. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year).*

2010-2011 Reading Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2010-2011 Math Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

(In 2010, 16 students will have scores that count toward Adequate Yearly Progress)

2011-2012 Reading Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2011-2012 Math Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2012-2013 Reading Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

2012-2013 Math Goal: Among those students whose scores count toward Adequate Yearly Progress, at least 10% who scored below basic will improve to basic.

- (5) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. *Describe in detail how the SIG funds will be used to improve academic achievement in this school, if it is a Tier III school. Indicate how these activities are designed to meet the specific needs of this school, its teachers, and its students.*

Not applicable.

- (6) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. Identify the stakeholders for this school and describe the consultation that took place. *Describe consultation with school administration, teachers and other staff, and parents and community members. Indicate when and how the consultation took place within the timeframe of February and March while developing the LEA application for SIG funds.*

All Title I principals met with the Federal Programs Coordinator on February 5 for an overview of the School Improvement Grant process and the 4 models required for Tier 1 or Tier 2 schools. On March 2, following word from the state that the Axtell Immersion Center had been placed on the list of Persistently Lowest Achieving schools, Dr. Pam Homan, Dr. Fred Aderhold, Kevin Dick, Steve Cain, and Ann Smith met to discuss the four models required for Tier 1 schools as defined in the School Improvement Grant. Following further review of the models and research into the feasibility of implementing them, Dr. Homan determined that the Turnaround Model would be most appropriate. On March 19, 2010, Ann Smith and JoJean Callison met with the staff of the Immersion Center to explain the 4 models and how the decision was made to implement the Turnaround Model. On March 29, 2010, a committee consisting of Immersion Center teachers Susan Torres, Melissa Honkomp-Grogan, and Stephanie Ayers; Parents Jean-Claude Diaminda and Adil Abdulhassan; Axtell Park Middle School Assistant Principal JoJean Callison and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith analyzed student and teacher data, program data, and parent and community data to establish appropriate measures for student progress and ongoing program evaluation. On April 8, 2010, ELL Coordinator Kevin Dick and Federal Programs Coordinator Ann Smith met with Donna Magnusson to review the report from the Office of Refugee Resettlement audit conducted in November 2009 and discuss opportunities for addressing the mental health and acculturation needs of students and their parents.

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

**Please refer to the individual school applications for a breakdown of budget categories and further information.**

South Dakota Department of Education  
 Budget Information  
 American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
 Title I School Improvement 1003(g)

Name of School: Axtell Immersion Center – Tier I

**Budget Summary**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)	Project Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$82,804	\$84,937	\$87,130	\$254,871
2. Employee Benefits	\$21,490	\$22,074	\$22,702	\$66,266
3. Travel	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$4,100	\$12,300
4. Equipment	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
5. Supplies	\$17,600	\$17,600	\$17,600	\$52,800
6. Contractual	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$9,000
7. Professional Development	\$26,007	\$21,048	\$6,089	\$53,144
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	\$165,001	\$152,759	\$140,621	\$458,381
9. Indirect Costs*	\$3,130	\$3,086	\$2,841	\$9,057
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	\$168,131	\$155,845	\$143,462	\$467,438

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

**Name of School: Anne Sullivan Elementary – Tier III**

**Budget Summary**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)</b>	<b>Project Total (f)</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$100,144	\$102,825	\$105,582	\$308,551
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$27,445	\$28,027	\$28,823	\$84,295
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$3,875	\$3,875	\$3,875	\$11,625
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$3,117	\$3,149	\$3,181	\$9,447
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$134,581	\$137,876	\$141,461	\$413,918
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$2,719	\$2,785	\$2,858	\$8,362
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$137,300	\$140,661	\$144,319	\$422,280

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

**Name of School: Cleveland Elementary – Tier III**

**Budget Summary**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)</b>	<b>Project Total (f)</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$124,620	\$144,423	\$148,466	\$417,509
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$37,386	\$40,700	\$41,882	\$119,968
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$0	\$1,236	\$1,273	\$2,509
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$0	\$4,275	\$4,275	\$8,550
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$3,562	\$3,599	\$3,635	\$10,796
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$165,568	\$194,233	\$199,531	\$559,332
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$3,344	\$3,924	\$4,031	\$11,299
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$168,912	\$198,157	\$203,562	\$570,631

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

**Name of School: Hawthorne Elementary – Tier III**

**Budget Summary**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)</b>	<b>Project Total (f)</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$147,546	\$151,756	\$156,092	\$455,394
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$42,214	\$44,065	\$44,725	\$131,004
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$1,200	\$1,236	\$1,273	\$3,709
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$4,275	\$4,275	\$4,275	\$12,285
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$3,562	\$3,599	\$3,635	\$10,796
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$198,797	\$204,931	\$210,000	\$613,728
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$4,016	\$4,140	\$4,242	\$12,398
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$202,813	\$209,071	\$214,242	\$626,126

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

**Name of School: Laura B. Anderson Elementary – Tier III**

**Budget Summary**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)</b>	<b>Project Total (f)</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$97,409	\$100,079	\$102,827	\$300,316
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$26,880	\$27,652	\$28,447	\$82,979
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$1,200	\$1,236	\$1,273	\$3,709
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$4,275	\$4,275	\$4,275	\$12,825
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$1,781	\$1,799	\$1,817	\$5,397
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$131,545	\$135,041	\$138,640	\$405,226
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$2,657	\$2,728	\$2,801	\$8,186
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$134,202	\$137,769	\$141,441	\$413,412

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

**Name of School: Terry Redlin Elementary – Tier III**

**Budget Summary**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)</b>	<b>Project Total (f)</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$96,569	\$99,214	\$101,937	\$297,720
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$26,765	\$27,534	\$28,325	\$82,624
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$3,875	\$3,875	\$3,875	\$11,625
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$2,672	\$2,699	\$2,726	\$8,097
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$129,881	\$133,322	\$136,863	\$400,066
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$2,624	\$2,693	\$2,765	\$8,082
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$132,505	\$136,015	\$139,628	\$408,148

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

**Name of School: Garfield Elementary – Tier III**

**Budget Summary**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)</b>	<b>Project Total (f)</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$72,499	\$74,494	\$76,545	\$223,538
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$20,084	\$20,662	\$21,257	\$62,003
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$1,200	\$1,236	\$1,273	3,709
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$5,100	\$5,100	\$5,100	\$15,300
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$6,032	\$916	\$920	\$7,868
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$104,915	\$102,408	\$105,095	\$312,418
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$2,119	\$2,069	\$2,123	\$6,311
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$107,034	\$104,477	\$107,218	\$318,729

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

**Name of School: Hayward Elementary – Tier III**

**Budget Summary**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)</b>	<b>Project Total (f)</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$37,111	\$37,983	\$47,105	\$122,199
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$9,820	\$10,082	\$11,474	\$31,376
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$618	\$618	\$1,273	\$2,509
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$2,138	\$2,138	\$4,275	\$8,551
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$891	\$900	\$909	\$2,700
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$50,578	\$51,721	65,036	\$167,335
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$1,021	\$1,045	\$1,314	\$3,380
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$51,599	\$52,766	\$65,350	\$170,715

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

**Name of School: Longfellow Elementary - Tier III**

**Budget Summary**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)</b>	<b>Project Total (f)</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$99,197	\$101,884	\$104,651	\$305,732
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$27,124	\$27,898	\$28,696	\$83,718
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$1,200	\$1,236	\$1,273	\$3,709
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$4,275	\$4,275	\$4,275	\$12,825
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$3,562	\$3,599	\$3,635	
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$135,358	\$138,892	\$142,530	\$416,780
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$2,734	\$2,806	\$2,879	\$8419
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$138,092	\$141,698	\$145,409	\$425,199

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

**Name of School: Lowell MST Elementary – Tier III**

**Budget Summary**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)</b>	<b>Project Total (f)</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$97,409	\$100,079	\$102,828	\$300,316
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$26,880	\$27,652	\$28,447	\$82,979
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$1,200	\$1,236	\$1,273	\$3,709
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$85,254	\$4,275	\$4,275	\$93,804
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$891	\$900	\$909	\$2,700
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$211,634	\$134,142	\$137,732	\$483,508
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$4,275	\$2,710	\$2,782	\$9,767
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$215,909	\$136,852	\$140,514	\$493,275

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**South Dakota Department of Education  
Budget Information  
American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

**Name of School: Sioux Falls School District – District Level Budget**

**Budget Summary**

<b>Budget Categories</b>	<b>Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)</b>	<b>Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)</b>	<b>Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)</b>	<b>Project Total (f)</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$0	\$12,000
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$819	\$819	\$28,447	\$1,638
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$18,000	\$18,540	\$19,096	\$55,636
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$24,819	\$25,359	\$19,096	\$69,274
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$501	\$512	\$386	\$1,399
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$25,320	\$25,871	\$19,482	\$70,673

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**Total Sioux Falls SIG Budgets**

**South Dakota Department of Education**  
**Budget Information**  
**Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**  
**Funded Under Both**  
**American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) CFDA – 84.388**  
**& Regular Title I School Improvement 1003(g) CFDA – 84.377**

**Name of School: Sioux Falls School District – Total Budgets**

**Budget Summary**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)	Project Total (f)
<b>1. Personnel</b>	\$961,308	\$1,003,674	\$1,033,164	\$2,998,146
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>	\$266,907	\$277,165	\$284,778	\$828,850
<b>3. Travel</b>	\$28,718	\$30,674	\$32,107	\$91,499
<b>4. Equipment</b>	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
<b>5. Supplies</b>	\$130,667	\$53,963	\$56,100	\$240,730
<b>6. Contractual</b>	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$9,000
<b>7. Professional Development</b>	\$52,077	\$42,208	\$27,456	\$121,741
<b>8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)</b>	\$1,452,677	\$1,410,684	\$1,436,605	\$4,299,966
<b>9. Indirect Costs*</b>	\$29,140	\$28,498	\$29,022	\$86,660
<b>10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)</b>	\$1,481,817	\$1,439,182	\$1,465,627	\$4,386,626

\*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)

**D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.**

By submitting this application, the LEA assures that it will do the following:

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;  
 I agree.
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;  
 I agree.
- (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  
 I agree.
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.  
 I agree.

**E. WAIVERS: The SEA has requested waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant. The LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.**

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

“Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.