

School Improvement Grants

School Level Section

Tiers I, II, and III

Name of School: Hayward Elementary					Grades Served: PreK - 5		
TIER I	TIER II	INTERVENTION				Tier III	Intervention
		turnaround	restart	closure	transformation		
						x	Elements from Transformational Model

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of the school and selected an intervention for the 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
 Rich Meier, Elementary Curriculum Coordinator
 Sue McAdaragh, District Math Leader
 Kiersta Machacek, Hayward Principal
 Jayne Zielenski, Hayward Assistant Principal
 Kersten Dobberpuhl, Teacher
 Sarah Jastorff, Teacher
 Kathy Horsted, Librarian

- 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 each of the four lenses: Student, teacher, program, and community and parent.*

Student: progress as measured by report card data; performance of District end of year math and reading assessments, Dakota STEP tests.

Teacher and Program: Review of 2009-11 School Improvement Plan; Audit results from Audit conducted in January, 2010.

Community and Parent: Parent interviews from Kindergarten transition meeting, Audit results from audit conducted January, 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.

Our school completed a comprehensive School Improvement Audit in January, 2010. This Audit involved our State Support Team member, a South Dakota Department of Education staff member, the District's Elementary Curriculum Coordinator and Elementary Special Education Supervisor as well as staff and parents. Hayward's Professional Development team met and analyzed the audit results and presented them to the entire Hayward staff on March 18.

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 this school.*

Hayward is on Level 2 Improvement for Math and Level 3 for Reading. Native American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP on the 2009 Dakota STEP math test. Audit findings include a recommendation that building leaders review the current collaboration structure and refine agendas to develop more focus on student work and strategies for those students not making progress. The audit also recommended that leaders review math instruction and work to develop a common approach to math instruction across the building.

There was a new Dakota STEP reading test in 2009 and all subgroups showed a drop in proficiency. Only the Students with Disabilities subgroup did not make AYP.

Hayward will become an ELL site in the 2010-11 school year. Hayward Hispanic students were not proficient in math on the 2009 Dakota STEP test, so we anticipate greater need for strategies to differentiate instruction for students at varying ability levels.

e. 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 identified through the comprehensive needs assessment:

1. Class Size Reduction*
2. Professional development in scientifically research-based strategies*
3. School climate and culture
4. Common planning time
5. Behavior Facilitator*

Weaknesses identified through the comprehensive needs assessment:

1. Unit/lesson planning based on student results*
2. Collaboration*
3. Differentiating instruction to meet student needs*
4. Interrupted student learning during summer months*

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

Hayward is at Level 2 school improvement for math and Level 3 improvement for reading. They will become an ELL center-base site next fall. Title I formula funds are inadequate to address this school's needs.

- (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 will implement following elements from the Transformational Model at Garfield:

- 1) Implement an instructional model based on student needs; provide job-embedded PD
- 2) Increased learning time for students

As a corrective action, the District implemented instructional coaches in 2008-09. Currently six instructional coaches, guided by the Elementary Curriculum Coordinator and the District Staff Development Coordinator, support elementary instruction in the District. The District is able to provide ongoing professional development for the coaches by providing funds for professional travel and structuring their schedules to allow time for collaboration with each other.

The District has a strong Special Education department that provides ongoing support and training for Special Education teachers and participates in curriculum development to ensure that all students receive appropriate instruction. Following the recommendation from the evaluation of the Instructional Coaching program, the District will add an Instructional Coach to work with ELL teachers to implement the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol model, which integrates English Language acquisition with content instruction.

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 will continue to leverage funding from local, state and federal sources to meet the needs at Hayward Elementary, including efforts to reduce class sizes and to provide additional learning time for staff through collaboration. The District will increase oversight of Hayward's efforts to improve student achievement due to a reorganization of Administrative responsibilities.

The District also has a Title IIB Math grant that provides a District Math Leader to support teachers in implementing Cognitively Guided Instruction in math. Christina Miller, Instructional Coach at Lowell Elementary, is certified by Add+VantageMR as a Math Recovery leader. She will provide support and guidance as Hayward investigates an intervention for struggling math students.

- (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.

- (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. *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.*

The Sioux Falls School District will implement following elements from the Transformational Model at Hayward:

1) Implement an instructional model based on student needs; provide job-embedded PD

Hayward will implement the SIOp strategies for ELL instruction, hiring an additional **.2 FTE ELL teacher** who will join the ELL teacher in providing direct support for English Language Learners as well as working with all classroom teachers to increase their capacity to differentiate instruction for their ELL students. The District's ELL Instructional Coach will provide support for all of the ELL teachers at Hayward to build their confidence in implementing SIOp strategies. This intervention will address the needs of English Language Learners and will help teachers develop confidence in differentiating instruction.

Hayward will hire a **.5 FTE Instructional Coach** to support all classroom teachers through modeling, cognitive coaching, collaboration, and assisting with identifying and/or creating instructional resources. The Instructional Coach will build teacher capacity to address the diverse learning needs of students. In addition, the Instructional Coach will help strengthen our collaboration time and increase the focus on student work and strategies to address learning needs.

2) Increased learning time for students

Hayward will provide 60 hours of summer school during the 3 weeks prior to the start of the school year. Summer School instruction will focus on math and reading and will target students who are performing below grade level.

- (8) 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.*

Our staff met on March 18 and discussed priorities for funding through the School Improvement Grant. All Tier III Title I principals met with Rich Meier, Sue McAdaragh, and Math Recovery Leader Christina Miller on March 22 to discuss professional development needs. Dr. Homan and Dr. Aderhold reviewed School Improvement Grant proposals on April 6.

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.

Grant Periods:

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

Personnel:

Instructional Coach	\$41,540 @ .5 FTE	=	\$20,770
ELL Teacher	\$41,540 @ .2 FTE	=	\$ 8,308
(One Half of Summer School Moved to Year 1 from Year 2)			
Summer School Teachers (8 teachers X 68 hours @ 26.55) (1/2)		=	\$ 7,222
Summer School paraprofessionals (120 hours @ \$10.30) (1/2)		=	\$ 618
Summer School Secretary (25 hours @ \$15.45) (1/2)		=	\$ 193

Benefits:

Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare			
Instructional Coach	\$20,770 x 30%	=	\$ 6,231
ELL Teacher	\$ 8,308 X 30%	=	\$ 2,492
(One Half of Summer School Moved to Year 1 from Year 2)			
Summer School Teachers (1/2)	\$14,443 X 13.65%	=	\$ 985
Summer School Paraprofessionals (1/2)	\$1,236 X 13.65%	=	\$ 85
Summer School Secretary (1/2)	\$ 386 X 13.65%	=	\$ 27

Travel

Summer School Transportation (1/2)		=	\$ 618
(One Half of Summer School Moved to Year 1 from Year 2)			

Supplies

Summer School Supplies (1/2)		=	\$ 2,138
(One Half of Summer School Moved to Year 1 from year 2)			

Professional Development:

Teacher Hourly (collaboration) 40 hours @ \$19.59		=	\$ 784
Benefits (Social Security, Medicare)	\$784 X 13.65%	=	\$ 107

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

Personnel:

Instructional Coach	\$42,786 @ .5 FTE	=	\$21,393
ELL Teacher	\$42,786 @ .2 FTE	=	\$ 8,557
(One Half of Summer School Moved to Year 1 from Year 2)			
Summer School Teachers (8 teachers X 68 hours @ 26.55) (1/2)		=	\$ 7,222
Summer School paraprofessionals (120 hours @ \$10.30) (1/2)		=	\$ 618
Summer School Secretary (25 hours @ \$15.45) (1/2)		=	\$ 193

Benefits

Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare			
Instructional Coach	\$21,393 x 30% =		\$ 6,418
ELL Teacher	\$ 8,557 X 30% =		\$ 2,567
Social Security, Medicare			
(One Half of Summer School Moved to Year 1 from Year 2)			
Summer School Teachers (1/2)	\$14,443 X 13.65% =		\$ 985
Summer School Paraprofessionals (1/2)	\$1,236 X 13.65% =		\$ 85
Summer School Secretary (1/2)	\$ 386 X 13.65%=		\$ 27

Travel

Summer School Transportation (1/2)			\$ 618
(One Half of Summer School Moved to Year 1 from Year 2)			

Supplies

Summer School Supplies (1/2)			\$ 2,138
(One Half of Summer School Moved to Year 1 from year 2)			

Professional Development

Teacher Hourly (collaboration) 40 hours @ \$19.79	=		\$ 792
Benefits (Social Security, Medicare) \$ 792 X 13.65% =			\$ 108

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

Personnel:

Instructional Coach	\$44,070 @ .5 FTE	=	\$22,035
ELL Teacher	\$44,070 @ .2 FTE	=	\$ 8,814
Summer School Teachers	(8 teachers X 68 hours @ 26.81) =		\$14,585
Summer School paraprofessionals (120 hours @ \$10.61)	=		\$ 1,273
Summer School Secretary (25 hours @ \$15.91)	=		\$ 398

Benefits:

Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare			
Instructional Coach	\$22,035 x 30% =		\$ 6,611
ELL Teacher	\$ 8,814 X 30% =		\$ 2,644
Social Security, Medicare			
Summer School Teachers	\$14,585 X 13.65% =		\$ 1,991
Summer School Paraprofessionals	\$1,273 X 13.65% =		\$ 174
Summer School Secretary	\$ 398 X 13.65%=		\$ 54

Travel

Summer School Transportation			\$ 1,273
------------------------------	--	--	----------

Supplies

Summer School Supplies			\$ 4,275
------------------------	--	--	----------

Professional Development

Teacher Hourly (collaboration) 40 hours @ \$19.99	=		\$ 800
Benefits (Social Security, Medicare) \$ 800 X 13.65% =			\$ 109

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

Name of School: Hayward Elementary

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

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