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

February 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: Sisseton Public Schools 54-2	Applicant's Mailing Address: 516 8th Ave. West, Sisseton, South Dakota, 57262 (605) 698-7613
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Dr. April Moen . Position and Office: Title I Director Contact's Mailing Address: 516 8th Avenue West, Sisseton, South Dakota, 57262	Telephone: (605) 698-7613 ext. 221 Fax: (605) 698-7404 Email address: april.moen@k12.sd.us
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name): Dr. Stephen J. Schulte	Telephone: (605) 698-7613 ext. 114
I certify that the program person identified above is authorized to act on behalf of the institution with regard to the School Improvement Grants. X_____ Signature of the LEA Superintendent	Date: 4/7/2010
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.	

south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Learning. Leadership. Service.

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): Dr. April Moen

Original Signature of Authorized Representative: _____

Date: 4/7/2010

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 19th. 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 12th. Tier III applications will be sent out by March 19th 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 9th. Applications will be reviewed by April 23rd. 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)	Diane.Lowery@state.sd.us
Beth Schiltz (773-4716)	Beth.Schiltz@state.sd.us
Betsy Chapman (773-4712)	Betsy.Chapman@state.sd.us

For fiscal questions:

Rob Huffman (773-4600)	Robyn.Huffman@state.sd.us
Paul Schreiner (773-7108)	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
Westside Elementary School				X				
Sisseton Middle School				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

List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome.

Sisseton Middle School Tier III School

Dr. Al Kosters, School Support Team Member
Kim Hill, Outside Consultant from ESA-1
Karen Whitney, Sisseton Middle School Principal
Dr. April Moen, Title I Director/School Improvement Coordinator
Max Torres, Parent
Dean Lehrke, 6th & 7th Grade Math Teacher
Heather McCleerey, 6th/7th/8th Language Arts Teacher/SPED

Sarah Gerhold, 6th/7th/8th Language Arts Teacher/SPED
Deb Thompson, 6/7/8th Math Title Teacher
Connie Knecht, 6/7th Science Teacher/PE
Jeanette Larsen, 7/8th Social Studies Teacher
Tressa Schmidt, Middle School Librarian

Westside Elementary School – Tier III School

Dr. Al Kosters, School Support Team Member
Kim Hill, Outside Consultant from ESA-1
Dan Yost, Westside Elementary School Principal
Dr. April Moen, Title I Director/School Improvement Coordinator
Michelle Greseth, Special Education Director
Meggan Hortness, Special Educator
Shawn Hanson, Reading Recovery Teacher/Title
Judy Wickre, 3rd Grade Teacher
Kathy Peterson, 4th Grade Teacher
Michelle Moen, 5th Grade Teacher
Colette Weatherstone, Parent, School Board member
LeRoy Hellwig, School Board Member
Jennie Evenson, School Board Member
Chandra Donnell, Parent
Eric Heath, Parent

a.
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

Sisseton Middle School: *DSTEP 2009 Reading and Math Data
***STAR Accelerated Reader Data**
***Achievement ongoing Formative Assessments**
***Orchard Reading/Math SD Standardized Data**
***Parent Involvement Surveys (Family Friendly Walk Through-Data)**
***PRIDE Survey information now available**
***Upcoming School Audit will take place April 20-22, 2010 with state school improvement audit team (Dr. Al Kosters, Bob Rose, Kim Hill, Lisa Reinhiller)**

Westside Elementary School
***DSTEP 2009 Reading and Math Data**
***Developmental Reading Assessments**
***Orchard Reading/Math SD Standardized Data**
***Parent Involvement Surveys (Family Friendly Walk Through-Data)**
***PRIDE Survey information**

***Upcoming School Audit will take place April 27-29, 2010 with state school improvement audit team (Dr. Al Kosters, Bob Rose, Kim Hill, Lisa Reinhiller)**

Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) conducted for the purpose of the SIG application. **Sisseton Middle School and Westside Elementary School: *Annual Data Retreat(Committee Members-see above) September 2009 in order to being the needs assessment of our school. Ongoing monthly Professional Learning Community(Grade Level Team) meetings and district development meetings(9/18, 10/16, 12/11,1/4,), bi-weekly staff professional development meetings (all year long) and bi-weekly leadership team meetings(all year long) that continue the school improvement discussions and needs assessments. These meetings are spent analyzing and observing student data and making preparations and instruction plans based on these results for our schoolwide and school improvement plans.**

c. Broadly describe the results of that review (specifics for each school will be outlined in the school sections). **Sisseton Middle School: <u>AYP Status from 2009 Dakota STEP</u> With the publication of the 2009 Dakota STEP scores, the middle school finds itself on Level 1 for math, on Level 1 for attendance and in Level 3 for school improvement in reading. The middle school did not make AYP for the following subgroups in both math and reading in 2009:Westside Elementary School: For the 2009-2010 school year the building was placed on Level 3 school improvement for math and on Level 1 for reading. The objective over the next two years is to make AYP in math and in reading. The subgroups at Westside that did not make AYP on the spring 2007, 2008, and 2009 Dakota STEP test in math and reading were the Native American, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities. Westside Elementary has been placed on Level 1 for attendance with 93.27%.**

STAR Reading results Grades 6,7,8
Fall
Grade 6: 1% on grade level, 76% below grade level, 23% above grade level
Grade 7: 4% on grade level, 64% below grade level, 32% above grade level
Grade 8 : 2% on grade level, 60% below grade level, 38% above grade level
17% schoolwide on or above grade level

Winter
Grade 6: 1% on grade level, 73% below grade level, 26% above grade level
Grade 7: 3% on grade level, 62% below grade level, 35% above grade level
Grade 8 : 2% on grade level, 60% below grade level, 38% above grade level
18% schoolwide on or above grade level
(according to one document data source)
Orchard Math Winter Results
32.5% schoolwide on or above grade level
Orchard Language Arts Winter Results
18.3% schoolwide on or above grade level

85% and above = Above Grade Level 50-84% = On Grade Level 49-0% = Below Grade Level
Language Arts
****In the fall all students take the SD Standardized Orchard math and reading test below grade level as the students are really on the grade level previous plus three months. In December they post-test. In January they test at grade level. The results below show our school results.****
September
On Grade Level = 63%
Below Grade Level = 17.69%
Above Grade Level = 19.3%
****82.3% on or above grade level schoolwide****
December
On Grade Level = 53.57%
Below Grade Level = 12.35%
Above Grade Level = 34.07%
****87.64% on or above grade level schoolwide****

January (all students grades 1-5 take grade level test)
On Grade Level = 65.38%
Below Grade Level = 25.11%
Above Grade Level = 9.5%
****74.88% on or above grade level schoolwide****

Math
September
On Grade Level = 61.57%
Below Grade Level = 19.2%
Above Grade Level = 19.2%
****80.77% on or above grade level schoolwide****
December
On Grade Level = 40.3%
Below Grade Level = 9.41%
Above Grade Level = 49.75%
****90.58% on or above grade level schoolwide****
January (all students grades 1-5 take grade level test)
On Grade Level = 64.38%
Below Grade Level = 23.8%
Above Grade Level = 11.7%
****76.08% on or above grade level schoolwide****

.

Sisseton Middle School CNA 2009

d. List the strengths and weaknesses for this school based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment.

Reading: Areas of Strength: Reading Indicator 3 and 2 for grades 6,7 ,8, Math N.2, M.A.2, M.N.1, M.N.3 and M.S.1 for Grades 6,7,8. Areas of Need: Reading Grade 6 R.2, Grade 7, R.3, Grade 8, R. 3 Math: Grade 6, M.A. 4, Grade 7, M.N.2, Grade 8, M.S.2

Westside Elementary School: Areas of Strength Reading Grade 3, R.1, Grade 4, R.4, Grade 5, R.4, Measureable increase on R.1.1 and R.4, Measureable increase on R.1.1 & R. 4 Areas of Need Reading: Grade 3, R.5, Grade 4, R.3, Grade 5, R.3. Grade 3: Measureable increase on R.3.4.2 and R.3.1.1, Grade 4: Measureable increase on R.4.4.1, Grade 5, Measureable increase on R.5.2.2
Math: Strength: Grade 3, M.A.2, Grade 4, M.A.1, Grade 5, MG. 2 , Gains made on M.G. 1 and M.A. 2, Gains made on M.G. 1 and M.A. 1 and Gains made on M.N.2 and M.G. 2 Areas of Need: Grade 3: M.N.1, Grade 4, M.N.3, Grade 5: M.S.2: Measureable increase on M.A.3 and M.M.1 – measureable increase on M.N.1 and M.A.3, measureable increase on M.S.1 and M.N.3

The strengths and weaknesses outlined above are from our annual DSTEP scores. These are the basis for our instruction. They are used as a guide to begin our strategies for school improvement. Throughout the year, we use the Orchard, Academy and Achievement programs to formatively assess our students in order to continue our school improvement goals and strategies with our school improvement plan.

a.Provide the rationale the district used to commit to serve this school with SIG funds.

The Sisseton Middle School will use this grant to continue and support to the implementation of a facilitator for their in-school/afterschool tutoring services offered to students struggling in academics. It will also use this grant to further support the use of research-scientific based and content-standard driven programs to continually provide instruction for all 6-8 graders in the areas of reading and math using a differentiated teaching approach for all students. With the publication of the 2009 Dakota STEP scores, the middle school finds itself on Level 1 for math, on Level 1 for attendance and in Level 3 for school improvement in reading. The middle school did not make AYP for the following subgroups in both math and reading in 2009:Native American, Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities. The school will use Title I funding for areas such as professional development for teachers in the areas of collaboration/staff development of programs that are used for the furthering of instruction and student development, professional learning communities, salaries/benefits for title teachers/paraprofessionals as well as parent involvement, safe and drug free schools and other title expenditures. The school with use the School Improvement funds for the incorporation of already projected goals and objectives as stated in the current School Improvement plans. The professional development for School Improvement follows with the planning, collaboration and plans for the data analysis, technical assistance, professional learning communities, small group interventions/assessments, leadership teams, workshops and program development for teachers/paraprofessionals. The g grant funds will be used in addition as a support to further the use of tutoring, small group and 1:1 intervention (during and afterschool) along with purchases of additional software/programs and equipment to further the development of research-scientific based programs to provide differentiated instruction for all students at the middle school level.

Over the three-year period, the teachers at Westside Elementary School will help students improve specific skills associated with identified math and reading content standards weaknesses. The School Improvement Team plans to prioritize the Orchard software program and Academy of Math/Reading that is based on South Dakota Standards in math and reading. Professional Development will also support the objectives of the school improvement process.

Westside Elementary will use this grant funding for the purpose of the tutoring/co-teaching of students at all levels of learning during the school day and after school. The support for these areas to enhance the learning for students will be through a tutoring /small group/co-teaching facilitator as well as through scientific research-based software that will pre/post and formatively assess students in alignment with the South Dakota Content Standards. These supports will also be assimilated into the school through the vital component of professional development for all-stake holders involved in the school.

Westside Elementary will be using the Title I funds, School Improvement funding and this grant money to incorporate the goals and strategies that are proposed from the data analysis. The students of need will be working with a tutor during the school day as well as

after school. The school will allow for professional development in order for teachers to analyze and prepare for differentiated instruction of students. The school will continue its efforts of having all stake holders involved in a process such as this systemic change in order to reach the students of the school.

The g grant funds will be used in addition as a support to further the use of tutoring, small group and 1:1 intervention (during and afterschool) along with purchases of software/programs and equipment to further the development of research-scientific based programs to provide differentiated instruction for all students in reading/math and school improvement goals and strategies at the elementary level.

(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. **N/A: Sisseton is a Tier III school**

b. Describe district administrative oversight. **N/A: Sisseton is a Tier III school**

(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. **N/A: Sisseton is a Tier III school**

(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.*
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?*
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.*
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.*

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.*

(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.*

(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).*

(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.

Sisseton Middle School:

- **<u>STRATEGY 1</u>: The needs of this application will be met by the use of continuing scientifically-research based programs such as our purchased Orchard and Academy of Math which uses a pre/post assessment(summative) along with learning/skill trees that are based on South Dakota content standards.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 2</u>:This grant will also allow for further formative assessment measures with achievement series throughout the schoolyear in both reading and math classes in order to provide ongoing formative assessments that will drive the instruction at the middle level.This provides differentiated instruction for each individual student in the school.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 3:</u>This application will also allow for a facilitator to be involved in the tutoring of students during and after the school day that are in need of furthering their instruction to a 1:1 setting along with the classroom setting.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 4:</u>The school will support this systemic change in looking at the student at the level he/she is at and working to bridge the academic gap using scientific-research based software and programs along with their current core materials that correlate these goals and objectives that need to be met to reach the measureable goals of the schools school improvement plan.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 5:</u>The school will foster this change by allowing for professional learning communities as well as leadership training time. The school will also look into this change as an opportunity that will be successful if proper documentation, progress-monitoring and evaluation are in place to create an environment that fosters and promotes the change necessary for the change of children's academic success.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 6:</u>The school will disseminate the data to all stake-holders in the district through the district web-site, local newspaper, weekly newsletters, parent-teacher conferences, professional learning communities, staff meetings as well as through personal parent/teacher contacts via phone/email as needed.**

- **<u>STRATEGY 7:</u>The scientifically-based research will guide the instruction/assignments/lesson planning for all students as it will guide the differentiated instruction through the use of the pre/post test. This research will also be used as it follows the South Dakota content standards in which the students are working to achieve and reach their goals through the spring DStep assessment each year.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 8:</u>The school will provide ample time for professional learning communities (PLC groups) to meet at least once a month during or after school as needed to incorporate the collaboration of the scientific research data.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 9:</u>The staff will be given at least one hour each week as a grade level team planning time to adequately discuss and plan further instruction based on the data from the research based programs in regards to their students.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 10:</u>The school will give 10 in-service days each school year to provide professional development time to discuss, plan, and drive their instruction based on the data analysis that has been given.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 11:</u>The school will provide professional development opportunities to further the development of the scientific-research based programs that have been described in this application.**

Westside Elementary School:

- **<u>STRATEGY 1:</u>The needs of this application will be met by the use of continuing the scientifically-research based programs such as our purchased Orchard and Academy of Math/Reading which uses a pre/post/formative assessment along with learning/skill trees that are based on South Dakota content standards. This provides differentiated instruction for each individual student in the school.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 2:</u>This application will allow for a facilitator to be involved in the tutoring/co-teaching of students during and after the school day that are in need of furthering their instruction to a 1:1 setting along with the classroom setting.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 3:</u>The school will support this systemic change in looking at the student at the level he/she is at and working to bridge the academic gap using scientific-research based software and programs along with their current core materials that correlate these goals and objectives that need to be met to reach the measureable goals of the schools school improvement plan.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 4:</u>The school will foster this change by allowing for professional learning communities as well as leadership training time. The school will also look into this change as an opportunity that will be successful if proper documentation, progress-monitoring and evaluation are in place to create an environment that fosters and promotes the change necessary for the change of children's academic success.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 5:</u>The school will disseminate the data to all stake-holders in the district through the district web-site, local newspaper, weekly newsletters, parent-teacher conferences, professional learning communities, staff meetings as**

- **<u>STRATEGY 6:</u>The scientifically-based research will guide the instruction/assignments/lesson planning for all students as it will guide the differentiated instruction through the use of the pre/post test. This research will also be used as it follows the South Dakota content standards in which the students are working to achieve and reach their goals through the spring DStep assessment each year.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 7:</u>The school will provide ample time for professional learning communities (PLC groups) to meet at least once a month during or after school as needed to incorporate the collaboration of the scientific research data. The staff will be given at least one hour each week as a grade level team planning time to adequately discuss and plan further instruction based on the data from the research based programs in regards to their students.**
- **<u>STRATEGY 8</u>:The school will provide 10 in-service days each school year to provide professional development time to discuss, plan, and drive their instruction based on the data analysis that has been given. The school will provide professional development opportunities to further the development of the scientific-research based programs that have been described in this application.**

(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.
N/A: Tier III School

(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.

N/A: Tier III Schools

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 X 7.65% (Social Security-Medicare) = $1,530
$15,000 X 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
Project Year 2:	July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012
Project Year 3:	July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013

Personnel:
1 FTE paraprofessional with benefits at each building to support the small groups and 1:1 plan with the individualized interventions and standards based instruction. This type of instruction is able to meet the individualized needs of all academic levels of learning in order to bring all students to their highest level of academic achievement in accordance with our goals for school improvement and the law of No Child Left Behind.

Employee Benefits: 1 FTE paraprofessional benefits package to support each paraprofessional facilitator at each school.

Travel: N/A

Equipment:
Westside: 2 portable labs in order to provide the infusion of the project into the classroom alongside the certified teacher rather than a pull-out targeted assistance program. This program is to encourage a smaller classroom setting within the current classroom to meet the rigorous academic needs of all students with varying learning levels on a day to day basis.

Supplies:
South Dakota Standards based software programs and applications to support the purchases of the portable laptop g grant project throughout the 3 year term at each school.

Contractual: N/A

Professional Development:
Funds available for stipends for teacher training, instruction, administration, ongoing evaluation of this project over the three year g grant project.

Indirect Costs

1.8%

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

Name of School: Sisseton Middle School

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 **1 FTE Paraprofessional to facilitate the small groups and 1:1 within the classroom setting. (Strategy 1,2,3)**	18000	18000	18000	36000
2.Employee Benefits **1 FTE Paraprofessional benefits to facilitate the small groups and 1:1 within the classroom setting. (Strategy 1,2,3)**	7050	7050	7050	21150
3. Travel	0	0	0	0
4.Equipment **Portable labs for each grade level throughout the three year period to allow for classrooms to have the in classroom small group/1:1 setting of using the reading/math interventions with the facilitator in the classroom. (Strategy 1,2,**	60000	60000	60000	180000

3,6)					
5.Supplies Licenses/Software/Reading/Math Supplies to support the g grant project of the intervention of meeting the needs of individual students at all levels through the school improvement project. (Strategy 1,2,4,)	2000	2000	2000	6000	
6. Contractual	0	0	0	0	
7.Professional Development Portable Lab Professional Development Academy of Math/Reading/Orchard Training Staff/Administration/Evaluation (Strategy 5,6,7,8,9,10,11)	6000	6000	6000	18000	
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	93050	93050	93050	279150	
9. Indirect Costs*	1674.9	1674.90	1674.90	5024.70	
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	94724.90	94724.90	94724.90	284174.70	

*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: Sisseton Westside Elementary School (Tier III)

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 **1 FTE Paraprofessional to facilitate the small groups and 1:1 within the classroom setting. (Strategy 1,2,3)**	18000	18000	18000	36000
2. Employee Benefits	7050	7050	7050	21150
3. Travel	0	0	0	0
4.Equipment **Portable labs for each grade level throughout the three year period to allow for classrooms to have the in classroom small group/1:1 setting of using the reading/math interventions with the facilitator in the classroom. (Strategy 1, 3,6)**	60000	60000	60000	180000
5.Supplies **Licenses/Software/Reading/Math Supplies to support the g grant project of the intervention of meeting the needs of individual**	4000	4000	4000	12000

south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Learning. Leadership. Service.

students at all levels through the school improvement project. (Strategy 1,6)					
6. Contractual	0	0	0	0	
7.Professional Development Portable Lab Professional Development Academy of Math/Reading/Orchard Training Staff/Administration/Evaluation (Strategy 4,5,7,8)	6000	6000	6000	18000	
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	95050	95050	95059	285150	
9. Indirect Costs*	1710.90	1710.90	1710.90	5132.70	
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	96760.90	96769.90	96769.90	290282.70	

*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;

X 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.

X 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 SD DOE has requested and received the waivers below.

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.

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

❑ Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.