



south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Learning. Leadership. Service.

School Improvement Grants LEA (District) 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

Due Date

May 2, 2011

South Dakota Department of Education

MacKay Office Building, Title I Office
800 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501

Grant Period Ends

June 30, 2014

FY 2010

School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Cover page

Legal Name of Applicant: Oelrichs School District 23-3	Applicant's Mailing Address: PO Box 65 Oelrichs, SD 57763
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Judy White Position and Office: Title I Director Contact's Mailing Address: PO Box 65 Oelrichs, SD 57763	Telephone: 605-535-2631 Fax: 605-535-2046 Email address: Judy.White@k12.sd.us
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name): Charles Fredrickson	Telephone: 605-535-2631
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: May 2, 2011
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): Charles Fredrickson

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 \$50,000 annually to \$2 million annually.

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.

Four Models

Districts with Tier I or II schools must select one of the following models to implement.

Turnaround model: The LEA replaces the principal (although the LEA may retain a recently hired principal where a turnaround, restart, or transformation was instituted in past two years) and rehiring no more than 50% of the staff; gives greater principal autonomy; implements other prescribed and recommended strategies;

Restart model: The LEA converts or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, charter management organization, or education management organization;

School closure: The LEA closes the school and enrolls the students in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving; or

Transformation model: The LEA replaces the principal (although the LEA may retain a recently hired principal where a turnaround, restart, or transformation was instituted in past two years); implements a rigorous staff evaluation and development system; rewards staff who increase student achievement and/or graduation rates and removes staff who have not improved after ample opportunity; institutes comprehensive instructional reform; increases learning time and applies community-oriented school strategies; and provides greater operational flexibility and support for the school.

Conditions of Eligibility

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

Waiver to Implement a Schoolwide Program

Requests for waivers to enable a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school operating a targeted assistance program to operate a schoolwide program so it can implement a turnaround, restart, school closure, or transformational model should be made directly to the United States Department of Education. Such a waiver is necessary because a school operating a targeted assistance program may only provide Title I services to students who are most at risk of failing to meet State's student academic achievement standards; it may not provide services for the school as a whole. In order to operate a schoolwide program, a school must meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

The LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver. The waiver must be published for public comment prior to submission.

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, 2011 – June 30, 2012

Project Year 2: July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013

Project Year 3: July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014

These funds are contingent on renewed federal funding.

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 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: LEA 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:

Strong: Responses were thorough with sufficient detail

Moderate: Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications

Limited or None: Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given

The complete scoring rubric is attached at the end of the document.

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: Upon approval of the State Application, the LEAs will be given a copy of the draft application package. A Live Meeting will be held at that time to go over the application and grant requirements. Districts will be asked to indicate their intent to apply for Tier I and II schools. Tier III applications will be sent out if warranted, based upon the number of Tier I and II schools LEAs intend to commit to serve and the amount of funding available. Technical assistance will be provided by department staff at the request of the district. LEA applications must be submitted within 30 working days. Awards are expected to be announced within three weeks after submission. Districts receiving grant awards may begin pre-implementation immediately, but no later than the first contract day for the 2011-2012 school year.

Applications must 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 must be sent to Beth Schiltz. 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 will be held to provide LEAs with the LEA application and School Sections. An over view of PLA identification, SIG requirements, the four intervention models, and application procedures will be provided.

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

Contact Information

For grant application questions:

Dr. Kristine Harms (773-6509)

Beth Schiltz (773-4716)

Kristine.Harms@state.sd.us

Beth.Schiltz@state.sd.us

For fiscal questions:

Rob Huffman (773-4600)

Paul Schreiner (773-7108)

Robyn.Huffman@state.sd.us

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
Oelrichs Elementary				X				
Oelrichs JH				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) (Tier I, II, & III) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school. **(Must be at the district level)**

- 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 district committee and 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.*

Judy White	Chairman
Billie Besco-Williams	K-12 Special Education
Shirley Besco	Counselor/Community Member
Charles Fredrickson	Administration

Nicole Forney	Paraprofessional/ Community Member
Jodi Kauffman	Elementary Teacher
Dee Tlustos	Elementary Teacher
Bonnie Anderson	School Board Member
Dottie Messinio	Paraprofessional/Community
Evan Ferguson	Middle School Teacher
Cindy Hill	Elementary Teacher
Buff Tewahade	HS Art Teacher
T'Mara Twiss	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 RetreatSM 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 CCSO, the results must be included in the data analysis.*

Student:

- *Dakota Character Surveys – perception data
- *Student motivational surveys – perception data
- *Dakota Step-grade 3-6 reading and math scores
- *Dakota Step growth data from math and reading from 3rd grade through 8th grade
- *Sat 10 for 2nd grade
- *DIBELS
- *STAR
- *Various district level assessments

Professional Practices:

The staff reviewed testing data at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year. Professional development utilizing technology in instructional strategies to be utilized in the lesson presentation made available to the staff. Training was provided using Bloom’s Taxonomy in analyzing test questions to look at the rigor in the classroom which is part of the 2025 initiative from the Department of Education. SMART board technology has been made available to all classroom teachers and some teachers expanded its use into classroom presentations.

The Dakota STEP was analyzed by all of the Oelrichs Elementary and Junior High School staff and administration and summarized by the SIG committee. The staff evaluated, brainstormed, and selected strategies that would be used to address the lowest two standards in reading and math, based on the Dakota Step test of 2009-2010 school year. All standards will be addressed over the course of the next three years with the two lowest being addressed year one, then the three lowest

in year two and then the two lowest in year three. The staff focuses on Marzano's instructional strategies

The committee reviewed the Dakota Character Surveys from 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 to determine the community and family participation and evaluation of the school. The Family leadership committee met with community representatives to identify specific areas of need within the community focused on service learning.

Programs and Structures: *Include an evaluation of current practices and programs as required in the third lens of data review.*

The Oelrichs Elementary and Junior High staff reviewed testing data at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year. The staff received some professional development utilizing technology in instructional strategies to be utilized in the lesson presentation. Training was provided using Bloom's Taxonomy in analyzing test questions to look at the rigor in the classroom which is part of the 2025 initiative from the Department of Education. SMART board technology has been made available to all classroom teachers and some teachers expanded its use into classroom presentations.

Family and Community Data

*Dakota Character Surveys – perception data

*Parent, Staff, and Student Surveys

Reviewing data from the previous data retreat, the team looked at the following information:

The pattern of our Dakota STEP shows a fluctuation each year, necessitating the on-going training and professional development in the areas of reading and math.

- 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 application availability and application submission); **WHO** was involved with the analysis of the data; and **HOW** the comprehensive needs assessment was accomplished.*

The Oelrichs School met with an ESA representative, who specializes in data review, and reviewed the data from the 2009-2010 Dakota Step assessment for the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades in September, 2010. We then spent time looking at strategies Ruby Payne focused on in her book, "Children of Poverty". The Dakota Character survey results and student motivational survey results were reviewed in the Spring of 2009 and 2010. The Elementary teachers met with a DIBELS coach to review how to administer the DIBELS test and what to look for in the data, and then met with the coach again to look at the data collected in the fall and again in the middle of the 2010-2011 school year and compared with data to determine student needs. The SIG committee met on April 14th and 15th to review the data results from the fall data retreat. All lenses were reviewed and goals were modified based on this information.

WHO was involved with the analysis of the data; and

Lacey Hoogland (ESA), the Oelrichs Elementary and Junior High School teaching staff, Judy White (Title I Director/Teacher), Billie Besco-Williams (SPED Director/Teacher) and Charles Ferguson (Administration) were the members involved with the analysis of the data used for completing the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA).

HOW the comprehensive needs assessment was accomplished

The Dakota STEP data was broken down into categories for the committee to review. The committee identified the areas of strength and weakness in each area of math and reading. During the data review the committee utilized data presented during the September district Data Retreat.

- 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.***

Based on the 2009-2010 Oelrichs school Dakota Step data, two weak areas in reading were identified in both the Elementary and Junior High Schools. The first was the student's ability to apply the elements of literature and text structures to interpret various genres. The second area of concern in reading is the students' ability to analyze and evaluate informational text. Two areas of weakness, both the Elementary and Junior High Schools, were identified in the math area. The primary concern in math was the use of deductive and inductive reasoning. The second area of concern in math is the ability of students to transform algebraic expressions.

The main area of weakness from the Dakota Character survey was the lack of autonomy that students felt they possessed in the decision making process. In addition, the student motivational survey noted two areas of weakness which included lack of hands on activities and the level of boredom with classes.

- 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.***

Strengths:

- student autonomy has shown improvement from the previous year, but still an area of need, in both the Elementary and Junior High Schools;
- good infrastructure of technology; SMART boards have been provided to teachers in both the Elementary and Junior High Schools.

Weaknesses:

- use of procedures to transform algebraic expressions in math, in the Elementary and Junior High;
- use of deductive and inductive reasoning to recognize and apply all areas of math, in both the Elementary and Junior High Schools;
- students being able to access, analyze, synthesis and evaluate informational texts in both the Elementary and Junior High Schools;
- students being able to apply knowledge of text structures, literacy devices, and literary elements to develop interpretations and form responses in both the Elementary and Junior High Schools;
- sense of autonomy in decision making in both the Elementary and Junior High Schools;

The prioritized areas of need for the SIG funds are:

- reading, math and technology development and training for curriculum integration;
- curriculum development to meet state standards with an emphasis on technology;
- development of formative and summative assessment protocols to measure student achievement;
- increase in project based learning, hands on activities, and differentiated instruction within the instructional presentation;
- job embedded professional development regarding subject specific pedagogy;
- instruction that increases deeper understanding of the community;
- increase rigor and relevance within the curriculum.

- 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 Oelrichs School District has two schools identified in this process as needing school improvement, the Elementary School and the Junior High School. We only have one elementary school and one junior high school in our district, and each is categorized as a Tier III school. These two schools are both eligible to receive SIG funds. The High School is not in improvement, therefore is not eligible.

- (2)** (Tier I & II) 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.*

N/A

- 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.*

N/A

- (3)** (Tier I) 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.*

N/A

(4) (Tier I, II & III) 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 school staff reviewed the Dakota STEP data for 2009-2010 and recognized the need for change. They selected the two lowest content standards in math and reading. This information will be shared with students and parents through the school newsletter to garner support and commitment to the strategies. The staff committed to using more graphic organizers and visual cues in their lessons. The Board of Education has defined district goals that focus on increasing student achievement. Greater professional development, technology hardware and software, and a revised approach to instructional presentation are areas we hope to continue to develop further.

- b. *Plans for future action must be indicated.*

It is the hope of the school district that the SIG grant will afford opportunities that are not possible with the limited funding available in a small school district such as ours. The school staff recognizes the need for improvement and wants to implement Reading, Math, and Technology Coaches to work with current staff to improve instructional practices. The school district will offer tuition reimbursement for staff members pursuing Advanced Degrees. Staff members will attend national conferences two out of the next three years. Reading and math laptops will be added to afford students opportunities to use technology to reinforce and enhance all courses. A tech person for year one will be able to provide needed support in setting up and managing these labs. Leading speakers will be invited into present to all staff members. Extended learning time will be offered through tutoring services, afterschool programs, and summer school. These opportunities will generate excitement and growth in our school district by improving the teaching staff expertise (making smart teachers smarter). The trickle-down effect to our students will be a better learning environment that is more relevant to their future needs.

- c. *Plans for future action must be indicated.*

It is the hope of the school district that the SIG grant will afford opportunities that are not possible with the limited funding available in a small school district such as ours. The school staff recognizes the need for improvement and wants to implement Reading, Math, and Technology Coaches to work with current staff to improve instructional practice. The school district will offer tuition reimbursement for staff members pursuing Advanced Degrees. Staff members will attend national conferences two out of the next three years. Reading and math laptops will be added to afford students better opportunities to use technology in their courses.

A tech person for year one will be able to provide needed support in setting up and managing these labs. Highly qualified presenters will be invited into present to all staff members. Extended learning time will be offered through tutoring services, afterschool programs, and summer school. These opportunities will generate excitement and growth in our school district by improving the teaching staff expertise (making smart teachers smarter). The trickle-down effect to our students will be a better learning environment that is more relevant to their future needs.

- d. 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?*

Consultation will continue between the District, our Elementary School, our Junior High School, and TIE along with various colleges and universities. These external providers will continue to be utilized because of their highly trained staff and their knowledge in researched based professional development models. They are also well trained in the components of state and federal school improvement requirements. Additional rationale for using these providers is because of the fact that Oelrichs has experienced success with current professional development activities and we have developed strong relationships which is of key importance for our small staff.

Planning sessions will be scheduled with administration, staff, and the external providers to discuss needs of the staff. The planning sessions will include the four lenses of data to ensure there is a comprehensive approach in identifying needs on an ongoing basis. A specific plan will be developed outlining the areas of need, training/support, and outcomes. This plan is currently under development and with SIG approval we will immediately be able to review and implement activities based on the funding received.

Consultation will continue between the District, our Elementary School, our Junior High School, and TIE along with various colleges and universities. These external providers will continue to be utilized because of their highly trained staff and their knowledge in researched based professional development models. They are also well trained in the components of state and federal school improvement requirements. Additional rationale for using these providers is because of the fact that Oelrichs has experienced success with current professional development activities and we have developed strong relationships which is of key importance for our small staff.

- e. 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, Math Counts, Reading Up, etc. Address resources in terms of funding, staffing, partnerships, and support.*

Student performance will continue to be measured based on the Dakota STEP test results for the 3rd through 6th graders. SAT will measure performance at the 2nd grade level. Pre and post summative assessments K-8 will be used through DSTEP, DIBELS, AIMSWEB, STAR and other district assessments as determined by needs of the grant. Effectiveness of professional development practices targeting specific instructional strategies will be evaluated to determine impact on student achievement in the areas of reading and math through the monitoring system developed by an outside resource, as well as the current evaluation system.

Address funding, staffing, and other resources that will be needed to sustain the reforms.

The Board of Education is committed to continuing with our salary schedule which provides increases for graduate courses and a master's degree. This would replace the incentive pay built into the grant. The stipend pay for the extended learning time would be supported by the district's general fund or rural education achievement program. The cost of the licensing for the AIMSweb for pre and post assessments would be built in to the district's budget. The board is also committed to allocating funding towards a tuition reimbursement program to continue professional development among staff. The professional development provided throughout the grant period would establish lead teachers among staff that would be available to continue to train new staff that would be hired in the future.

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. What barriers exist?*

There needs to be more band width, a switch, and technical support to implement and troubleshoot the new computer labs. The staff will provide teaching time for the after school tutoring on a volunteer basis and receive an additional stipend. Students and parents need to be aware of the need for the extended learning times (afterschool) and support and engage in them (community buy-in).

Indicate the willingness of the district to modify procedures along the way if needed.

The School Board and staff are willing to adapt to the needs of the students and district as we would move forward with the school improvement process. The Board of Education is committed to increasing student achievement within the district. If adjustments are necessary, it is felt that the support is present.

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 district chose to implement a school wide incentive plan to foster collaboration among staff and to meet our end goal of improving student achievement. Our district's plan was developed using the South Dakota Incentives Plus plan as a model. The incentive levels, as outlined in the budget, are to be awarded to the principal, all instructional staff, and paraprofessionals when the school demonstrates growth in student achievement as determined by our growth formula. We will use the information gathered from SAT10 and the Dakota STEP as our main indicators, with district assessments as an alternative source when needed. This will be addressed separately in the areas of math and reading. The amount allocated will be disbursed equally as growth is shown in math and reading and as more technology is being used in the classroom. It

is felt that the incentive pay will be an incentive for individuals to apply for positions within the district and retain them once they are hired. Following the grant period, the opportunity will be made available to move up on the district salary schedule further assisting in the retention of staff. Procedures will be developed that will require staff to work within the district one year for each year that tuition reimbursement payments are made towards an advanced degree. If funds are expended and a staff member chooses to leave the district, funds will be reimbursed to the district.

The staff will be evaluated using the Charlotte Danielson evaluation tool as adopted by the State of South Dakota. They are required to identify effective instructional practices in their lesson plans and complete all parts of our lesson design template in their teaching methods. Staff members who struggle in being effective will work with administration collaboratively to brainstorm resources and professional development opportunities necessary for improvement. On the teacher performance appraisal all staff will score at least at a proficient or advanced level. If they are marked unsatisfactory or needs improvement, the principal will work specifically with the individual to identify individual goals in the deficit area. Goals will focus on ways to address student achievement and timelines established for the principal and staff member to review progress. If progress is not noted with the designated timeframe, a specific plan of assistance will be developed for the staff member under the supervision of the principal. The Plan of Assistance would identify specific goals and expectations the staff member must meet. Should any staff member fail to show adequate progress, recommendation for non renewal will be made following district policy. The final decision will remain with the Oelrichs Board of Education.

The staff will be given the opportunity to attend local, state, or national conferences, which will directly relate to their subject area. Leading experts in education will be invited to speak to the staff to promote project based learning and effective research based instructional strategies to use within the instructional presentation of lessons. Technology integration within the curriculum to increase student engagement will also be promoted. We would utilize further technology training opportunities and the services of a technology coach to assist teachers in becoming more technologically adept. We will also utilize reading and math coaches here as well as project-based learning, Marzano and differentiated instruction.

- (5) (Tier I & II) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to pre-implement and 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 first year pre-implementation and the remaining three year implementation time period. The timeline should be from the district perspective.*

N/A

- (6) (Tier I, II, & III) 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 districts must use the Dakota Step (indicator) to define their measurable goals which are based upon the percent of proficient students. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year.) Other goals should be set that are measurable and specify the indicator (district assessments) that will be used during each of the grant years.*

Elementary Goals and Objectives

Goal #1: To improve the reading skills of all students.

Objective 1: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year 84% or more of elementary students K-6 will be proficient in reading skills at their grade level with an 8% gain in years thereafter as measured by the Orchard, STAR reading test, Dakota STEP (grades 3-6), or SAT10 (grade 2).

Goal #2: To improve the mathematical skills of all students.

Objective 1: By the end of the 2011-2012 school 86% or more of elementary students K-6 will be proficient in mathematical skills at their grade level with an 8% gain in years thereafter as measured by the STAR math test, Orchard, Dakota STEP (grades 3-6), or SAT10 (grade 1-2).

Junior High School Goals and Objectives

Goal #1: To improve the reading skills of all students.

Objective 1: By the end of the 2011-2013 school years 84% or higher of junior high students will be proficient in reading skills at their grade level with an 8% gain in years thereafter as measured by the STAR math test, Orchard, or Dakota STEP (grades 7-8).

Goal #2: To improve the mathematical skills of all students.

Objective 1: By the end of the 2011-2012 school years, 86% or higher of junior high school students, grades 7-8, will be proficient in mathematical skills at their grade level with a 6% gain in years thereafter as measured by the STAR math test, Orchard, or Dakota STEP (grades 7-8).

- (7) (Tier III) 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.*

We will be bringing in another Title I teacher, preferably with an emphasis in math, to help support our high needs students, a Paraprofessional for the first year of implementation and half time for the next two years of the grant, and we will be making technology available through the purchase of computers, appropriate subscriptions, software, etc. to help remediate and enhance student learning. The Title I teacher and the Paraprofessional will be absorbed through other programs and the natural attrition of staff. A tutorial program, the after school program, and summer school will be enhanced through the use of the technology that is being made available. We will be bringing in Reading, Math and Technology Coaches to assist the teachers in becoming better at what they already do and providing other professional development opportunities.

MATH

Oelrichs will move at least 10 percent of students from below basic/basic to proficient/advanced, as measured by safe harbor, on the Dakota STEP Math test in the spring of 2012 as defined by the AMO set by the State of South Dakota. The funds will be used to improve academic achievement through the use of content coaches. Coaches will work individually with teachers to determine strengths

and weaknesses. Coaches will then determine the strategies need to increase rigor in the classroom and enhance hands-on activities to increase student engagement and achievement. Teachers will be trained on the state adopted Core Content Curriculum Standards, on utilizing the Marzano’s nine learning strategies, and incorporating technology into the everyday classroom through the use of computers for remediation and enhancement.

READING

Oelrichs will move at least 10 percent of students from below basic/basic to proficient/advanced, as measured by safe harbor, on the Dakota STEP Reading test in the spring of 2012 as defined by the AMO set by the State of South Dakota. The funds will be used to improve academic achievement through the use of content coaches. Coaches will work individually with teachers to determine strengths and weaknesses. Coaches will then determine the strategies need to increase rigor in the classroom and enhance hands-on activities to increase student engagement and achievement. Teachers will be trained on the state adopted Core Content Curriculum Standards, on utilizing the Marzano learning strategies, and incorporating technology into the classroom through the use of computers for remediation and enhancement.

- (8) (Tier I & II) 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 III schools the district commits to serve. The districts must use the Dakota Step (indicator) to define their measurable goals which are based upon the percent of proficient students. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year.) Other goals should be set that are measurable and specify the indicator (district assessments) that will be used during each of the grant years.*

N/A

- (9) (Tier I & II) 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.*

N/A

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.

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--	--

**School Budget categories for consideration in required budget narrative.
Aggregate school level budgets into a district level budget.**

Grant Periods:

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

Personnel: Salaries; paid to certificated staff and substitute staff.

- 1 Teacher (to support high needs students) 05 FTE = \$20,000
 - 1 Paraprofessional 1 FTE = \$10,660
 - Stipend Pay for 2 Fridays per month - 5 staff @ \$ 150 per Friday
For 16 Fridays X 5 X \$150 = \$24,000
 - Stipend Pay for Leadership Team 6 days of summer work
4 people @ \$150 daily = \$3,600
 - Stipend Pay for Staff for 3 days of summer work
10 people \$150 daily = \$4,500
 - Stipend pay for Leadership team 3 staff X \$150 X 16 days = \$4,800
 - Incentive Pay for Classified Staff 5 @ \$500 = \$2,500
 - Incentive Pay for Certified Staff 10 @ \$750 = \$7,500
 - Incentive Pay for School Leadership = \$6,400
(BLT 4 @\$1000 = \$4,000)
(2 Principals @ \$1200 = \$2,400)
 - Substitute Pay for Staff 50 days @ \$70 per day = \$3,500
- TOTAL = \$87,460**

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).

- Teacher .5FTE - \$20,000 X .1365 + Insurance = \$6,124
- Paraprofessional 1 FTE \$10,608 X .1365 + Insurance = \$6140
- Stipend Benefits (10 staff X 16 Fridays X \$150 X .1365) = \$3276
- Stipend Benefits (4 staff X 6 X \$150 X .1365) = \$494
- Stipend Benefits (10 staff X 3 days X \$150 X .1365) = \$614
- Stipend Benefits (3 staff LT X \$150 X 16 X .1365) = \$983
- Incentive Benefits (2.5 Classified Staff X \$500 X .1365) = \$342
- Incentive Benefits (5 Certified Staff X \$750 X .1365) = \$1024
- Incentive Benefits (2 Leadership team X \$1000 X .1365) = \$546
- Incentive Benefits (1 Principal X \$1200 X .1365) = \$328
- Substitute Benefits for Staff 50 days

\$3,500 X .0765 (Social Security-Medicare) = \$268

TOTAL = \$20,139

Travel: Expenditures for staff, travel (including mileage), airline tickets, taxi fare, meals, lodging, miscellaneous expenses

Professional Development Conferences staff (travel, conference fees, etc.) = \$4,000
(Conferences focused on Instructional Strategies and Behavioral Interventions)
Mileage Estimate = \$111 per person per event x 10 = \$1,110
Lodging Estimate = 2 night per conference \$150 x 10 = \$3000
Meals Estimate = \$26 per day @ 3 day = \$39 x 10 = \$780
Miscellaneous expenses (taxi fare, etc.) = \$1484

TOTAL = \$10,374

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 digital cameras, DVD players, laptop computers and desktop computers. The grantee will be expected to maintain an equipment inventory list.

Laptop computers - 24 @ \$1,100 = \$26,400
Access Points, Switch and Miscellaneous expenses - \$4,976

TOTAL = \$31,376

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

Literacy/Math –Downloads (for previously purchased Kindles)/ Books/ etc. = \$2500
Software for Reading and Math Labs - \$4,000
Misc. Supplies and subscriptions - \$5,074

TOTAL = \$11,574

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.

Reading Coach for 25 days @ \$1000 per day = \$25,000
Math Coach for 25 days @ \$1000 per day = \$25,000
Technology Coach for 25 days @ \$1000 per day = \$25,000
Summer Training Consultant - \$3,750
Technology /Network Trainer/Consultant @ \$115 per hour = \$23,000

TOTAL = \$101,750

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

Tuition Reimbursement Fee estimate for 10 staff to obtain Advanced Degree @
\$400 per credit hour for a maximum of 6 hrs annually = \$12,000
(Tuition will be reimbursed upon successful completion of credits.)
State Conference fees for multiple staff= \$4,500
National Conference Fees= \$2500

TOTAL = \$19,000

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

Based upon approved restricted indirect cost rate of 4.73% = **\$8,385**

Year 1 Total = \$290,058

Project Year 2: July 1, 2012– June 30, 2013

Personnel: Salaries; paid to certificated individuals and substitute staff.

Teacher .5 FTE (to support high needs students) – \$40,000
Paraprofessional .25 FTE (to support teachers and students) = \$5,330
Stipend Pay for 10 staff @ \$100 per Friday X 16 Fridays = \$16,000
Stipend Pay for Leadership Team 3 days of summer work X 4 staff @ \$100 daily = \$1,200
Stipend Pay for Staff for 3 days of summer work X 10 staff X \$100 daily = \$3,000
Substitute Pay for Staff 25 days @ \$70 per day = \$3,500
TOTAL = \$69,030

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).

Teacher Benefits 1 FTE (\$ 20,000 X .1365 + Insurance & SDRS) = \$10,848
Paraprofessional Benefits .5 FTE (\$2,665 x .1365 + Insurance) = \$3,070
Stipend Pay for Fridays \$16,000 X 13.65% (Social Security-Medicare) = \$2184
Stipend Pay for Staff \$1200 X 13.65% (Social Security-Medicare) = \$164
Stipend Pay for Leadership Team \$3,000 X 13.65% (Social Security-Medicare) = \$410
Substitute Pay for Staff 50 days \$3,500 X 13.65% (Social Security-Medicare) = \$268
TOTAL = \$16,944

Travel: Expenditures for staff travel, including mileage, airline tickets, taxi fare, meals, lodging
Professional Development Conferences staff (travel, conference fees, etc.) = \$3,000

Conferences focused on Instructional Strategies and Behavioral Interventions
Mileage Estimate = \$111 per person per event x 10 = \$1,110
Lodging Estimate = 1 night per conference \$150 x 10 = \$1,500
Meals Estimate = \$520
Miscellaneous expenses (taxi fare, etc.) = \$704
TOTAL = 6,834

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 digital cameras, DVD players, laptop computers and desktop computers. The grantee will be expected to maintain an equipment inventory list.

Laptop computers - 10 @ \$1,100 = \$11,000
Technical Equipment and Miscellaneous expenses (batteries, lamps,
Smartboard accessories - \$1000
TOTAL = \$12,000

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

Reading/Math/Download/ Books/ Library/etc. - \$3656
Software for Reading and Math Labs - \$1062
Subscriptions and Misc. Supplies - \$1074
TOTAL =\$5792

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.

Reading Consultant Contracted Service (National Level) – Provide professional development workshop during fall in-service - \$25,000
Math Consultant Contracted Service (National Level) – Provide professional development workshop during fall in-service - \$25,000
Technology Network/Trainer @ \$115 per hour = \$20,000
TOTAL = \$70,000

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

Advanced Degree @ \$400 per credit hour for a maximum of 6 hrs annually = \$10,000
(Tuition will be reimbursed upon successful completion of credits.)
TOTAL = \$10,000

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

Based upon approved restricted indirect cost rate of 4.73% = **\$5,983**

Year 2 Total = 196,583

Project Year 3: July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014

Personnel: Salaries; paid to certificated individuals and substitute staff.

Teacher .5 FTE (to support high needs students) – \$40,000
Paraprofessional .25 FTE (to support teachers and students) = \$5,330
Stipend Pay for 10 staff @ \$100 per Friday X 16 Fridays = \$16,000
Stipend Pay for Leadership Team 3 days of summer work X 4 staff @ \$100 daily = \$1,200
Stipend Pay for Staff for 3 days of summer work X 10 staff X \$100 daily = \$3,000
Substitute Pay for Staff 25 days @ \$70 per day = \$3,500
TOTAL =\$69,030

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).

Teacher Benefits 1 FTE (\$ 20,000 X .1365 + Insurance & SDRS) =\$10,848

Paraprofessional Benefits .5 FTE ($\$2,665 \times 1.365 + \text{Insurance}$) = \$3,070
 Stipend Pay for Fridays $\$16,000 \times 13.65\%$ (Social Security-Medicare) = \$2184
 Stipend Pay for Staff $\$1200 \times 13.65\%$ (Social Security-Medicare) = \$164
 Stipend Pay for Leadership Team $\$3,000 \times 13.65\%$ (Social Security-Medicare) = \$410
 Substitute Pay for Staff 50 days $\$3,500 \times 13.65\%$ (Social Security-Medicare) = \$268
TOTAL = \$16,944

Travel: Expenditures for staff travel, including mileage, airline tickets, taxi fare, meals, lodging
 Professional Development Conferences staff (travel, conference fees, etc.) = \$3,000
 Conferences focused on Instructional Strategies and Behavioral Interventions
 Mileage Estimate = \$111 per person per event $\times 10 = \$1,110$
 Lodging Estimate = 1 night per conference $\$150 \times 10 = \$1,500$
 Meals Estimate = \$520
 Miscellaneous expenses (taxi fare, etc.) = \$704
TOTAL = 6,834

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 digital cameras, DVD players, laptop computers and desktop computers. The grantee will be expected to maintain an equipment inventory list.

Laptop computers - 10 @ \$1,100 = \$11,000
 Technical Equipment and Miscellaneous expenses (batteries, lamps, Smartboard accessories) - \$1000
TOTAL = \$12,000

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

Reading/Math/Download/ Books/ Library/etc. - \$3656
 Software for Reading and Math Labs - \$1062
 Subscriptions and Misc. Supplies - \$1074
TOTAL = \$5792

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.

Reading Consultant Contracted Service (National Level) – Provide professional development workshop during fall in-service - \$25,000
 Math Consultant Contracted Service (National Level) – Provide professional development workshop during fall in-service - \$25,000
 Technology Network/Trainer @ \$115 per hour = \$20,000
TOTAL = \$70,000

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

Advanced Degree @ \$400 per credit hour for a maximum of 6 hrs annually = \$10,000

(Tuition will be reimbursed upon successful completion of credits.)

TOTAL = \$10,000

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

Based upon approved restricted indirect cost rate of 4.73% = **\$5,983**

Year 3 Total = 196,583

(Name) School District

**Budget Information
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

Budget Summary

Schools	Project Year 1 7/01/11 - 6/30/12 (a)		**Project Year 2 7/01/12 - 6/30/13 (b)	**Project Year 3 7/1/13 - 6/30/14 (c)	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Oelrichs Elementary School Tier III		\$145,767	\$97,857	\$97,857	\$341,482
Oelrichs Junior High School Tier III		\$144,291	\$98,726	\$98,726	\$341,742
Name of School & Tier					
Name of School & Tier					
District - Level Activities					
Total Costs		\$290,058	\$196,583	\$196,583	\$683,224

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

** Contingent upon renewed federal funding

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 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.

- 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.

F. WAIVERS: The SEA has not requested waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant. The LEA may apply for the following waiver.

The SD DOE has not requested the waiver below.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will apply. If the LEA does not intend to apply for the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver. The waiver must be published for public comment prior to submission.

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

