



south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Learning. Leadership. Service.

School Improvement Grant

LEA Application **Smee School District**

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

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0682

Due Date

South Dakota Department of Education
MacKay Office Building, Title I Office
800 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501

Grant Period Ends
June 30, 2017

FY 2013
School Improvement Grant (SIG)
Cover page

LEA Name: Smee School District	LEA Mailing Address: 12250 SD Hwy. 1806 P.O. Box B Wakpala, SD 57658
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Jay Shillingstad . Position and Office: Title I/School Improvement Coordinator Contact's Mailing Address: same as above	Telephone: 605-845-3040 Fax: 605-845-7244 Email address: jay.shillingstad@k12.sd.us
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name): Greg East	Telephone: 605-845-3040
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: 3/24/2014
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):

Original Signature of Authorized Representative:

Date: _____

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

Guidelines

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State’s “Tier I” and “Tier II” schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of a State’s Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State’s other Tier I schools (“newly eligible” Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of a State’s secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State’s other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years (“newly eligible” Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools (“newly eligible” Tier III schools). In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the

LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

ESEA Flexibility

An SEA that has received ESEA flexibility no longer identifies Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; instead, it identifies priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools. Accordingly, if it chooses, an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request may select the "**priority schools list waiver**" in Section H of the SEA application for SIG funds. This waiver permits the SEA to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools. An additional waiver is in place to add the list focus schools to the SIG list.

Through its approved ESEA flexibility request, an SEA has already received a waiver that permits its LEAs to apply for SIG funds to serve priority schools that are not otherwise eligible to receive SIG funds because they are not identified as Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The waiver offered in this application goes beyond this previously granted waiver to permit the SEA to actually use its priority schools list as its SIG list.

Allocations

Federal requirements set the minimum award for each school at \$50,000 and the maximum award at \$2,000,000 per year.

Under this competition, South Dakota has \$1.37 million in Federal FY 2013 funds available, plus a limited amount of uncommitted funds from previous competitions, to award 3 year projects. Therefore, the maximum combined three year total award amount a school could receive is approximately \$1.4 million. The minimum award amount for each school is \$50,000 per year.

In previous years, South Dakota SIG awards averaged \$175,000 per year per school. SD DOE reserves the right to make awards for less than the amount requested based on what is reasonable and necessary.

Based on Need and Commitment

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 priority or focus schools.

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 priority school that the LEA commits to serve: Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, or Transformational Models.

Four Models

Districts with priority and focus 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 priority or focus schools that currently do not have Tier I or Tier II School Improvement Grants for the 2013-2014 school year.

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:

Pre-implementation	Award Notification – June 30, 2014
Project Year 1:	July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015
Project Year 2:	July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016
Project Year 3:	July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017

The SEA must renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to each priority or focus 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. 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 and school applications will undergo review by a panel with facilitation. Panel members will be recruited with expertise in curriculum, administration, and teacher evaluation. A rubric will be used to determine if LEA applications/school applications meet the requirements of the grant and warrant approval. Each element will be scored based on the following scoring rubric:

Strong: 3 points- Responses were thorough with sufficient detail

Moderate: 2 points- Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications

Limited: 1 point- Responses were attempted but lacking specificity

Not Evident: 0 points- No response was given or response was unclear and lacked many details and evidence

The complete scoring rubric is attached at the end of this document and at the end of the school application.

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. Technical assistance will be provided by department staff at the request of the district. LEA applications must be submitted within 45 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 2014-2015 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 Shawna Poitra (shawna.poitra@state.sd.us). **A follow-up paper copy of the original LEA cover page signed by the authorized representative and the**

superintendent and the original School cover page signed by the principal must be mailed to SD DOE (800 Governors Drive, Pierre, SD 57501).

Technical Assistance

A Live Meeting will be held to provide LEAs with the LEA application and School Sections. An overview of 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 be available to help districts as they design their SIG applications.

Contact Information

For grant application questions:

Shannon Malone (773-6509)

shannon.malone@state.sd.us

Shawna Poitra (773-8065)

shawna.poitra@state.sd.us

For fiscal questions:

Rob Huffman (773-4600)

robyn.huffman@state.sd.us

Cody Stoeser (773-7108)

cody.stoeser@state.sd.us

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 priority and focus school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that each priority and focus school will implement.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	INTERVENTION			
		Turn-around	Restart	Closure	Transformation
Wakpala Elementary	4675600				X
Wakpala Middle School	4675600				X

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant. Please answer these questions from a district perspective, taking into consideration each of the district’s priority and focus schools.

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school for the purpose of the SIG application 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 analysis 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.*

The following were involved in the analysis of school data:

- Greg East, Superintendent
- Karyl Knudson, Elementary Principal
- Curtis Huffman, Middle/High School Principal
- Kathy Schmeichel, Special Education Director
- Heather Overland, Elementary/Middle School Math Teacher
- Jay Shillingstad, Title I/School Improvement Coordinator
- Stephanie Weideman, SST
- Bob Rose, Title I Technical Advisor
- Colleen Blake, Learning Specialist Three Rivers Special Services Cooperative

- 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.

Our school improvement plan is guided by SD-LEAP and the seven school turnaround principles. We also recognize the state as a provider of technical assistance in our efforts to move forward with academic improvements.

The elementary staff participated in two data roll outs based on AIMSweb benchmark testing. The first one was at the end of August 2013, following initial benchmark testing. Results were used to group students for interventions in reading. In early January 2014, we completed a data roll out with Colleen Blake. Using winter benchmark results from AIMSweb benchmark test, an error analysis was completed and this information was used to identify specific student needs and to identify commonalities among grade levels.

In September 2013, we participated in the state sponsored SD-LEAP Data Retreat and completed a needs assessment using the Four Lenses of Data: Student Achievement, Programs and Structures, Professional Practice, and Family and Community. We analyzed data from Dakota STEP, STAR Enterprise, AIMSweb, and State Report Card.

The data analysis helped us identify our top 4 priorities: strengthen reading interventions; implement math interventions in elementary and middle school; focus on data driven instruction; and, improve teacher evaluation process.

Strengthening reading and math interventions is dependent on hiring an experienced data/intervention specialist, which is what we will do if awarded. The specialist will manage all student data and assist us in our efforts to improve reading interventions and expand math interventions, which were started in the 2013-2014 school year. Without this, we are at risk of not meeting the specialized instruction needed in our schools. Also, both schools listed above are priority schools and, consequently, we are required to implement MTSS with fidelity and this grant will help us meet that requirement as well.

- 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 most recent CNA was completed in Spring 2012. A more recent CNA has not been completed due to a change in administration and transition of duties. The above described needs analysis is being used in lieu of a CNA. The SD-LEAP system has provided an additional basis for a CNA, which is different from previous models.

In September 2013, we participated in the state sponsored SD-LEAP Data Retreat and completed a needs assessment using the Four Lenses of Data: Student Achievement, Programs and Structures, Professional Practice, and Family and Community. We analyzed data from Dakota STEP, STAR Enterprise, AIMSweb, and State Report Card.

On May 28, 2014 we will participate in the state sponsored Academy of Pacesetter Districts training, and on May 29 and 30, 2014, we will also participate in the Data Retreat in Pierre.

We provide adequate data sources and evaluation of current practices and programs to support these grant applications. We have demonstrated a great need for these funds and are deeply committed to doing what we plan to do, that is, strengthen reading and math interventions in both schools by hiring intervention specialists who will better manage our data and strengthen our data driven specialized instruction.

- 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 priority and focus school.*

We have identified the need to strengthen reading and math interventions in the elementary school, and expand reading and math interventions in the middle school. We cannot do this with current resources and therefore are dependent upon being awarded SIG funds so we can move forward with our school improvement efforts. We have already demonstrated to the state that we have the capacity and commitment to implement fully and effectively more rigorous interventions in both schools.

The results from our fall data retreat based on prior year testing clearly demonstrated that a majority of our students are below basic and basic in reading and math. This data along with the fall 2014 STAR Enterprise and AIMswEB benchmark testing reflect the need for interventions in both math and reading during the term of the grant.

- 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.*

Elementary school: Strengths are strong principal and demonstrated ability to deliver interventions resulting in increased student achievement. Weakness is lack of intervention specialist to manage data and interventions. SIG funds will be used to hire an intervention specialist.

Middle School: Strengths are adequate capacity and commitment to strengthen reading and math interventions. Weakness is lack of reading and math intervention specialist to manage data and interventions. SIG funds will be used to hire an intervention specialist.

(2) X The LEA assures that each priority and focus school that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.

(3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—

- 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 transformation model? (Examples may include describing credentials of qualified staff, support of turnaround efforts by school board/community, new staff ready to implement change, etc.) Will the district contract with any person or organization to assist with the implementation of the turnaround or transformation model? Differentiate what has already taken place and detailed plans for the future. Who from the district will provide oversight of the SIG and how that will be accomplished?

Smee School District has been involved with SD-LEAP for nearly three years as we were part of the SD-LEAP pilot initiative in 2011-2012. Our involvement with SD-LEAP has equipped us with the capacity for continuous improvement. Our Superintendent Greg East and Elementary Principal Karyl Knudson are both recognized by the state as being transformational leaders. We enjoy the support of our school board and the community as we move forward with turnaround efforts. We have received training in MTSS and are committed to deliver reading and math interventions with fidelity as required by the state; however, our current resources are not enough to sustain our efforts to date. The SIG funds will enable us to move forward and better meet the instructional needs of our students.

Our Title I/School Improvement Coordinator, Jay Shillingstad, will provide oversight of the SIG's via weekly meetings with the school principals and intervention specialists as well as monthly SD-LEAP district and school level team meetings. These meetings will be used to track progress of interventions by reviewing current student data and using that data to drive instructional practices.

- b. **Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.** *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. Examples may include non-renewal of current principal, held data retreat, met with staff to plan for upcoming PD, held school board meeting to explain change, etc. Broadly address all of the schools the district has committed to serve. School level applications will contain specific actions and timelines the district will meet in implementing the interventions for each school.*

District level data retreats were held in 2012 and 2013. The following were identified as top priorities: strong leadership, a new principal and teacher evaluation system, implementation of reading and math interventions, and improvement of classroom instruction.

School board members attended the retreat in 2013 and learned about our efforts to implement transformation interventions. Our superintendent and/or other staff attend monthly Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Education Consortium meeting, participate in a weekly one hour long radio program about school events and transformation efforts. We also attend monthly Wakpala Tribal/District Council meetings to communicate our transformation efforts and school events. In all of our efforts, we have made the public aware about the forthcoming changes as they relate to teacher and principal effectiveness, especially in the evaluation process.

Another key element would be cooperative work done with Standing Rock Sioux Tribe via Health, Education, Welfare committee as it relates to school activities, attendance, curriculum, and accreditation. The school is also a partner in applying for several grants with the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe in the areas of mental health, wellness, law enforcement, and economic

development.

The elementary school started reading interventions in 2012-2-2013 and added math interventions in 2013-2014. The middle school started reading and math interventions in 2013-2014. Both schools are in need of additional staff to strengthen what has been started and therefore SIG funds will be used to hire intervention specialists at each school level. The only way we can deliver interventions more effectively and meet requirements of MTSS is to hire additional staff as our current resources are not enough.

- c. 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. (Is there a process for Requests for Proposals (RFPs)? Is there an MOU or contract in place to hold provider accountable? Are performance measures established? Will the provider be reviewed regularly?) Provide a detailed plan for this process in the future. Who will be involved in the selection procedure? What criteria have been set?*

Not applicable as we do not plan to use external providers.

- d. 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 21st Century Grants, MTSS, Math Counts, etc. Address resources in terms of funding, staffing, partnerships, and support.*

We plan to use other Title I funds to purchase intervention supplies and use existing staff to deliver interventions. General funds will be utilized to assist with supplies, books, copies, and other resources as necessary.

- e. **Modify its practices, procedures, 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. Examples may include governance structures, business processes, union and board agreements, hiring and staffing practices, flexibilities in budgeting, time/schedules, curriculum, assessments, etc. What barriers exist? Indicate the willingness of the district to modify procedures along the way if needed.*

To fully and more effectively implement interventions in both schools is dependent on hiring additional staff as recorded in the school level applications. We have already leveraged current staff to deliver interventions and have modified our schedules in both schools to accommodate time for interventions. On April 9, 2014 the school board approved the 2014-2015 school calendar increasing the number of contact days with students from 166 to 170.

- f. 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, building staff capacity, repurposing staff, re-evaluating partner agreements, and other resources that will be needed to sustain the reforms. Describe which activities will be sustained and which, if any, will be terminated.*

We may be able to repurpose staff at the end of the SIG funds. For example, we may be able to use other Title I monies to cover one K-8 full-time intervention specialist. We will also look for additional grant monies at the end of the SIG funds to sustain our reform efforts.

- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each priority and focus school identified in the LEA's application. *Highlight major events and benchmarks for all schools over the three year implementation time period. If asking for pre-implementation costs (for activities from award date to June 30, 2014. Examples include: Hold community meetings to review school performance; compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data; Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model), describe what the funds will cover. The timeline should be from the district perspective.*

Transformation interventions were put in place in 2012-2013 in the elementary school, and in 2013-2014 in the middle school. We will continue this intervention model in 2014-2015 and through the duration of our Priority status as well as during the term of the SIG grant if awarded.

The timeline below highlights major events and benchmarks:

- Principals attended SLO training in February/March 2014.
 - On April 9, 2014, the school board approved additional student contact days.
 - On April 9, 2014, the school board approved hiring a reading interventionist for MS/HS for 2014-2015.
 - One administrator to be certified as a Teachscape administrator in May 2014.
 - Teachscape training will take place for all K-12 teachers and administrators on May 20 and 21, 2014.
 - Attend training during summer 2014 for MTSS/PBIS training.
 - Attend summer training 2014 for data utilization.
 - During summer 2014, 80% of staff will attend SLO training for their area.
 - Starting in fall 2014 and continuing through spring 2016, the district will utilize the 7 days of PD assistance provided by the South Dakota Department of Education to address various needs of both teachers and administration.
 - During 2014-2015, evaluation processes for teacher and principal effectiveness will have initial stages of implementation including at least one principal and two teachers for this process.
 - By Fall 2015, teacher will complete Praxis relating to area of reading.
- (5) The LEA must review each priority and focus school that receives School Improvement Grant funds. *Describe how the LEA will monitor annual goals for student achievement, which may be documented in SD LEAP. (Each school must have a reading and math annual goal, which must be measurable and specify the indicator (district assessment for 2014-15, Smarter Balanced Assessment for 2015-16 and 2016-17) that will be used during each of the grant years.) Indicate how progress will be measured towards each of the requirements for the selected intervention model. If progress is not shown, describe the action steps the district may take.*

Annual reading and math goals for each school will be set in the Fall and recorded in SD-LEAP. Progress on goals will be measured 3 times during the year using AIMSweb and STAR Enterprise during 2014-2015. Smarter Balanced assessment results in 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 will be used to help establish goals and measure progress during those years.

If progress is not shown, re-purposing of staff, non-renewal of staff, schedule changes, and/or adjustments to intervention strategies will be done.

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

We will utilize local weekly radio program to discuss and disseminate information about the SIG application as well as its effectiveness year to year. A key part of the radio program relates to fact that listening audience can call in with questions or concerns during the live broadcast, thus having immediate feedback as it relates to caller's concerns. We will also discuss school improvement efforts quarterly at the local tribal district council meetings. Another key piece will include discussions with the tribal health, education, and welfare committee on at least an annual basis.

It is intended that parents/guardians will be notified via various mailings during the school year to inform them of progress. During parent-teacher conferences held twice per year, the Superintendent, Principals, and Title I/School Improvement Coordinator will meet with the public to discuss school improvement efforts. Staff will be updated via principal meetings and during in-service held throughout the year.

- (7) The LEA may apply for district-level funds to provide activities for all eligible priority and focus schools in their district receiving a SIG award. If the LEA has more than one priority and focus school eligible for funds, describe any district-level activities the LEA is applying for. (Ex. District has three eligible priority and focus schools that received SIG funds and will provide professional development to all three schools out of district-level funds rather than individual SIG school funds.) *Describe the district-level activity and the amount requested for each activity. Who at the district level is monitoring these activities?*

Not applicable.

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each priority and focus 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 priority and focus school it commits to serve; and
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s priority and focus schools.

Note: An LEA’s budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each priority and focus school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA’s three-year budget plan.

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of priority and focus schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 (not to exceed \$6,000,000 per school over three years).

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Priority School #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
Priority School #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
Focus School #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
Focus School #2	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
LEA-level Activities		250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
Total Budget	\$1,216,750	\$5,062,250	\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$17,880,500

Smee School District
Budget Information
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)

Budget Summary

Schools	Pre-implementation (Optional) Award Notification- 6/30/14	Project Year 1 7/1/14-6/30/15	**Project Year 2 7/1/15 - 6/30/16	**Project Year 3 7/1/16 - 6/30/17	Three-Year Total
Wakpala Elementary School		\$55,175	\$57,102	\$56,322	\$168,599
Wakpala Middle School		\$60,525	\$59,144	\$60,802	\$180,471
***District - Level Activities					
Total Costs					\$349,070

*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)
 ** Contingent upon renewed federal funding
 ***Only applicable for LEAs with more than one eligible priority and focus school applying for grant

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each priority and focus school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (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 priority and focus school, that it serves with school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a priority or focus 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;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select, and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and
- (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT
SCORING RUBRIC
LEA APPLICATIONS**

Reviewer: _____

District: _____

Submitted By: _____

School(s): _____

Questions within LEA SIG Application

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school for the purpose of the SIG application and selected an intervention for each school. (Must be at the district level.)

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong -3 points	Moderate-2 points	Limited-1 point	Not Evident-0 points
a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the committee including the members and positions.	Response included details of the committee including the members and positions.	Response was missing details of the committee such as the members and/or positions.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of a committee that conducted the needs assessment.
b. Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) designed for the purpose of the SIG application.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the data sources analyzed as part of the CNA.	Response included details of the data sources analyzed as part of the CNA.	Response was missing details of the data sources analyzed as part of the CNA.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence that data sources were analyzed as part of the CNA.
c. Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the district's CNA process.	Response included details of the district's CNA process.	Response was missing details of the district's CNA process.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the district's CNA process.
d. Broadly describe the results of the review. (Summarize the results of the CNA for each eligible SIG school that is applying.)		Response was thorough and included specific details of the district's CNA results, including a summarization of each school's results.	Response included details of the district's CNA results, including a summarization of each school's results.	Response was missing details of the district's CNA results or the school's summarization.	Response was unclear and lacked details of the district's CNA results and each school's summarization.
e. List the strengths and weaknesses for each eligible SIG school that is applying based on the results of the CNA.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the strengths and weaknesses for each eligible SIG school.	Response included details of the strengths and weaknesses for each eligible SIG school.	Response was missing details of the strengths and weaknesses for each eligible SIG school.	Response was unclear and lacked details of the strengths and weaknesses for each eligible SIG school.

Needs Analysis Comments:

Questions within LEA SIG Application

(3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken , or will take to---

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
a. Describe the LEA’s capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the LEA’s capacity to serve the identified SIG schools.	Response included details of the LEA’s capacity to serve the identified SIG schools.	Response was missing details of the LEA’s capacity to serve the identified SIG schools.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the LEA’s capacity to serve the identified SIG schools.
b. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the one of the four models.		Response was thorough and included specific details of what has taken place to date to design and implement a model in the eligible schools.	Response included details of what has taken place to date to design and implement a model in the eligible schools.	Response was missing details of what has taken place to date to design and implement a model in the eligible schools.	Response was unclear and lacked details of what has taken place to date to design and implement a model in the eligible schools.
c. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the LEA’s process to select external providers.	Response included details of the LEA’s process to select external providers.	Response was missing details of the LEA’s process to select external providers.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of a process to select external providers in the LEA.
d. Align other resources with the interventions.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the how other LEA resources are aligned to support interventions.	Response included details of the how other LEA resources are aligned to support interventions.	Response was missing details of the how other LEA resources are aligned to support interventions.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence that the LEA has aligned resources to support interventions.
e. Modify its practices, procedures, or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.		Response was thorough and included specific details of any policies, procedures, or practices that need modification.	Response included details of any policies, procedures, or practices that need modification.	Response was missing details of any policies, procedures, or practices that need modification.	Response was unclear and lacked details of any policies, procedures, or practices that need modification.

f. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.		Response was thorough and included specific details and evidence of how the LEA plans to sustain efforts after the grant ends.	Response included details and evidence of how the LEA plans to sustain efforts after the grant ends.	Response was missing details and evidence of how the LEA plans to sustain efforts after the grant ends.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the LEA plans to sustain efforts after the grant ends.
---	--	--	--	---	--

Actions Taken Comments:

Questions within LEA SIG Application					
Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each priority and focus school identified in the application.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the timeline needed to implement the chosen interventions in each school.	Response included details of the timeline needed to implement the chosen interventions in each school.	Response was missing details of the timeline needed to implement the chosen model in each school.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the timeline needed to implement the chosen interventions in each school.
Timeline Comments:					

Questions within LEA SIG Application					
Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(5) The LEA must review each Priority and Focus school that receives School Improvement Grant funds.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the LEA's process to review and monitor each eligible SIG school, including student achievement goals.	Response included details of the LEA's process to review and monitor each eligible SIG school, including student achievement goals.	Response was missing details of the LEA's process to review and monitor each eligible SIG school, including student achievement goals.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the LEA's process to review and monitor each eligible SIG school, including student achievement goals.
Priority and Focus School Review Comments:					

Questions within LEA SIG Application					
Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(6) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its priority and focus schools. (admin, staff, parents, community, school board)		Response was thorough and included specific details of the LEA’s consultation with relevant stakeholders.	Response included details of the LEA’s consultation with relevant stakeholders.	Response was missing details of the LEA’s consultation with relevant stakeholders.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the LEA’s consultation with relevant stakeholders.
Stakeholder Comments:					

Questions within LEA SIG Application					
Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(7) The LEA may apply for district-level funds to provide activities for all eligible priority and focus schools in their district receiving a SIG award. If the LEA has more than one priority and focus school eligible for funds, describe any district-level activities the LEA is applying for.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the district-level activities needed to implement the intervention models.	Response included details of the district-level activities needed to implement the intervention models.	Response was missing details of the district-level activities needed to implement the intervention models.	Response was unclear and lacked details of the district-level activities needed to implement the intervention models.
District-Level Comments:					

Questions within LEA SIG Application

Budget Narrative and Budget Table

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(8) A budget has been completed in the format requested in the application.		Budget was thorough with all columns completed correctly and included funds for all three years in the format requested for each school.	Budget was completed and included funds for all three years in the format requested for each school.	Budget was completed but was missing details and/or did not include funds for all three years in the format requested for each school.	Budget was not completed and/or did not include funds for all three years in the format requested for each school.
(9) The LEA has requested sufficient funds to fully implement interventions selected for each school, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.		Amount requested is appropriate and necessary to fully implement the chosen model within each school, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.	Amount requested is satisfactory to fully implement the chosen model within each school, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.	Amount requested is inadequate and or unreasonable to fully implement the chosen model within each school, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.	Amount requested does not justify evidence to fully implement the chosen model within each school, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.

Budget Narrative Comments:

Questions within LEA SIG Application

Approvals

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Not Evident-0 points
(10) LEA Superintendent and Authorized Representative have signed off on the proposal.		Signatures are present	Signatures are missing

Overall Application Comments:

Total Score: _____ **out of possible 54 points.** *A value in the **Limited or Not Evident** column will require a revision before the grant can be awarded. Applications will be ranked according to percent of possible points.*

Decision: **Award grant** **Award grant with revisions** **Do Not Award Grant**