

School Improvement Grants

School Level Section

Tiers I, II, and III

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

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

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

Dr. Pam Homan, Superintendent
 Dr. Fred Aderhold, Assistant Superintendent
 Ann Smith, Federal Programs Coordinator
 Rich Meier, Elementary Curriculum Coordinator
 Sue McAdaragh, District Math Leader
 Nancy Duncan, Garfield Principal
 Philip Korfe, Garfield Assistant Principal
 Virginia DeBoer, Parent
 Amy Stene, Parent
 Priscilla Rasmussen, Parent
 Erin Larson, Teacher
 Carol Daly, Teacher
 Kathy Holter, Teacher
 Tina Lamoureaux, Teacher
 Stephanie Muchow, Teacher
 Laura Slama, Math Instructional Coach
 Sheri Schneider, Teacher
 Sue Quail, Teacher

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

Student: progress toward quarterly benchmark goals established Garfield’s School Improvement Plan; performance of District end of year math and reading assessments, Dakota STEP tests.
 Teacher and Program: Review of 2009-11 School Improvement Plan; Audit results from Audit conducted Feb 22-24, 2010.

Community and Parent: Audit results from audit conducted Feb 22-24, 2010.

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

Our school completed a comprehensive School Improvement Audit on Feb 22-24, 2010. To prepare for the School Improvement Audit our teachers worked together at a staff meeting on February 17 to discuss our school, its strengths and areas needed for improvement. We discussed what we are doing well within our school and what areas we still need to focus on.

Garfield's Math Instructional Coach and principal met 4 times between February 8 and March 22 to discuss her work with teachers and what her work in classrooms suggests teachers need next to continue to build capacity to support students who are struggling in math. On March 11 and 16, all of the district's elementary principals, including Garfield's principal and assistant principal, met with Christina Miller, Math Instructional Coach at Lowell MST Elementary School and a certified Add+Vantage Math Recovery trainer.

Classroom teachers examined 3rd quarter benchmark data to determine ongoing needs.

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

Garfield is on Level 3 improvement for Math and Alert for Reading. The Audit findings indicated a need to continue working to develop more common formative assessments and place a greater focus on using student assessment results in continuous unit/lesson planning. In 2008-09, Garfield Elementary made AYP in all cells that were populated in the previous school year but did not make AYP in one cell in reading (Native American) and one cell in Math (Native American). Garfield Elementary was moved on Improvement Level 3 for 2009-10 school year in math and on alert in reading. Garfield has a high mobility rate with students moving between schools multiple times within a school year, which results in gaps in their learning that impacts their progress. Students lose valuable skills over the summer because their parents are not helping them maintain academic skills.

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

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

Strengths identified through the comprehensive needs assessment:

1. Clear vision and mission
2. Professional development in scientifically research-based strategies*
3. Professional development through coaching*

4. Scientifically-based instructional strategies
5. Safe and drug-free learning environment

Weaknesses identified through the comprehensive needs assessment:

1. Unit/lesson planning based on student results*
2. Support for at-risk students*
3. Lack of formative assessments to support Cognitively Guided Instruction in math*
4. High student mobility*
5. Limited parent involvement to help student maintain skills through summer months*

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

Garfield is at Level 3 school improvement for math. Title I formula funds are inadequate to address this school's needs.

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

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

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

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

The District has a strong Special Education department that provides ongoing support and training for Special Education teachers and participates in curriculum development to ensure that all students receive appropriate instruction.

The District partners with the University of South Dakota, South Dakota State University, Dakota State University, Augustana College and the University of Sioux Falls for professional development, including offering graduate credit to teachers at a reduced rate.

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

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

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

Not applicable

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

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

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

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

Garfield will continue the **1.0 FTE Instructional Coach** implemented with 1003(g) funds in January 2009. This coach will provide modeling and support for teachers to involve students in math projects that require 21st Century skills. The Math Instructional Coach will help teachers use assessment data to guide instruction, which will help more students become proficient in math.

Garfield will hire a **.5 FTE Math Teacher** to work with small groups of students in the area of math and provide support to the other teachers in the building as they implement strategies for math intervention.

2) Increased learning time for students

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

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

Our school completed a comprehensive School Improvement Audit on Feb 22-24, 2010. The Leadership Team and Grade Level representatives met on March 25 to discuss priorities for funding through the School Improvement Grant. All Tier III Title I principals met with Rich Meier, Sue McAdaragh, and Math Recovery Leader Christina Miller on March 22 to discuss professional development needs. Dr. Homan and Dr. Aderhold reviewed School Improvement Grant proposals on April 6.

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

Grant Periods:



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

Personnel:

Instructional Coach	\$41,540 @ 1.0 FTE	=	\$41,540
Math Teacher	\$41,540 @ .5 FTE	=	\$20,770
Summer School Teachers	(5 teachers X 68 hours @ 26.29)	=	\$ 8,939
Summer School Administrator	(25 hours @ \$50)	=	\$ 1,250

Benefits

Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare			
Instructional Coach	\$41,540 x 30%	=	\$ 12,462
Math Teacher	\$20,770 X 30%	=	\$ 6,231
Social Security, Medicare			
Summer School Teachers	\$8,939 X 13.65%	=	\$ 1,220
Summer School Administrator	\$1,250 X 13.65%	=	\$ 171

Travel

Summer School Transportation	\$ 1,200
------------------------------	----------

Supplies

Summer School Supplies	\$ 5,100
------------------------	----------

Professional Development

Teacher Hourly (collaboration)	248 hours @ \$19.59	=	\$ 4,858
Benefits (Social Security, Medicare)	\$4,858 X 13.65%	=	\$ 663
Substitutes	5 days @ \$90	=	\$ 450
Benefits (Social Security, Medicare)	\$450 X 13.65%	=	\$ 61

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

Personnel:

Instructional Coach	\$42,786 @1.0 FTE	=	\$42,786
Math Teacher	\$42,786 @ .5 FTE	=	\$21,393
Summer School Teachers	(5 teachers X 68 hours @ 26.55)	=	\$ 9,027
Summer School Administrator	(25 hours @ \$51.50)	=	\$ 1,288

Benefits

Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare			
Instructional Coach	\$42,786 x 30%	=	\$ 12,836
Math Teacher	\$21,393 X 30%	=	\$ 6,418
Social Security, Medicare			
Summer School Teachers	\$ 9,027 X 13.65%	=	\$ 1,232
Summer School Administrator	\$1,288 X 13.65%	=	\$ 176

Travel

Summer School Transportation	\$ 1,236
------------------------------	----------

Supplies

Summer School Supplies \$ 5,100

Professional Development

Teacher Hourly (collaboration) 18 hours @ \$19.79 = \$ 356
Benefits (Social Security, Medicare) \$ 356 X 13.65% = \$ 49
Substitutes (5 days @ \$90) = \$ 450
Benefits (Social Security, Medicare) \$ 450 X 13.65%= \$ 61

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

Personnel:

Instructional Coach \$44,070 @ 1.0 FTE = \$44,070
Math Teacher \$44,070 @ .5 FTE = \$22,035
Summer School Teachers (5 teachers X 68 hours @ 26.81) = \$ 9,115
Summer School Administrator (25 hours @ \$53) = \$ 1,325

Benefits

Insurance, Retirement, Social Security, Medicare
Instructional Coach \$44,070 x 30% = \$ 13,221
Math Teacher \$22,035 X 30% = \$ 6,611
Social Security, Medicare
Summer School Teachers \$ 9,115 X 13.65% = \$ 1,244
Summer School Administrator \$1,325 X 13.65% = \$ 181

Travel

Summer School Transportation \$ 1,273

Supplies

Summer School Supplies \$ 5,100

Professional Development

Teacher Hourly (collaboration) 18 hours @ \$19.99 = \$ 360
Benefits (Social Security, Medicare) \$ 360 X 13.65% = \$ 49
Substitutes 5 days @ \$90 = \$ 450
Benefits (Social Security, Medicare) \$ 450 X 13.65% = \$ 61

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

Name of School: Garfield Elementary

Budget Summary

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

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