



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

te
011

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

FY 2010
School Improvement Grant (SIG)
Cover page

Legal Name of Applicant: Rapid City Area Schools 51-4	Applicant's Mailing Address: 300 Sixth Street Rapid City, SD 57701
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Lisa Plumb Position and Office: Director of Federal Programs, Grants and Assessment Contact's Mailing Address: 300 Sixth Street Rapid City, SD 57701	Telephone: (605) 394-6892 Fax: (605) 394-2271 Email address: lisa.plumb@k12.sd.us
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name): Dr. Timothy Mitchell	Telephone: (605) 394-4031
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:
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): **Dr. Timothy Mitchell**

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
North MS				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.*

A district team from RCAS as LEA has analyzed the needs of North Middle School (NMS) during a comprehensive needs assessment which was conducted on April 12, 2011. The members of the district committee are as follows:

Valerie Nefzger, Principal of North Middle School
Dr. Timothy Mitchell, Superintendent
Katie Bray, Assistant Superintendent
Troy Volesky, Director of Special Education and Student Related Services
Jr. Bettelyoun, Director of Indian Education
Lisa Plumb, Director of Federal Programs, Grants and Assessment

The district committee further reviewed information provided by the school committee which included:

Valerie Nefzger – Building Principal
Audra Nesland – Building Leadership Team Member and Title I Reading Teacher
Travis Miller – Building Leadership Team Member and Science Teacher
Danielle Harding – Building Leadership Team Member and Special Education Teacher
Connie Krueger – Building Leadership Team Member and Instructional Coach
Kathy Walker – Building Leadership Team Member and Writing Teacher
Anna Ball – Building Leadership Team Member and Art Teacher
Annie Melendez – Building Leadership Team Member and Math Teacher

Additional consultation on data results and determining proposed interventions included information from the following:

Sharon Rendon – RCAS Secondary Math Leader
Deann Kertzman – RCAS Elementary Math Leader
Ann Hengen – RCAS Secondary Literacy Leader
Lisa Plumb – Director, Federal Programs and Grants
Susie Roth – Director, Staff Development
Deb Warr - Knollwood Elementary Principal
Cary Minnick – General Beadle Principal
Danny Janklow – Horace Mann Principal
Chris Martian – Technology Program Specialist

- 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 CCSSO, the results must be included in the data analysis.*

During the district’s comprehensive needs assessment, data from North Middle School’s Dakota Standardized Test of Educational Progress (DSTEP) results were reviewed in the context of Adequate Yearly Progress. In addition, the School Improvement Audit Tool that was completed during the School Improvement Audit of North Middle School in December of 2007 was reviewed, as well as the District Improvement Audit Tool that was completed during the District Improvement Audit of Rapid City Area Schools in January of 2011 was reviewed.

The district committee also reviewed the extensive data analysis completed at the building level which included:

- DSTEP Data from prior five years
 - District Level Assessment Data to include Gates, CBM's, DACs results
 - Standards Based Report Card Data from Northside Elementary Schools
 - Common Formative Assessments specific to North Middle Schools Reading and Math Goals
 - Professional Practices, Programs and Structures were analyzed through survey information and evaluation reports completed under guidance from RCAS
 - Family and Community Data
 - PIRC Survey Data
 - District Review of prior Audit Results (2007)
- 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 process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment for North Middle School for the purpose of the SIG application was as follows:

When: Tuesday, April 12, 2011

**Who: Valerie Nefzger, Principal of North Middle School
Dr. Timothy Mitchell, Superintendent
Katie Bray, Assistant Superintendent
Troy Volesky, Director of Special Education and Student Related Services
Jr. Bettelyoun, Director of Indian Education
Lisa Plumb, Director of Federal Programs, Grants and Assessment**

The district committee also reviewed information provided by the school committee which included:

**Valerie Nefzger – Building Principal
Audra Nesland – Building Leadership Team Member and Title I Reading Teacher
Travis Miller – Building Leadership Team Member and Science Teacher
Danielle Harding – Building Leadership Team Member and Special Education Teacher
Connie Krueger – Building Leadership Team Member and Instructional Coach
Kathy Walker – Building Leadership Team Member and Writing Teacher
Anna Ball – Building Leadership Team Member and Art Teacher
Annie Melendez – Building Leadership Team Member and Math Teacher**

The district committee reviewed additional information provided through consultation on data results and determining proposed interventions from the following:

Sharon Rendon – RCAS Secondary Math Leader
Deann Kertzman – RCAS Elementary Math Leader
Ann Hengen – RCAS Secondary Literacy Leader
Lisa Plumb – Director, Federal Programs and Grants
Susie Roth – Director, Staff Development
Deb Warr - Knollwood Elementary Principal
Cary Minnick – General Beadle Principal
Danny Janklow – Horace Mann Principal
Chris Martian – Technology Program Specialist

How: The district’s comprehensive needs assessment of North Middle School aligned with the following agenda:

- Building representative provided an overview of the building analysis including data, needs and interventions for NMS
 - District Team reviewed additional data for NMS
 - District Team identified strengths and areas of need for NMS
 - District Team identified needs and interventions for NMS
 - District Team identified services NMS will receive from the district
 - District Team identified goals, objectives and strategies for NMS
 - District Team reviewed components of SIG application and determined request for SIG funding
- 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.*

Overall Results of Review

North Middle School has 85% of their students participating in the free and reduced lunch program. In addition, NMS has a high level of transiency and inconsistent student attendance, as well as sporadic parent involvement and engagement. NMS has responded with strong leadership, intense professional development for staff, high level of implementation of quality instructional practices and interventions as in the Response to Intervention model. As a result, an increasing number of students are reaching proficiency in reading and math, yet there are still achievement gaps.

Data Review for Math:

- **Dakota STEP Data:**
- The Building Leadership team reviewed five years of D-Step math scores and observed that an average of 59% of students scored Below Basic or Basic as measured by the D-Step.

- **DACS:**
 - The Building Leadership Team did a three year review of DACS scores in math and discovered an average of 73% low average and below average students as defined by DACS.

- **Formative Assessment Statistics:**
 - The Building Leadership Team reviewed the formative assessment conducted by the 6th, 7th, 8th grade teachers and found the following results:
 - 8th grade: The pretest average of 70% or better was achieved by 3.5% of the 8th grade students. The posttest average of 70% or better was achieved by 52% of the 8th grade students.
 - 7th grade: The pretest average of 70% or better was achieved by 15% of the 7th grade students. The posttest average of 70% or better was achieved by 44% of the 7th students.
 - 6th grade: The pretest average of 70% or better was achieved by 35% the 6th grade students. The posttest average of 70% or better was achieved by 61% the 6th grade students.

Transitioning Student Data - Looking at 5th grade students

- In reviewing a four year timeline for our feeder schools' fifth grade standard-based report cards for math, the Building Leadership team found an average, ranging from 23% to 38% of students not reaching proficiency on the five number sense skills.

Data Review for Reading:

- **Dakota STEP Data:**
 - The Building Leadership Team reviewed five years of D-Step reading scores and observed that an average of 46.2% of the students scored Below Basic or Basic as measured by the D-Step.

- **CBM (Curriculum Based Measurement)**
 - Over a three year period, North Middle averaged a Basic score on the CBM testing of reading fluency.

- **GMRT (Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test):**
 - Over a three year period, at no time did the average 6th, 7th, or 8th grade reading score reach beyond Basic on GMRT tests.

- **Formative Assessment:**
 - Reading teachers on the 6th, 7th, 8th grade levels created formative assessments for Indicator Five of the state Reading Standards (Students can access, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate informational texts*). A pretest and posttest revealed growth, but indicated that students were still not proficient on this indicator.

Data Review Family and Community Data:

- Parents indicated that the front office staff is frequently helpful and friendly (88.9%). 96% of the parents felt welcome at the school. 94.6% of the parents felt their child is “treated with respect and taught to behave respectfully and responsibly.”
- In a parent survey given to parents in the fall of 2010, 18.9% of the respondents reported that students were not well-prepared for the next grade level.
- In the same survey given to teachers in the fall of 2010, 35.7% of the respondents reported that students were not well-prepared for the next grade level.
- In the survey, parents indicated that communication could be stronger. 44.3% picked “Sometimes” for the statement: “You are provided with specific information about what your child is learning in various subjects.”

Data Review Professional Practices/Programs and Structures:

- Professional Practices
 - North maintains a commitment to Inquiry Based math instruction. We have adopted a research based curriculum in all grade levels (Connected Math 2) The district is committed to the continued support and implementation of the inquiry initiative and to assisting and supporting all math teachers in the implementation of inquiry math.
 - Project PRIME (Promoting Reflective Inquiry in Mathematics Education), focused on improving the professional capacity of all mathematics teachers through 100 hours of training for district math teachers, including all of NMS .
 - In the summer of 2010, all North Middle School math and special education teachers were given a number of professional development options. Furthermore, middle school teachers have had five training sessions throughout the 2010-2011 school year. The professional development opportunities are focused on the implementation of the Connected Math 2 materials. North maintains a commitment to a balanced literacy approach and the workshop model in all content areas.
 - North actively participates in the Secondary Learning Lab initiative of RCAS, whose purpose is to observe student learning and instruction in the areas of balanced literacy, inquiry-based mathematics, and content driven technology integration in order to apply the observed practices to one’s own classroom. The outcome is to implement a particular set of practices in classrooms across the district, as well as to increase collaboration, dialogue, and reflection among teachers.
 - Reading instruction is provided for all students at North Middle School through use of Title I funds.
 - Support for staff through literacy and math coaches to includes coaching cycles, Study Groups, learning labs and other opportunities for professional growth.
 - Implemented Write to Learn Assessment with all 7th grade students and related staff received training.

- 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.*

The strengths of NMS include strong leadership, intense professional development for staff, high level of implementation of quality instructional practices and interventions as in the Response to Intervention (RtI) model. As a result, an increasing number of students are reaching proficiency in reading and math. Concerns include North Middle School having 85% of their students participating in the free and reduced lunch program. In addition, NMS has a high level of transiency and inconsistent student attendance, as well as sporadic parent involvement and engagement. Despite progress, there are existing student achievement gaps.

Specific Strengths:

- Through the implementation of Learning Labs teachers are being trained to collect and analyze data on student learning.
- Staff has routinely collaborated in study groups, data groups and professional development opportunities. Professional Development at North Middle School is a strength.
- 2010 results showed North making AYP in Reading and Math for our Native American, Economically Disadvantaged, and All categories. This is the first year North has showed such significant growth. AYP data included under rationale in next section
- Our most formative data proves the ability of teachers and students to improve achievement through targeted instruction at specific goal areas (Reading and Math data)

Specific Weaknesses:

- DSTEP scores over time for North have shown failure to make AYP in most categories
- Deficiencies in Number Sense and foundational math skills for a significant portion of all grade levels with inadequate growth to 'catch up' and close the gap
- Inadequate growth in Reading to 'catch up' and close the gap.
- Current structure of day and limited additional resources don't allow for broad opportunities to provide instructional interventions in key areas (math number sense for example)
- Current staffing doesn't allow for building wide training in implementing non-fiction writing and reading in all content areas (as a high leverage strategy and as preparation for Common Core Adoption)

Prioritized Needs:

- Additional math instruction time
- Training in AVMR as a diagnostic tool for students experiencing difficulty in mathematics
- Math resources for Targeted Math Class (Do the Math)
- Additional licenses of Write To Learn (all grade levels)
- Professional Development in implementing Common Core Standards (specifically the use of informational writing in all content areas)

- 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 rationale the district used to determine which schools would be served with SIG funds was to include all schools eligible for SIG funds. RCAS has five schools in Tier III. Four applied and received SIG funds last year, and NMS is eligible this year.

- (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.*

NMS is a Tier III school.

- 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.*

NMS is a Tier III school.

- (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.*

NMS is a Tier III school.

(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.*

RCAS is committed to serving the needs of each school in the district. Regarding interventions throughout the school year for NMS, extensive professional development opportunities in literacy, math and RtI have been provided by the Offices of Staff Development and Special Education, an additional .5 FTE administrator has been funded by the district for NMS, and 2.0 FTE's (one certified and one para-professional) are provided with district funds through the Office of Indian Education to address the academic and cultural needs of students. In addition, ongoing technology support is provided by the Office of Information Technology as NMS has continued to integrate technology in the classroom. NMS has been identified as a Title I school. As such, NMS receives funding and support through the Office of Federal Programs, Grants and Assessment.

Future district action and support for the 2011-2012 school year will be provided to NMS in the areas of developing common formative assessments and implementing the Common Core Standards.

- b. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. *Indicate the process used up to this point for selection of external providers. Provide a detailed plan for this process in the future. Who will be involved in the selection procedure? What criteria have been set?*

NMS is considering contracting out to external providers and input will be provided based upon research based practices and recommendations by our Office of Staff Development. RCAS is prepared to develop a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to select external providers.

- c. Align other resources with the interventions. *Describe other resources available to the district that will be leveraged to assist with interventions under SIG. Include participation in SDI+, RtI, Math Counts, Reading Up, etc. Address resources in terms of funding, staffing, partnerships, and support.*

RCAS will provide the following resources which will be leveraged to assist NMS with the interventions described under SIG.

Staffing: The district has a Director of Staff Development, Director of Special Education, Director of Indian Education and Director of Federal Programs, Grants and Assessment, a secondary literacy coordinator, secondary math coordinator, technology coordinators, literacy and math teacher leaders, intervention strategists and standard support specialists who will all work with NMS to successfully implement the chosen interventions.

Funding: District funding that will assist the schools in successfully implementing the chosen interventions includes existing general fund support as well as Title I Part A, Title IIA and Title IID support.

Support: District support that will assist the schools in successfully implementing the chosen interventions include transportation, technology and business support.

Partnerships: District partnerships that will assist NMS in successfully implementing the chosen interventions include partnerships with Black Hills Special Services Cooperative, Parent Information Resource Network, Technology and Innovation in Education, and the Center for the Advancement of Mathematics and Science Education (CAMSE).

- d. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. *Describe policies and practices that will need to be changed in order to fully implement the selected interventions. What barriers exist? Indicate the willingness of the district to modify procedures along the way if needed.*

Based upon the Title I Tier III school applications from NMS in RCAS, no policies and practices will need to be changed to fully implement the selected interventions.

- e. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. *Describe how the district will continue the reform efforts once the SIG funds no longer exist. Address funding, staffing, and other resources that will be needed to sustain the reforms.*

Based upon the Title I Tier III school applications from the four elementary schools in RCAS, the district will sustain the reform efforts with the following resources:

Staffing: The district has a Director of Staff Development, Director of Special Education, Director of Indian Education and Director of Federal Programs, Grants and Assessment, a secondary literacy coordinator, secondary math coordinator, and technology coordinators who will work with NMS to successfully implement the chosen interventions.

Funding: District funding that will assist the schools in successfully implementing the chosen interventions within the fiscal means available include existing general fund support as well as Title I Part A, Title IIA and Title IID support.

Support: District support that will assist the schools in successfully implementing the chosen interventions within the fiscal means available include transportation, technology and business support.

Partnerships: District partnerships that will assist the schools in successfully implementing the chosen interventions include partnerships with Black Hills Special Services Cooperative, Parent Information Resource Network, Technology and Innovation in Education, and the Center for the Advancement of Mathematics and Science Education (CAMSE).

In addition, NMS will gather data on effectiveness of reform efforts and will review this data during their annual comprehensive needs assessment process to determine priorities, and how successful programs will be sustained with Title I or other grant funds.

- (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.*

NMS is a Tier III school.

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

NMS is a Tier III school.

- (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.*

To support NMS at Tier III, RCAS will provide following services:

Staffing: The district has a Director of Staff Development, Director of Special Education, Director of Indian Education and Director of Federal Programs, Grants and Assessment, a secondary literacy coordinator, secondary math coordinator, and technology coordinators who will work with NMS to successfully implement the chosen interventions.

Funding: District funding that will assist the schools in successfully implementing the chosen interventions within the fiscal means available include existing general fund support as well as Title I Part A, Title IIA and Title IID support.

Support: District support that will assist the schools in successfully implementing the chosen interventions within the fiscal means available include transportation, technology and business support.

In the area of math, NMS will be implementing a daily extended learning opportunity for students in need of support. In the area of literacy, NMS will be increasing the use of the WriteToLearn formative writing assessment to all students, grades 6-8, as well as increasing student use of non-fiction text in reading and writing activities.

Detailed description of activities:

Math Teacher for Instruction of At-Risk Students:

Purpose

The Math Teacher position is designed to provide extra instructional assistance to students who have not yet reached proficiency in mathematics, specifically in Number Sense . The program goal is to provide the extra support needed to succeed in mastery of the content of our regular math program.

The SIG funds will be used to improve academic achievement in Math by providing for additional instruction specific to student needs through a second block math class for identified students in sixth through eighth grade.

Program

Targeted students will receive an additional 45 minutes of instruction per day in mathematics, specifically in Number Sense. *Do The Math* is the primary curriculum for this course and is in alignment with our inquiry based mathematics program. Class size will be limited to fifteen students with the support of an instructional assistant to allowing for small group work, a necessary component. The small group size allows the teacher to target the needs of the group and provide optimal support.

Targeted Students

The students that will participate in the program are chosen through a rigorous assessment process to include:

- * Proficiency in number sense
- * Performance on DACS
- *Performance on Scholastic Math Inventory
- * Proficiency on D-STEP
- *Unit pretest and posttest data

After analyzing assessment data by proficiency level, the list of potential students for the math program will be reviewed for teacher input.

Math Tutoring Curriculum

The curriculum is designed to incorporate both the Rapid City Area School Standards and the State of South Dakota Content Standards. The instruction is differentiated based on student needs. The curriculum materials will be based around *Do The Math*, a supplemental program

currently adopted for special education students. We choose to use this curriculum to provide a consistent continuum of support for students who may be participating in the Rtl process.

Targeted Objectives

- * Provide second math class for identified students as an instructional intervention for students not mastering the number sense standards for their grade level.
- * *Add+Vantage MR Training* for all teachers of mathematics at North Middle School over grant period
- * Provide Staff release time/compensation for data retreats for examining data and setting goals

Preparation for Integration of Common Core Standards – Non-Fiction Writing across content areas:

Purpose

SIG funds will also be used to hire an outside consultant to help with implementation strategies around the Common Core Standards, specifically the emphasis on informational text. Based on College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing emphasize the shared responsibility for students' literacy development in all content areas. In addition, materials and resources will be purchased to support this work (*Write to Learn* Licenses for all students; additional non-fiction text for all content areas).

Program

The program will increase the amount of certified staff support to increase nonfiction reading and writing in all content areas, a high leverage instructional strategy. The Common Core Implementation Guide and NAEP point directly to a “special emphasis on informational text” and a shared responsibility within the school to promote instruction in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language. Through working with a consultant and using current structures we believe we can assist staff in preparing for the implementation of Common Core by providing development specific to the Common Cores heavy emphasis on non-fiction writing.

In addition, access to the State's writing assessment *Write to Learn* for all students in all three grade levels will provide further opportunity for writing in content areas that receives timely and specific feedback relevant to the students' needs in writing in the content areas.

Targeted Staff/Targeted Students

All staff and students at North middle school will receive the additional training and material resources.

Targeted Objectives

- * Provide training for content teachers on incorporating non-fiction writing across contents as both a high leverage instructional strategy and a preparatory step for adoption of Common Core Standards
- * Provide *Write to Learn* licenses for all students grades 6-8 at North Middle School

- *Provide staff release time/compensation for Write to Learn training utilizing RCAS trainers.
- *Purchase additional non-fiction resources across content areas

(8) (Tier III) 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.*

2010-2011Math: 79% of all students will score at or above a proficient level in math as measured by the Dakota Step Test in the spring of 2010. (AMO)

Specific core standards to address or improve include:

6.S.2.1.	(Knowledge) Find the probability of a simple event.
7.S.2.1.	(Comprehension) Given a sample space, find the probability of a specific outcome.
8.S.2.1.	(Comprehension) Find the sample space and compute probability for two simultaneous independent events.

Reading: 76% of all students will score at or above a proficient level in reading as measured by the Dakota Step Test in the spring of 2010. (AMO)

Specific core standards to address or improve include:

Reading – Indicator 5 – Students can access, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate informational texts.	
Standard 6.R.5.1	Students can compare and contrast information on one topic from multiple informational texts.
Standard 6.R.5.2	Students can evaluate the credibility of informational texts.
Standard 6.R.5.3	Students can utilize sources to locate information
Standard	Students can determine which reference sources will provide the best information for

7.R.5.1	the assigned task.
Standard 7.R.5.2	Students can analyze and organize data from informational text.
Standard 7.R.5.3	Students can evaluate the accuracy and credibility of information about a topic contained in multiple sources.
Standard 7.5.R.4	Students can analyze the author's purpose in text.
Standard 8.R.5.1	Students can evaluate information and author's purpose about a topic gathered from informational text.
Standard 8.R.5.2	Students can recognize expository, persuasive, and procedural text.
Standard 8.R.5.3	Students can combine new information with existing knowledge to enhance understanding.

(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.*

NMS is a Tier III School.

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.**

Personnel: Salaries; paid to certificated individuals (i.e., certified teachers); staff that are not certificated (i.e., paraprofessionals, secretaries, teachers' aides, bus drivers).

Examples: Teacher: \$40,000 @ .5 FTE = \$20,000
Paraprofessional: \$15,000 @ 1 FTE = \$15,000

Employee Benefits: Payments made on behalf of employees that are not part of gross salary (i.e., insurance, Social Security, retirement, unemployment compensation, workers compensation, annual leave, sick leave).

Examples: \$20,000 X 7.65% (Social Security-Medicare) = \$1,530
\$15,000 X 7.65% (Social Security-Medicare) = \$3,000

Travel: Expenditures for staff travel, including mileage, airline tickets, taxi fare, meals, lodging, student transportation.

Examples: 3 trips X 400 miles X .37= \$4,440
Bus - 5 days per week X \$20 per day X 20 weeks = \$2,000

Equipment: Equipment should include tangible, nonexpendable personal property that has a useful life of more than one year. This should include all electronic equipment such as laptop and desktop computers. The grantee will be expected to maintain an equipment inventory list.

Examples: Desktop computers @ \$1200 = \$3600
Laptop computer -1 @ \$900 = \$900

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

Examples: Reading books - \$300
Software for Math assistance program - \$175

Contractual: (Purchased Services) Personal services rendered by personnel who are not employees of Local Education Agency (LEA), and other services the LEA may purchase; workshop & conference fees, tuition, contracted services, consultants, scoring services, rent, travel, etc.

Example: Company A – Provide professional development workshop - \$1,200

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

Example: Professional development conference – New York

Airfare - \$550
Registration - \$250
Meals – 3 days @ \$36 per day = \$108
Lodging – 2 days @ \$175 = \$350
Miscellaneous – Cab - \$50

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

Include a budget description for each year of the proposed 3 year project. Provide details linking expenditures to requirements of the intervention selected for Tiers I and II. Indicate expenses related to strategies to be used in Tier III schools.

Grant Periods:

Project Year 1: July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012
Project Year 2: July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013
Project Year 3: July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014

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.

Budget categories for consideration in required budget narrative.

Personnel: Salaries; paid to certificated individuals (i.e., certified teachers); staff that are not certificated (i.e., paraprofessionals, secretaries, teachers’ aides, bus drivers).

1.0 FTE Math Teacher for at Risk Students	\$39,000
1.0 FTE Math Instructional Assistant for at Risk Students	\$14,500
Data Retreats (up to 8 teachers @ \$20 per hour)	\$4,000
Substitute Pay (for AVMR and data retreats at \$90 per day)	<u>\$3,600</u>
	\$61,100
	Three Year Total (\$183,300.00)

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).

2.0 FTE (53,500 x 0.0765 Social Security-Medicare)	\$4,092.75
2.0 FTE (53,500 x 0.06 Retirement)	\$3,210.00
2.0 FTE (53,500 x 0.0054 Workman's Comp)	\$288.90
2.0 FTE (3,977 x 2 Insurance)	\$7,954.00
AVMR & Data (7,600 x .0765 Social Security - Medicare)	<u>\$581.40</u>
	\$16,127.05
	(Three Year Total \$48,381.15)

Travel: Expenditures for staff travel, including mileage, airline tickets, taxi fare, meals, lodging, student transportation.

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.

10 classrooms computers @ \$950 per	\$9,500
Printer	\$600

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

Do the Math (Start up and two years replacement materials for students)	\$15,000
Math Supplies (manipulatives, calculators, print over three years)	\$17,000
Connected Math 2 (Teacher Additions and CD-Roms)	\$3,500
Write To Learn Licenses (at \$10 per student per year cost x 3 years)	\$12,000
Non-Fiction Materials (High Interest Content Area Text over three years)	<u>\$50,000</u>
	\$97,500

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.

RFP for Common Core Implementation Support – (5,000 per day/5 days per year)	\$75,000
Non Fiction Writing and Reading Emphasis over three years	

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

Advantage Math Training (8 teachers total over 3 years)	\$11,200
Conferences, Workshops, Trainings (5,000 per year)	\$15,000
	<u>\$26,200</u>

Indirect Costs: Grantees must have an approved restricted indirect cost rate before indirect cost may be charged to this program. (3 year total)

\$10,200

Include a budget description for each year of the proposed 3 year project. Provide details linking expenditures to requirements of the intervention selected for Tiers I and II. Indicate expenses related to strategies to be used in Tier III schools.

Grant Periods:

Project Year 1:	July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012
Project Year 2:	July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013
Project Year 3:	July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014

	<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Year 2</u>	<u>Year 3</u>
<u>Personnel:</u>	\$61,100	\$61,100	\$61,100
<u>Employee Benefits:</u>	\$16,127.05	\$16,127.05	\$16,127.05
<u>Travel:</u>	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Equipment:</u>	\$10,100	\$0	\$0
<u>Supplies:</u>	\$32,500	\$32,500	\$32,500
<u>Contractual:</u>	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
<u>Professional Development:</u>	\$7,800	\$9,200	\$9,200
<u>Indirect Costs:</u>	\$3378	\$3411	\$3411

(Rapid City Area Schools 51-4) 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			
NORTH MIDDLE SCHOOL TIER III					
Employee Salaries		61,100.00	61,100.00	61,100.00	183,300.00
Employee Benefits		16,127.05	16,127.05	16,127.05	48,381.15
Equipment		10,100.00	0	0	10,100.00
Supplies		32,500.00	32,500.00	32,500.00	97,500.00
Contractual		25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	75,000.00
Professional Development		7,800.00	9,200.00	9,200.00	26,200.00
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS		152,627.05	143,927.05	143,927.05	440,481.15
Indirect Costs		3,378	3,411	3,411	10,200
TOTAL COSTS		156,005.05	147,338.05	147,338.05	450,681.15

*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.

