



south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Learning. Leadership. Service.

School Improvement Grants LEA (District) Application

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

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A



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

Due Date

2 May 2011

South Dakota Department of Education

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

Grant Period Ends

June 30, 2014

FY 2010

School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Cover page

Legal Name of Applicant: Wagner Community School	Applicant's Mailing Address: 101 Walnut Ave SW, Wagner, SD 57380
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Lori Bouza Position and Office: Fed Programs Coordinator Contact's Mailing Address: 101 Walnut Ave SW, Wagner, SD 57380	Telephone: 605.384.4354 Fax: 605.384.3888 Email address: Lori.Bouza@k12.sd.us
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name): Susan Smit , Superintendent	Telephone: 605.384.3677
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): ___Susan Smit, Superintendent_____

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
Wagner Elementary School				xx				
Wagner Middle School				xx				
Wagner Primary School				xx				

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.*

Stakeholder group	Name	Position
Parents	Richie Sully	MS Parent
	Lourdes Archambeau	Elem Parent

	Amber Bruguier	Primary Parent
Teacher	Jacqueline Herrboldt	District Wide Instructional Coach – Reading
	Cheryl Thaler	District Wide Instructional Coach – Math
	Hillary Tjeerdsma	MS Teacher
	John Tyler	MS Teacher
	Jason Knebel	Elem Teacher
	Cindy Goter	Elem Teacher
	Patti Mattis	Primary Teacher
	Laura Soukup	Primary Teacher
	Charlene Soukup	Elem Counselor
	Jennifer Noteboom	MS Counselor
Administration	Carol Ersland	Elem Principal
	Steve Petry	MS Principal
	Lori Bouza	Primary Principal/Title I Coordinator
Community	Lila Mattis	Head Start Education Coordinator
	Al Kosters	SST Member
	Kristi Hilzendeger	ESA Consultant
	Missy Rehder	District Wide SPED Coordinator

- b. Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district’s comprehensive needs assessment designed for the purpose of the SIG application. *Your answer must address data within the four lenses of the Data RetreatSM process: Student, Professional Practices, Programs & Structures, and Family & Community Data. Include an evaluation of current practices and programs as required in the third lens of data review. If any of the schools involved have had a school level audit based on the District Audit Tool published by CCSO, the results must be included in the data analysis.*

The district received notification about the grant by email on the 29th of March. When notification was received, Susan Smit – Superintendent, Carol Ersland- Elem Principal, Lori Bouza – Primary Principal/Fed Programs, Missy Rehder – SPED Coordinator, Jacqueline Herrboldt – Instructional Coach, Cheryl Thaler – Instructional Coach, and Steve Petry – Middle School Principal began the conversation as to what could be done to enhance the current school improvement plans and increase student achievement, teacher efficacy, and implementation of 21st century skills. The school improvement plans and strategic plans were referenced along with the data from the data retreat and current data from the 2010-2011 school year quarterly assessments to determine the needs. After viewing the SIG webinar, the SIG planning team (Carol Ersland – Elem Principal, Jacqueline Herrboldt- District Instructional Coach (reading), Cheryl Thaler – District Instructional Coach (Math), and Lori Bouza – Primary Principal/Fed Programs) traveled to Rapid City on the 13th of April to attend a SIG retreat. The purpose of the retreat was to review data related to school improvement plans and process, discuss school programs, areas of effectiveness for the school, and challenges that the school district faces. The planning team reviewed the results from the district wide data retreat, the comprehensive needs assessment, community data, and program data. The team considered the coming implementation of common core standards in reading and math areas and the need for valid assessment of them to guide instruction. The team spent two days, 14-15 April, discussing goals and strategies for the SIG that would enhance the state approved school improvement plans. This focused specifically data from the August data review and September school wide data retreat and on the current student achievement data from 2010-2011 school year. The team compiled their findings using both performance and perception data from each the four lenses: Student, Professional Practices, Programs & Structures, and Family & Community Data. A concern for the district is the use of technology as a teaching tool. The district has resources, but often not enough for students to simultaneously use. Another concern is that the technology is being integrated into the lessons, not used in isolation. 21st century skills and learning require that the technology to be embedded into the instruction. The district feels that a technology audit would be useful in providing data to guide the professional development.

The team reviewed the data from the September data retreat. It showed what each grade level and content area had to address and the standards that were consistently below proficient. In the area of student data, the team examined the Stanford Reading First tests for grades K-3, Dakota STEP grades 3-8 and 11, STAR tests, Orchard tests, E-Metric site standards analysis, Results for CORE Phonics Screener, State Writing Assessment data, IXL math data, 8th grade State Technology Assessment results, ACT/Plan/Discover/Explore standardized test results, benchmark tests, quarterly assessments, pre/post exams.

Data for the Student Perceptions lens was the Safe and Drug Free Schools At Risk Behavior survey, attendance and truancy data, discipline data, drop out/graduation data. Data about students' enrollment such as scheduling and extracurricular activities, special education categories, and summer school enrollment was analyzed along with student demographic data (ethnicity, F/R lunch, gender).

The program and structures data provided another lens the data team reviewed. The schedule of classes provided was reviewed, curriculum map reports, alignment of curriculum, professional development that had been completed during the school year, strategic plan funding pages.

The Professional practices lens provided information such as iObserve (an electronic protocol based on Marzano's research used in classroom walkthrough and observations) information derived from classroom walkthroughs, highly qualified teacher certification information, professional development taken/provided, surveys/evaluations of in-services, summaries of staff leave- illness/school directed/personal/w-o pay, curriculum map information. These sources provided data to consider how teachers teach, their ongoing learning, and their self efficacy.

Parent Teacher Conference attendance data, parent survey information, Monthly parent meeting topic survey, Native American Education Committee meeting minutes, and transition plans/activities provided input as to the family and community data the team gathered and considered.

The team found the needs of the Elementary School focused on Reading in All students, Native American, and Economically Disadvantaged groups. Data showed the margin for making or missing AYP in all cases was very narrow. After examining the individual student data, the bubble students were noted along with the standards of concern. Many students with poor scores also had attendance issues. Current school year data reinforced these findings.

Standards of concern for the elementary were examined and corresponding standards at the primary level were determined. In order to raise the achievement in reading and math at the elementary level in the deficit standards, the primary school established a focus on these standards. The kindergarten scores for the Stanford Reading First, progress monitoring, and standards assessments were analyzed to give additional perspective on how to support the elementary school.

The team found the needs of the Middle School focused on Reading in All students, Native American, and Economically Disadvantaged groups. They also noted student behavior/discipline to be a problem. The high number discipline of referrals from classrooms is a concern. Data showed the margin for making or missing AYP in all cases was very narrow. After examining the individual student data, the bubble students were noted along with the standards of concern. Many students with poor scores also had attendance issues. Current school year data reinforced these findings.

In reviewing the schedules for all schools, it was found teachers had very little time available to collaborate. The district is in process of implementing the concept of professional learning communities as researched by DuFour and realizes the need for time to collaborate is a necessity.

The district has established a working relationship with USD and has been collaborating with them on Go Teach and the Bush grant. To assist staff with furthering their education and mentor teachers, the school has partnered with USD in the PDC program. The district has provided professional development to assist teachers in understanding the Marzano research and how effective instructional strategies impact learning.

- 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 district received notification about the grant by email on the 29th of March. When notification was received, Susan Smit – Superintendent, Carol Erslund- Elem Principal, Lori Bouza – Fed Programs, Missy Rehder – SPED Coordinator, Jacqueline Herrboldt – Instructional Coach, Cheryl Thaler – Instructional Coach, and Steve Petry – Middle School Principal began the conversation as to what could be done to enhance the current school improvement plans to increase student achievement, teacher efficacy, and implementation of 21st century skills. The school improvement plans and strategic plans were referenced along with the data from the data retreat and current data from the 2010-2011 school year quarterly assessments to determine the needs. The SIG team met for a retreat on the 14-15th of April. This focused specifically on review of data from the August school wide data retreat and on the current data from student achievement, The District held a team Data Retreat in August of 2010. The team compiled their findings using both performance and perception data from each the four lenses: Student, Professional Practices, Programs & Structures, and Family & Community Data as noted in previous answer.

- 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.*

The team found the needs of the Middle School focused on Reading in All students, Native American, and Economically Disadvantaged groups. They also noted student behavior/discipline to be a problem. The high number discipline referrals from classrooms a concern. Data showed the margin for making or missing AYP in all cases was very narrow. After examining the individual student data, the bubble students were noted along with the standards of concern. Many students with poor scores also had attendance issues. Current school year data reinforced these findings.

The team found the needs of the Elementary School focused on Reading in All students, Native American, and Economically Disadvantaged groups. Data showed the margin for making or missing AYP in all cases was very narrow. After examining the individual student data, the bubble students were noted along with the standards of concern. Many students with poor scores also had attendance issues. Current school year data reinforced these findings.

Being a feeder school for the elementary, the primary school must focus on building a stronger foundation for the skills needed to be successful in reading and math at the elementary school.

Responsibility and accountability for all schools lies at the district level. For this reason, it is necessary for the district to look for patterns of need in all schools and try to build consistency in answer to those needs.

- 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.*

School	Strengths	Priority?	Weaknesses	Priority?
Wagner Middle School	Reading Block is 90 minutes	Yes	Missed AMO in Dakota STEP scores in reading and math	Yes
	Inclusion for students with disabilities	Yes	Lack of Two way Communication between home and school	Yes
	Technology	Yes	High incidence of Discipline referrals	Yes
	Low teacher to student ratio	Yes	Lack of Parental Involvement	Yes

	Facility	No	High rate of Absenteeism	Yes
	library	No	Teacher Lack of Knowledge of Core Content Standards	Yes
	PBIS project school	No	Teacher unfamiliarity with Danielson Model for evaluation	Yes
	School Reach notification	No	RtI process has begun, but not fully implemented	Yes
	Use of SBR web based standards mastery products	No		
	Use of iObservation for walkthroughs	No		
School	Strengths	Priority?	Weaknesses	Priority?
Primary School	Reading and math scores are over 85% at grade level	Yes	High Absenteeism	Yes
	Inclusion for students with disabilities	Yes	Teacher Lack of Knowledge of Core Content Standards	Yes
	Low teacher to student ratio	Yes	Teacher Lack of Knowledge of Danielson Model for evaluation	Yes
	Standards assessment used to determine mastery	Yes	Teacher Lack of Knowledge of Core Content Standards	Yes
	RtI strategies used	No		
	PBIS project school	No		
	School Reach notification	No		
School	Strengths	Priority?	Weaknesses	Priority?
Wagner Elem	Reading First Strategies/procedures used	Yes	Missed AMO in Dakota STEP scores in reading and math	Yes
	Inclusion for students with disabilities	Yes	Lack of Two way Communication between home and school	Yes
	Technology	Yes	High incidence of Discipline referrals	Yes
	Low teacher to student ratio	Yes	Lack of Parental	Yes

			Involvement	
	Facility	No	High rate of Absenteeism	Yes
			Teacher Lack of Knowledge of Core Content Standards	Yes
	library	No	Teacher Lack of Knowledge of Danielson Model for evaluation	Yes
	Rtl strategies used	No		Yes
	PBIS project school	No		
	School Reach notification	No		
	Use of SBR web based standards mastery products	No		
	Use of iObservation for walkthroughs	No		

- 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.*

All of the district's Tier III schools (Primary, Elementary, and Middle School) will be served. Being in one district and one building, the teachers will be able to align their practices to fully benefit all students from grade K-8 with consistency and continuity being achieved with the services described within the grant. The district is concerned about providing a consistent vocabulary and standard of research based practice for all grades. Using the grant to provide resources and research proven methods to all schools will provide this consistency.

- (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.

Not Applicable

- 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.*
- 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.*

- (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.*

Not Applicable

- (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.*

School improvement plans have been written and approved at the state level. Included in the plans are strategies and interventions that will be enhanced through the resources of this grant. Up to this point, the schools have used the RtI approach with reading and math interventions. This process is stronger in the Primary and the Elementary. The Middle School requires additional professional development to increase fidelity to the process. All schools have begun implementation of PBIS. This grant will allow for continued training. Grades K-3 participated in the Reading First grant for 7 years. These strategies have been continued in grades K-3 after grant had ended. The district has employed math and reading instructional coaches to provide mentoring and assist with instructional strategies. The schools have consulted with a reading specialist to enhance reading block and interventions, insure fidelity to the reading core and consistent practices for reading instruction grades K-6. The ESA has provided a consultant to mentor math coach and provide CGI math coaching. The schools use Study island, ixl web based math skill practice, eSuite for math and reading, LIPPS interventions for students at tier III intervention of RtI in second and third grades, PBIS – to include monthly awards ceremonies – incentives for students with 2 or less referrals – monthly and bimonthly incentives for attendance, AIMSweb progress monitoring and benchmarking implementation, book studies at elementary level, Literacy meetings, monthly math and reading articles shared, quarterly assessments used to provide summative data, Racism Study groups, Dads of Great Students (DOGs program), Kagan structures, monthly district leadership (teacher and admin) meetings, quarterly data team meeting, and implementation of Boys Town educational model. Technology is available for checkout, but often there are not enough resources for all students to be engaged simultaneously. The schools use iObserve used to provide teachers with feedback to increase teacher efficacy and strengthen instructional effectiveness. A small amount of time is set aside for collaboration. To create effective professional learning communities, additional collaboration time is necessary along with additional training pertaining to this concept.

Teachers have taken two online Marzano courses, The Art and Science of Teaching and The Marzano Designing Learning Goals and Objectives.

Future actions will include:

Year 1 and 2: TIE technology audit will be completed throughout the district with to insure that technology is embedded into instruction. A tie audit will provide survey information from the students', parents', teachers' lenses that will allow us to make data driven decision to enhance instruction. The technology assessment done at the 8th grade level has consistently provided us with data that our students are performing at basic or below basic levels. We have technology and would like to purchase additional equipment but need the audit to insure that we are using it most effectively. Training for the use of technology will be determined using the results of the audit. Consultation will be provided with reading and math specialists to refine teaching of the core content and integration of 21st century skills into content areas. Teachers will implement "flipping the classroom" technique to increase engagement of students and provide monitored practice of skills. External providers will supply training covering common formative assessment to insure reliability- validity based on CORE content standards work and the Danielson model for examining teacher effectiveness will be introduced. Win Win Discipline training will be offered. The concept of Professional Learning Communities will be explored and embedded into professional development during years 1 and 2.

In addition to the above interventions, year 3 will add: Consultation with Native American Higher Performance Learning Communities (NAHPLC) will address the gaps in Native American and white students in achievement. Another avenue addressed through NAHPLC will be to develop an understanding of cultural impact upon students and barriers that exist in their diversity.

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?

The Building Leadership Team and School Board are involved in the selection procedures for external providers. This is a requirement for any future external providers who may work with the school district. It is also a requirement that follow-up is done with the schools in a form of coaching to ensure the program is being followed and to help with questions that staff may have. The district has established working relationships with ESA 3, ESA 2, and TIE and will utilize one of these resources to provide services. If there is a capacity these entities can't provide, the district will look outside the region with an RFP process

- a. *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.*

The district has participated in SD Math Counts, Reading Up, Reading First, SEPA grant, JAG, PDC program with USD, Bush Grant, Go Teach, and PBIS. The district is committed to utilizing resources available in such a way that students benefit. The district is making plans to update curriculum to Common Core Standards and to explore the concept of professional learning communities. Robert Marzano's research on effective instruction has been the focus of professional development for the past two years. In addition to these courses, the district uses the iObserve electronic classroom observation tool to offer feedback to teachers and create common vocabulary across the district. The grant plans align with and enhance the school improvement plans approved at state level.

- b. *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.*

The district has decided to participate in a technology audit to insure it is using technology in a valid, effective way to increase student achievement. From this audit, changes may be required in order to impact students positively. The district is prepared to do this. The 8th grade technology assessment has consistently shown the majority of students to be basic or below basic in their technology skills and the district wishes to change this. The district is moving forward with Common Core Standards in preparation for the high stakes assessment at the state level. The district is committed to meeting the AMO for the Dakota STEP math and reading assessment. Instruction must align with those standards to do this. With the state endorsing the Danielson model of teacher evaluation, the district has decided to embrace that model and provide professional development to increase teacher understanding. All of these decisions reinforce the district's willingness to make changes when students are impacted positively. The district will continue to make decisions that favorably affect students, even if that means that changes may need to take place. The barriers that exist will be time for implementation and need for professional development. The district is willing to make changes necessary to implement the interventions noted in the grant.

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

The district has decided to use external resources to provide professional development over the course of the three year grant. The goal is to have efforts sustained through the skills teachers have been given from the training that has been offered. Outside evaluators and providers will hold the district accountable for reaching this goal. The technology will have

become embedded as part of the teaching process and professional learning communities will exist to provide peer resources when problems arise. The district is committed to raising student achievement through research based interventions and will continue to strive for excellence using Title I grants, local funds, collaborations with USD and ESA, Jobs for America's Graduates, and Title VII funding.

- (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.*

Not Applicable

- (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.*

Not Applicable

(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.

Using an external provider, the district will receive professional development to increase teacher effectiveness and raise efficacy. The district will be using Marzano's research related to effective instructional strategies and Danielson's research related to increasing the effectiveness of teacher evaluation as it relates to student achievement. Another facet toward which the district will direct improvement efforts is that of 21st century skill implementation and technology integration. Teachers will be trained in the use of new technologies, their use as educational tools, and research based strategies to assist with instruction and implementation. With the impending implementation of the Common Core Standards, teachers will attend the trainings offered at the DOE and also bring in external providers to offer additional training that will insure curriculum alignment to the standards. To assure formative and summative assessment are also aligned with the standards, the district will receive training to increase the validity and reliability of assessments and their alignment to the Common Core Standards, and on research based instructional methods to increase student engagement and achievement.

Thus our approach will be multipronged:

- 1) Increase instructional effectiveness through the introduction of the Danielson model and use of Marzano's research based effective instructional strategies – provide professional

development to increase teacher effectiveness using research based strategies from Marzano and Danielson

- 2) Increase implementation of 21st Century Skills through technology use, provide teachers with training and technology to increase student engagement/achievement through the integrated use of technology such as iPods and iPads, as teaching tools; using “flipping the classroom” techniques” to provide students with more supervised practice of skills,
- 3) Provide training focused on the unpacking the Common Core Standards and alignment of curriculum to the Common Core Standards
- 4) Assure that formative and summative assessment are aligned with the standards, the district will receive training to increase the validity and reliability of assessments and their alignment to the Common Core Standards.

In addition to these components that directly address student achievement, the process of becoming a professional learning community, one that indirectly affects learning, must be addressed. Teachers will be given time to collaborate through the use of stipend compensation. The district will use external providers to begin the process using DuFour’s work. Because the district has a diverse clientele and data shows gaps exist in achievement, attendance, and graduation rates between the Native American and white students, the district would like to extend the exploration professional learning communities to include the aspect of culture and traditional living. The Native American Higher Performance Learning Community process may provide assistance in this avenue. Through this process, the district would address the gap and possible barriers students experience which may inhibit them from reaching their potential. The external provider would assist staff in understanding the cultural differences, barriers, and student/learner needs in addition to providing instructional resources to increase achievement.

Using resources of this grant, the district will employ technology as a teaching tool to use instructional methods that are research based, integration of technology (such as SMART tables, kindles, iPods, and iPads), and integration of cooperative learning structures in conjunction with the technology use.

- (7) (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.*

Primary School Goals:

The primary school will support the goals and strategies for the elementary school through their goals. This will be done through rigorous instruction and assessment of the standards, research based interventions for reading and math. Specific goals to do this are:

Reading: 90% of students will benchmark on AIMS Web at the end of the year. In addition, 90% of students will identify all letters of the alphabet and corresponding sounds at the end of the year.

Math: 90% of students will benchmark on AIMS Web at the end of the year. In addition, 90% of students will identify numerals from 0-20 at the end of the year.

Attendance: ADA will reach 94% at a minimum.

Elementary School goals:

- **Goal 1:** Native American Students in grades 3-4 will read at increasing levels of proficiency for variety of purposes based on individual strengths and needs measured by the Dakota Step to make AYP.
 - ✓ **Objective 1:** Native American Students will improve their total reading performance in grades 3-4 so that at least 43% will be performing at or above level in 2010 based on the Dakota Step. Through the confidence interval 43% of Native American students will be advanced or proficient in reading based on 2011 Dakota Step testing in the spring to make AYP.
- Goal 2:** Native American Students in grades 3-4 will increase their math skill levels of proficiency using a variety of purposes based on individual strengths and needs measured by the Dakota Step to meet AYP.
 - ✓ **Objective 2:** The Native American Students will improve their total math performance in grades 3-4 so that at least 45% will be performing at or above grade level in 2011. Using the confidence interval 45% of Native American students will be advanced or proficient in math based on the 2011 Dakota Step testing in the spring to make AYP.
- **Goal 3:** All Wagner Elementary Students in grades 3-4 will read at increasing levels of proficiency for variety of purposes based on individual strengths and needs measured by Dakota Step to meet AYP.
 - ✓ **Objective 3:** All Wagner Elementary Students grades 3-4 will improve their total reading performance so that at least 53% will be performing at or above grade level in spring 2011 as measured by the Dakota Step in 2011 to meet AYP. Using the confidence interval 53% of All Wagner Elementary Students will be advanced or proficient in reading based on the 2011 Dakota Step testing in the spring to make AYP
- **Goal 4:** All Wagner Elementary Students in grades 3-4 will increase their math skill levels of proficiency using a variety of purposes based on individual strengths and needs measured by Dakota Step to meet AYP.
 - ✓ **Objective 4:** All Wagner Elementary Students in grades 3-4 will improve their total math performance so that at least 60% of all students will be proficient or advanced in math based on 2011 Dakota Step in the spring to make AYP. Using the confidence interval 60% of All Wagner Elementary Students will be advanced or proficient in math based on the 2011 Dakota Step testing in the spring to make AYP
- Goal 5:** Economic Disadvantaged Students in grades 3-4 will read at increasing levels of proficiency for variety of purposes based on individual strengths and needs measured by Dakota Step to meet AYP.

- ✓ **Objective 5:** Economic Disadvantaged Students will improve their total reading performance through the confidence interval 46% and will be proficient or advanced in reading based on the Dakota Step test in the spring 2011 to make AYP.
- **Goal 6:** Economic Disadvantaged Students in grades 3-4 will increase their math skill levels of proficiency using a variety of purposes based on individual strengths and needs measured by Dakota Step to meet AYP.
 - ✓ **Objective 6:** Economic Disadvantaged Students will improve their total math performance in grades 3-4 so that at least 48% Economic Disadvantaged Students will be proficient or advanced in math based on the Dakota Step test in the spring 2011 to make AYP.

Middle School Goals: 2010-11 Math Goal: To Make AYP in Math

5th grade

Goal: Through confidence interval, 73% or all students will be advanced or proficient in math to make AYP

Goal: Through confidence interval 59% of Native American students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 64% of econ.dis. Students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 26% of SPED students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP

6th grade

Goal: Through confidence interval, 73% or all students will be advanced or proficient in math to make AYP

Goal: Through confidence interval 59% of Native American students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 64% of econ.dis. Students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 26% of SPED students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP

7th grade

Goal: Through confidence interval, 73% or all students will be advanced or proficient in math to make AYP

Goal: Through confidence interval 59% of Native American students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 64% of econ.dis. Students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 26% of SPED students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP

8th Grade

Goal: Through confidence interval, 73% or all students will be advanced or proficient in math to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 64% of econ.dis. Students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 26% of SPED students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP

Goal: Through confidence interval 59% of Native American students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

2010-11 Reading Goal: To Make AYP in Reading

5th grade

Goal: Through confidence interval, 66% or all students will be advanced or proficient in reading to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 57% of econ.dis. Students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 30% of SPED students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP

Goal: Through confidence interval 55% of Native American students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

6th grade

Goal: Through confidence interval, 66% or all students will be advanced or proficient in reading to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 57% of econ.dis. Students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 30% of SPED students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP

7th grade

Goal: Through confidence interval, 66% or all students will be advanced or proficient in reading to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 57% of econ.dis. Students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 30% of SPED students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP

Goal: Through confidence interval 55% of Native American students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

8th grade

Goal: Through confidence interval 55% of Native American students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval, 66% or all students will be advanced or proficient in reading to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 57% of econ.dis. Students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP.

Goal: Through confidence interval 30% of SPED students will be advanced/proficient to make AYP

- (8) (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.*

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 Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

Note: An LEA’s budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

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

The District Budget supports the school level grants by providing external providers to oversee, guide staff, and evaluate the grant. The District will contract for evaluation services of the grant with outside providers. The providers will provide ongoing facilitation of the grant, evaluate progress, and guide the district as it strives to meet goals set in the grant. This cost is noted in contractual services years 1, 2, and 3.

The district will supply the servers to allow teachers to use innovative methods such as podcasts (for “flipping the classroom”) to provide instruction. The cost for these is noted in the equipment budget totals – years 1 and 2.

The district supports the implementation of Core Common Standards, creation of valid/reliable assessments, and the concept of Professional Learning Communities.

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

At the district level, there will be no additional costs for personnel. Personnel costs for school budgets are for stipend pay for teacher work days related to goals (Common Core Standards, cooperative learning, PLC, assessment and collaboration). The personnel costs are also to be spent on substitute pay when teachers are attending Common Core workshops. The Primary, Elementary, and Middle School budgets are aggregated below:

Personnel:

Year 1 – Pre-implementation	\$11250
Year 1:	\$97875
Year 2:	\$76500
Year 3:	\$73375
<u>Total Personnel:</u>	<u>\$332375</u>

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).

There are not additional costs for employee benefits at the district level. The costs for benefits are derived at the school level and will cover the social security- Medicare, retirement, and insurance payments that are not part of the stipend pay.

Employee Benefits:

Year 1 – Pre-implementation: \$11250 salary dollars x 13%=	\$14625
Year 1: \$97875 salary dollars x 13%=	\$12723.75
Year 2: \$76500 salary dollars x 15%=	\$11475
Year 3: \$73375 salary dollars x 17%=	\$12473.75
<u>Total Employee benefits:</u>	<u>\$51297.50</u>

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

There will be no additional costs for travel at the district level. At the school level, travel funds will be used for trips made to the Common Core Standards workshops and the costs associated. Other travel expenses will be for observations trips to classrooms that have implemented the “flipping” strategies and workshops that address the needs found in the comprehensive needs assessments.

Travel:

Pre-implementation - Year 1	\$13208
Year 1:	\$18510.50
Year 2:	\$16475.50
Year 3:	\$32951
<u>Total Travel:</u>	<u>\$81145</u>

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.

At the district level for equipment, there is a need to purchase 2 podcast servers to allow classrooms to complete the “flipping the classroom” strategies. The server will enable the classroom teachers to post their podcasts for student access. At the school level, there will be costs incurred for technology devices to increase student engagement, provide resources to host skill based interventions in reading and math on an individual basis, and provide avenues to implement 21st century skills into classroom instruction.

Equipment:

Year 1- Pre-implementation	\$0
Year 1:	\$225123
Year 2:	\$207436
Year 3:	\$189792
<u>Total Equipment</u>	<u>\$441951</u>

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

There will be no additional costs at the district level for supplies. School level costs are designed to provide math and reading applications, books covering assessment strategies, eBooks, and software to put safety filter licenses on devices.

Supplies:

Year 1 – Pre-implementation:	\$0
Year 1:	\$39550
Year 2:	\$52750
Year 3:	\$56800
<u>Total supplies:</u>	<u>\$149100</u>

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.

The District will contract for evaluation services of the grant with outside providers. The providers will provide ongoing facilitation of the grant, evaluate progress, and guide the district as it strives to meet goals set in the grant.

Schools will contract with external providers to train on Common Core Standards, reliable/valid assessments, professional learning communities, RtI, effective instructional strategies, and the Danielson framework for evaluation.

Contractual:

Year 1 – Pre-implementation:	\$0
Year 1:	\$113000
Year 2	\$85000
Year 3:	\$153000
Total Contractual:	\$351000

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

There will be no additional costs at the district level for professional development. The school level costs will pay for the expenses for conferences held off campus that address the goals set in the grant and the school improvement plans.

Professional Development:

Year 1 – Pre-implementation:	\$0
Year 1:	\$8100
Year 2:	\$8100
Year 3:	\$8100
Total Professional Development:	\$24300

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

Not applicable

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

Wagner 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			
Wagner Middle School, Tier III	6204.60	188759.50	173882	187182	556028.10
Wagner Elementary School, Tier III	16713.80	195631.50	191952	207992	612289.30
Wagner Primary School, Tier III	3002.10	125691.25	87102.50	114842.25	330638.10
District - Level Activities	58880.28		50093.65	51001.63	159975.56
Total Costs	594883.33		503030.15	561017.88	1658931.06

*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.

