


APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: South Dakota Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: South Dakota Department of Education 700 Governors Drive Pierre, SD 57501
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Diane R. Lowery Position and Office: NCLB Team Leader & Title I Director Office of Educational Services and Support Contact's Mailing Address: 700 Governors Drive Pierre, SD 57501 Telephone: 605-773-6509 Fax: 605-773-3782 Email address: diane.lowery@state.sd.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Thomas J. Oster	Telephone: 605.773.5669
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: 	Date: February, 22, 2010
The State, 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.	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. (A State’s Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA’s definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition.

Link to Definition: Once the state’s definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) schools has been federally approved, the list will be located on a State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) link within the state’s Stimulus website located at: <http://doe.sd.gov/stimulus/>.

An Excel document is attached to this application providing the list of PLA schools by LEA in the format requested below. Once the definition of PLA schools has been approved the list of schools will also be posted on the website cited above.

<u>LEA NAME, NCES ID #</u>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA: An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information set forth below in an LEA’s application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA application contains an overall LEA section as well as a separate school section for each Tier I, II, or III school the district commits to serve. The LEA application is intended to be completed from a district perspective. Specifics are detailed in each individual school section.

The criteria the state will use to judge completeness of each application is embedded into the LEA application and school sections. The broad question or requirement is stated followed by blue, italicized text that gives further direction as to the information that must be included in the answer. This format is consistent with the department's Consolidated Application for ESEA funds and the application for 1003(a) school improvement funds. This has worked well for the stated purposes and is one that SD districts are used to. Consistency in expectation will be helpful to districts during the SIG application process, especially since it has a quick timeline.

Part 1

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

The LEA is required to address this question from both a district and a school perspective. The LEA application asks the district to explain its comprehensive needs assessment process it conducted to determine which of its Tier I, II, or III schools to serve as well as how the interventions were chosen. The district must list the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome. Data sources that were analyzed must be noted. Districts are required to consider data within the four lenses of the Data RetreatSM process: Student, Professional Practices, Programs & Structures, and Family & Community Data (consistent with current SEA requirements). An evaluation of current practices and programs is 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 must describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) conducted for the purpose of the SIG application, including when the comprehensive needs assessment was conducted, who was involved with the analysis of the data, and how the comprehensive needs assessment was accomplished. A broad description of the results of that review will be noted in the LEA application with specifics for each individual school outlined in the school sections. Strengths and weaknesses for each school will be summarized, based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment. The district will provide the rationale used to determine which schools to commit to serve with SIG funds.

(2) The LEA has demonstrated that it 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 selected intervention in each of those schools.

The LEA will describe its capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application. Capacity to execute and support a turnaround or transformational model will be addressed, if applicable. Potential contracts with any person or organization to assist with the implementation of the turnaround or transformational model will be noted. The district will indicate resources it has in terms of staffing, funding, support, partnerships, etc. that will assist the district in successfully implementing the chosen interventions. Administrative oversight must be addressed including who from the district will provide oversight of the SIG and how that will be accomplished.

(3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those

funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

The LEA budget will be a compilation of the individual school budgets which are contained in the school sections. The panel reviewing the applications will pay close attention to the school level budget in relation to the intervention chosen for implementation in order to ascertain if sufficient funds are requested. Both the school and district level budgets will be outlined for the three years of availability, if the intervention warrants that time and financial commitment.

Part 2

The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant but, most likely, will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe how it will assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

(1) *Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.*

The district will describe what it has done to this point to design the interventions described in the school level sections. The response will broadly address each of the schools the district has committed to serve. School sections must address each requirement of the chosen model. Plans for future action must be indicated. The district's timeline for implementing the interventions for each school must be contained in the school level sections.

(2) *Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.*

Districts are asked to indicate the process used up to this point for selection of external providers and to provide a detailed plan for this process in the future. Who will be involved in the selection procedure and the criteria set for selection must be noted.

(3) *Align other resources with the interventions.*

Districts will describe other resources available to the district that will be leveraged to assist with interventions under SIG. School section will include requirement to list available resources for each school and address resources in terms of funding, staffing, partnerships, and support.

(4) *Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.*

LEA application must describe policies and practices that will need to be changed in order to fully implement the selected interventions. Barriers to implementation that exist must be addressed. An action plan should address the timeframe, stakeholder input, and procedures that are necessary for modification to take place. The willingness of the district to modify procedures must be indicated.

(5) *Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.*

The LEA must indicate 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.

C. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school. The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

There is one district in the state that has more than one Tier I school. If the LEA indicates that it will not serve each of its Tier I schools, the district must indicate the barriers or reasons why it lacks the capacity to serve all Tier I schools. The district may cite issues including 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, and school improvement. This district has multiple requirements to address. The review panel will assess the district's response and provide a recommendation to the SEA about lack of capacity. If the panel and the SEA believe that the district does have capacity to serve more than one Tier I school, department staff will notify the district to negotiate an acceptable solution before deciding to approve or disapprove the application.

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth below.

(1) Describe the SEA's process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

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 warrants approval. Each element will be scored based on the following scoring rubric:

Comprehensive: Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points)

Clarifications: Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point)

Incomplete: Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points)

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: LEAs were given a copy of the draft application package on Friday, February 19th. A Live Meeting was held at that time to go over the application and grant requirements. The state SIG application will be submitted to ED on February 22, 2010. The final LEA application package will be forwarded to the districts upon ED approval. Another Live Meeting will be conducted for all districts involved. Districts will be asked to indicate their intent to apply for Tier I and II schools by March 12th. Tier III applications will be sent out by March 19th 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 by April 9th. Applications will be reviewed by April 23rd. Awards are expected to be announced by May 7, 2010. Districts receiving grant awards may begin implementation immediately, but no later than the first contract day for the 2010-2011 school year.

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

The LEA will state the reading and math annual goals for each Tier I or II school. The goal must be measurable and specify the indicator (Dakota STEP) that will be used during each of the grant years. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year). The application review panel will be provided current performance data for each school and will determine if the goals are challenging and yet reasonable.

LEAs will submit data annually for each Tier I and II school as stated in application. A panel, similar in composition to the application review committee, will be convened to assess each school's progress towards meeting their goals. If one or more of the district's Tier I or II schools did not meet the annual goal, the panel will take into consideration LEA and SEA implementation reports and the evaluation of the school's improvement plan. Applications for LEAs that have not ensured fidelity of implementation for the interventions chosen may not be renewed if goals are not met. The panel will make a recommendation to the SEA. The district would be notified that concern has been raised and given opportunity to explain the situation. An SEA committee, including the Secretary of Education, would make the final decision about grant fund renewal.

(3) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier III schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals.

The LEA will state the reading and math annual goals for each Tier III school. The goal must be measurable and specify the indicator (Dakota STEP) that will be used during each of the grant years. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year). The application review panel will be provided current performance data for each school and will determine if the goals are challenging and yet reasonable.

LEAs will submit data annually for each Tier III school as stated in application. A panel, similar in composition to the application review committee, will be convened to assess each school's progress towards meeting their goals. If one or more of the district's Tier III schools did not meet the annual goal, the panel will take into consideration LEA and SEA implementation reports and the evaluation

of the school's improvement plan. Applications for LEAs that have not ensured fidelity of implementation for the interventions chosen may not be renewed if goals are not met. The panel will make a recommendation to the SEA. The district would be notified that concern has been raised and given opportunity to explain the situation. An SEA committee, including the Secretary of Education, would make the final decision about grant fund renewal.

- (4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.***

The Title I team within the SEA will provide oversight and monitor LEAs that receive SIG funding. A Title I staff member will be assigned to each district as the SEA contact. Initially, monthly reports with activity logs for each school will be submitted and conference calls with the district held. Concerns will be addressed in a timely manner in order to keep implementation on track and address issues that might arise. Periodic on-sight visits will take place as needed, but at least twice each year. School Support Team members will be assigned to each district receiving a grant and will provide technical assistance and support. An annual review will take place to assess implementation and effectiveness of the LEA grant. LEA and school staff will attend the review conducted by the Title I team. School Support Team members and members of the Committee of Practitioners will also participate. Additional content and issue experts will be summoned as needed and appropriate department staff will be asked to participate.

- (5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.***

The first priority will be to districts that commit to serve Tier I or II schools. The second priority will be for districts serving Tier III along with its Tier I or II schools. The third priority would be for Tier III schools. If the LEA applications for Tier I and II schools exceed available funds, LEA applications with the highest initial rubric score will be considered first. The SEA would work with those districts to ensure that all requirements are met in the application before giving final approval.

- (6) Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.***

The first priority for serving Tier III schools would be for those LEAs that also commit to serve Tier I or II schools. For districts that have only Tier III schools, priority will go first to LEAs that choose to implement one of the four intervention models in at least one Tier III school. The next priority would be for Tier III schools that will implement components of the turn around or transformational intervention models. The final consideration would be for Title III schools that intend to use SIG funds to continue or enhance effective interventions to support their school improvement plan.

- (7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.***
- (8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.***

The South Dakota Department of Education does not intend to take over any school.

E. ASSURANCES: The SEA must provide the assurances set forth below.

By submitting this application, the South Dakota Department of Education assures that it will do the following:

- ✓ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- ✓ Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- ✓ Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.
- ✓ Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the State receives FY 2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the State).
- ✓ Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- ✓ Monitor each LEA's implementation of the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- ✓ To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- ✓ Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; amount of the grant; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- ✓ Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION: An SEA may reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with the State-level funds it has received from its School Improvement Grant.

The SEA will use state-level SIG funds to support staff time and expenses to administer and monitor its grant recipients. Fees for facilitation and review panel expenses for application and annual goals review will be paid with SIG funds. School Support Team contracts and expenses will also be funded. If there are sufficient funds available, state level activities for schools with common issues would be conducted.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: An SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

- ✓ The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application. A meeting was held in September and a webinar conducted in January to inform COP members of the grant opportunity and requirements and to solicit input on the state's application. Information was sent and comments received via email.

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

- ✓ The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including LEA officials and School Support Team members. Several emails were sent to districts with schools in improvement to inform them of the grant as it emerged in the fall into the winter. A Live Meeting (webinar) was held late January to receive feedback and provide information. A Title Update newsletter article about SIG was provided for broad dissemination. A phone call was made with each Superintendent with one or more schools on PLA list and personal input and questions were received. Another Live Meeting was held just prior to submission of the state application and the draft LEA application and school sections were provided. SEA staff were informed throughout the development of the SIG including the Secretary, NCLB team, management team, NCLB Title Team, and Grants Management.

H. WAIVERS: The final requirements invite an SEA to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must list in its application those requirements for which it is seeking a waiver.

The South Dakota Department of Education requests a waiver of the requirements it has listed below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I and Tier II schools.

- ✓ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- ✓ Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.
- Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement the waiver(s) only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver(s) in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver(s) in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, prior to submitting this request in its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on this request and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding this waiver request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

Prior to submitting this waiver request, South Dakota provided LEAs with schools in Tiers I, II, or III and its Committee of Practitioners with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on this request. South Dakota provided such notice by sending an email on February 22, 2010 (see

copy of notice attached). Copies of all comments that South Dakota received from LEAs in response to this notice are attached hereto. South Dakota has also provided notice and information regarding this waiver request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public by posting information regarding the waiver request on its Stimulus Web site (<http://doe.sd.gov/stimulus/Title1waiver.asp>). Comments will continue to be accepted during the time period in which the SEA and ED communicate about the state's application and will be compiled as a final comment document prior to ED approval of the state's application.

The State assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.



south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Learning. Leadership. Service.

School Improvement Grants LEA 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
Expiration Date: 06/30/2010

Due Date
April 9, 2010

South Dakota Department of Education
Kneip Office Building, Title I Office
700 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501

Grant Period Ends
June 30, 2013

FY 2009
School Improvement Grant (SIG)
Cover page

Legal Name of Applicant:		Applicant's Mailing Address:	
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: . Position and Office: Contact's Mailing Address:		Telephone: Fax: Email address:	
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name):		Telephone:	
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): _____

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 \$500,000 annually to \$2 million annually.

The final requirements for the SIG program, set forth in 74 FR 65618 (Dec. 10, 2009), and amended by the interim final requirements, set forth in 75 FR 3375 (Jan. 21, 2010) (final requirements), implement both the requirements of section 1003(g) of the ESEA and the flexibilities for the SIG program provided through the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

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.

Conditions of Eligibility

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

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, 2010 – June 30, 2011

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

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

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 a 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: EA 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:

Comprehensive: Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points)

Clarifications: Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point)

Incomplete: Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points)

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: LEAs were given a copy of the draft application package on Friday, February 19th. A Live Meeting was held at that time to go over the application and grant requirements. The SIG will be submitted to ED on February 22, 2010. The final LEA application package will be forwarded to the districts upon ED approval. Another Live Meeting will be conducted for all districts involved. Districts will be asked to indicate their intent to apply for Tier I and II schools by March 12th. Tier III applications will be sent out by March 19th if warranted, based upon the number of Tier I and II schools LEAs intend to commit to serve and the amount of funding available. EA applications must be submitted by April 9th. Applications will be reviewed by April 23rd. Awards are expected to be announced by May 7, 2010. Districts receiving grant awards may begin implementation immediately, but no later than the first contract day for the 2010-2011 school year.

Applications may 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 may be sent to Betsy Chapman. 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 was held on February 19, 2010 to provide LEAs with the draft LEA application and School Sections. An over view of PLA identification, SIG requirements, the four intervention models, and application procedures was provided. Another Live Meeting will be scheduled once the State and LEA applications and School Sections have been federally approved.

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

Contact Information

For grant application questions:

Diane Lowery (773-6509)
Beth Schiltz (773-4716)
Betsy Chapman (773-4712)

Diane.Lowery@state.sd.us
Beth.Schiltz@state.sd.us
Betsy.Chapman@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

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) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school
 - a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome. *(Your answer must include the following: A list of the names of the members of the committee. The position within the district that each person is representing, The committee must include a broad range of stakeholders including administrators, teachers, program directors, community members, and parents).*
 - 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.)*
 - c. Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) conducted for the purpose of the SIG application. *(Your answer must include the following: **WHEN** the comprehensive needs assessment was conducted, give date (must be completed*

- between February and application submission); **WHO** was involved with the analysis of the data; and **HOW** the comprehensive needs assessment was accomplished.*
- 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.*
 - 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.*
 - 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.*
- (2) The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- 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) 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.*
- (4) 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.*
 - 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?*
 - 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, Reading First, etc. Address resources in terms of funding, staffing, partnerships, and support.*

- 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.*
 - 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.*
- (5) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to 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 three year implementation time period. The timeline should be from the district perspective.*
 - (6) 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 goal must be measurable and specify the indicator (Dakota STEP) that will be used during each of the grant years. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year).*
 - (7) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. *Briefly describe the activities for all Tier III schools served. Specifics of the activities will be provided in each school section.*
 - (8) 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 I and II schools the district commits to serve. The goal must be measurable and specify the indicator (Dakota STEP) that will be used during each of the grant years. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year).*
 - (9) 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.*

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.

District 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).

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, 2010 – June 30, 2011
Project Year 2: July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012
Project Year 3: July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013

Personnel:

Employee Benefits:

Travel:

Equipment:

Supplies:

Contractual:

Professional Development:

Indirect Costs

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

Name of School:

Budget Summary

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)	Project Total (f)
1. Personnel				
2. Employee Benefits				
3. Travel				
4. Equipment				
5. Supplies				
6. Contractual				
7. Professional Development				
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)				
9. Indirect Costs*				
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)				

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

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 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds to September 30, 2013.
- 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.

Tier I

District	School
Shannon County 65-1	Shannon County Alternative School
Sioux Falls 49-5	Family Immersion Center - Axtell Park
Todd County 66-1	Todd County High School
Todd County 66-1	He Dog School
Todd County 66-1	Spring Creek School

Tier II

District	School
Belle Fourche 09-1	Belle Fourche Education Connection
Frederick Area 06-2	Frederick High School
Grant-Deuel 25-3	Grant-Deuel High School
Gregory 26-4	Gregory High School
McLaughlin 15-2	McLaughlin High School
New Underwood 51-3	New Underwood High School
Waverly 14-5	Waverly High School

Excluded from Tier II List

Lead-Deadwood 40-1	Lead-Deadwood Career & Technology Education	GED Prep School
Bon Homme 04-2	Bon Homme Colony Alternative High School	Less than ten tested students 2009
Iroquois 02-3	Iroquois High School	Less than ten tested students 2009
Redfield 56-4	Redfield GSM Alternative	Less than ten tested students 2009
Shannon County 65-1	Shannon County Virtual High School	Less than ten tested students 2009

Tier III

District	School
Andes Central 11-1	Andes Central Elementary
Belle Fourche 09-1	Belle Fourche MS
Bennett County 03-1	Martin Elem
Bennett County 03-1	Bennett County Jr High
Eagle Butte 20-1	C-EB Upper Elementary
Eagle Butte 20-1	Eagle Butte Elementary
Gregory 26-4	Gregory Elementary School
Huron 02-2	Huron Middle School
Ipswich Public 22-6	Rosette Colony Elem*
Kadoka Area 35-2	Kadoka Elementary School
McLaughlin 15-2	McLaughlin Jr. High
McLaughlin 15-2	McLaughlin Elementary
Oelrichs 23-3	Oelrichs Elem
Oelrichs 23-3	Oelrichs Jr Hi
Rapid City 51-4	Robbinsdale Elem
Rapid City 51-4	Valley View Elem
Rapid City 51-4	Horace Mann Elem
Rapid City 51-4	Knollwood Heights Elem
Rapid City 51-4	General Beadle Elem
Rapid City 51-4	North Middle Sch
Shannon County 65-1	Batesland Elementary
Shannon County 65-1	Red Shirt Table Elementary
Shannon County 65-1	Wolf Creek Upper
Shannon County 65-1	Rockyford Lower
Shannon County 65-1	Rockyford Upper
Sioux Falls 49-5	Anne Sullivan Elementary
Sioux Falls 49-5	Cleveland Elementary
Sioux Falls 49-5	Terry Redlin Elementary
Sioux Falls 49-5	Garfield Elementary
Sioux Falls 49-5	Hayward Elementary
Sioux Falls 49-5	Hawthorne Elementary
Sioux Falls 49-5	Lowell Elementary
Sioux Falls 49-5	Laura B. Anderson Elementary
Sioux Falls 49-5	Longfellow Elementary
Sisseton 54-2	Sisseton Elementary School
Sisseton 54-2	Sisseton Middle School
Smee 15-3	Wakpala Elementary
Smee 15-3	Wakpala High School

Todd County 66-1	South Elementary
Todd County 66-1	Rosebud Elementary
Todd County 66-1	Littleburg Elementary
Todd County 66-1	North Elementary
Todd County 66-1	Todd County MS
Todd County 66-1	O'Kreek Elementary
Watertown 14-4	Watertown High School
White River 47-1	White River Middle Sch
White River 47-1	White River Elementary
White River 47-1	White River High School
White River 47-1	Norris Elementary*