


APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: South Dakota Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: South Dakota Department of Education 800 Governors Drive Pierre, SD 57501
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant  Name: Dr. Kristine Harms  Position and Office: Title I Director Office of Educational Services and Support  Contact's Mailing Address: 800 Governors Drive Pierre, SD 57501  Telephone: 605.773.6509  Fax: 605.773.3782  Email address: kristine.harms@state.sd.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Thomas J. Oster	Telephone: 605.773.5669
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <span style="margin-right: 10px;">X</span>  </div>	Date: 12/2/10
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.	

# School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

---

**State Name:** South Dakota



U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, D.C. 20202



OMB Number: 1810-0682  
Expiration Date: September 30, 2013

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.



# SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

## **Purpose of the Program**

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools ("newly eligible" Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years ("newly eligible" Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools ("newly eligible" Tier III schools). (See Appendix B for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

## **Availability of Funds**

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010, provided \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2010. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) estimates that, collectively, States have carried over approximately \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG funds that will be combined with FY 2010 SIG funds, for a total of nearly \$1.4 billion that will be awarded by States as part of their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012.

## **State and LEA Allocations**

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2010 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2010 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Appendix A provides guidance on how SEAs can maximize the number of Tier I and Tier II schools its LEAs can serve with FY 2009 carryover and FY 2010 SIG funds when making their LEA allocations for the FY 2010 competition. See Appendix A for a more detailed explanation.

## **Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners**

Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

# FY 2010 Submission Information

## **Electronic Submission:**

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2010 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2010 application to the following address: [school.improvement.grants@ed.gov](mailto:school.improvement.grants@ed.gov)

In addition, the SEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the SEA's authorized representative to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

## **Paper Submission:**

If an SEA is not able to submit its application electronically, it may submit the original and two copies of its SIG application to the following address:

Carlas McCauley, Education Program Specialist  
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320  
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in government processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

## **Application Deadline**

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

## **For Further Information**

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at [carlas.mccauley@ed.gov](mailto:carlas.mccauley@ed.gov).

# **FY 2010 Application Instructions**

**Most of the FY 2010 SIG application is identical to the FY 2009 application. A new section for additional evaluation criteria (Section B-1) has been added and Section H on Waivers has been expanded. Section D on Descriptive Information (Section D – Part 1, Section D – Parts 2-8) has also been reformatted into two separate sections for the FY 2010 application, but all other parts of the application remain the same.**

**Consequently, except as provided below, an SEA must update only those sections that include changes from the FY 2009 application. In particular, the Department expects that most SEAs will be able to retain Section B on Evaluation Criteria, Section C on Capacity, and Section D (parts 2-8) on Descriptive Information, sections that make up the bulk of the SIG application. An SEA has the option to update any of the material in these sections if it so desires.**

**We are requiring SEAs to update some sections of the SIG application to ensure that each SEA focuses its FY 2010 SIG funds, including any funds carried over from FY 2009, on serving its persistently lowest-achieving schools in LEAs with the capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement one of the four required school intervention models beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.**

**Note that while an SEA may be able to submit significant portions of its FY 2010 SIG application unchanged from FY 2009, we recommend that it review all sections of the FY 2010 application to ensure alignment with any required changes or revisions.**

**SEAs should also note that they will only be able to insert information in designated spaces (form fields) in the application because of formatting restrictions. Clicking on a section of the application that is restricted will automatically jump the cursor to the next form field which may cause users to skip over information in the application. Users may avoid this issue by using the scroll bar to review the application. However, due to these restrictions, the Department recommends that SEAs print a copy of the application and review it in its entirety before filling out the form.**

# FY 2010 Application Checklist

**Please use this checklist to serve as a roadmap for the SEA's FY 2010 application.**

Please note that an SEA's submission for FY 2010 must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- Lists, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's FY 2010 LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.
- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

**Please check the relevant boxes below to verify that all required sections of the SEA application are included and to indicate which sections of the FY 2010 application the SEA has revised from its FY 2009 application.**

<b>SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 (SEA is requesting waiver)	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition
	<input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
<b>SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
<b>SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	

SECTION C: CAPACITY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION E: ASSURANCES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
SECTION H: WAIVERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section H: Waivers provided	

## 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.

Each SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools based on the State’s most recent achievement and graduation rate data to ensure that LEAs continue to give priority to using SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in each of their persistently lowest-achieving schools, rather than using SIG funds to support less rigorous improvement measures in less needy schools. However, any SEA that has five or more Tier I schools that were identified for purposes of the State’s FY 2009 SIG competition but are not being served with SIG funds in the 2010-2011 school year may apply for a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists.

An SEA also has the option of making changes to its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest-



achieving schools”. An SEA that exercises this option must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Regardless of whether it modifies its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or generates new lists, along with its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, an SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop these lists. The SEA may provide a link to the page on its Web site where its definition is posted, or it may attach the complete definition to its application.

Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009

Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010

*For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:*

*For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:*

1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.

1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.

SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)

2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.

3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.

**Insert definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or link to definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” here:**

### **South Dakota’s Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools**

South Dakota developed its list of Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) schools using the following definitions. In developing its PLA list, the state identified two groups of schools. The first group consists of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as listed in the state’s NCLB Report Card for 2010. These schools include elementary, middle, and high schools. Elementary schools are defined in ARSD 24:43:01:01 (38) as a school consisting of any combination of grades from kindergarten through eighth grade. ARSD 24:43:01:01 (41) defines a secondary school as one consisting of any combination of three or more consecutive grades, including ninth grade through twelfth grade. Secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I Part A funds were the second group of schools identified. School eligibility for Title I services has been determined by each district through its chosen ranking procedure as documented in its consolidated application for the 2010-2011 school year.

South Dakota considered two factors, proficiency and lack of progress, in identifying its list of PLA schools. The two factors, proficiency and lack of progress, were weighted equally; added to the list are any Title I high schools that have a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a three year period. Secondary and elementary schools were also weighted equally. South Dakota has chosen not to expand its list to identify additional schools as eligible for School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds.

### **Proficiency**

Proficiency was determined based on academic achievement of the “all students” group on the DSTEP for 2010. Academic achievement and lack of progress were based solely on results from the Dakota State Test of Educational Progress (DSTEP) reading and math assessments including the alternate, DSTEP-A. Proficiency includes any student who is proficient or advanced. The “all students” group included all students who took the test who met the state’s definition of full academic year as per its approved accountability workbook. Reading and math results were combined to develop a single percentage score for each school. The numerator was determined by calculating the total number of proficient and advanced students in the “all students” group in reading and in math for each school in 2010. The total number of proficient students in reading and mathematics were added together. The denominator was determined by calculating the total number of students in the “all students” group in the school who took the DSTEP reading and mathematics assessments in 2010 who met the state’s criteria for full academic year. The total number of students tested in reading and math were added together. The numerator was divided by the denominator to determine the percent proficient in reading and mathematics, combined, in the school. This score was used to rank each set of schools from highest to lowest in terms of proficiency of the “all students” group on the DSTEP reading and mathematics assessments

combined.

### **Lack of Progress**

Lack of progress was determined to identify schools that are lowest achieving over multiple years. South Dakota computed lack of progress over three years. In order to look at lack of progress, the steps described to determine proficiency as described above were repeated for the DSTEP assessment results for each school. Rankings for three years were added together for a total ranking. This total combined ranking score was utilized to rank each set of schools from highest to lowest in terms of lack of progress.

#### **Tier I**

To determine the 5% or 5 lowest achieving schools within this group of Title I schools, proficiency and lack of progress were calculated for each school. Proficiency and lack of progress were added together and rank ordered highest to lowest. The schools were chosen from the bottom 5% or 5 of that ranking. These schools were identified as Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) for this tier. Added to the list would be any Title I high schools that have a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a three year period.

#### **Tier II**

Tier II schools are secondary schools eligible, but not receiving, Title I funds. School eligibility for Title I services was determined by each district for the school year. To determine the lowest achieving 5 % or 5 schools within this group of schools, proficiency and lack of progress were calculated for each school. Proficiency and lack of progress were added together and rank ordered highest to lowest. The schools were chosen from the bottom 5% or 5 of that ranking. These schools were identified as Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) for this tier. At this point, schools with less than ten students tested (consistent with the state's minimum "n" of 10 as per waiver 2) were excluded from the full list to protect personally identifiable information for individual students in these small schools. The schools at the bottom of that proficiency ranking were noted. Added to the list would be any eligible, but not participating, Title I high schools that have a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a three year period.

#### **Tier III**

Five percent or 5 Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring were identified as Tier I schools. The remaining are listed as Tier III schools. In addition, the state included in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest achieving schools in accordance with the n-size waiver. Also included in the Tier III list are Tier III schools receiving FY 2009 grants. These schools may only apply for FY 2010 funds if applying for one of the intervention models, in which case the FY 2009 grant will be rescinded.

An SEA must attach two tables to its SIG application. The first table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for FY 2010 SIG funds. The second table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that were served with FY 2009 SIG funds.

Please create these two tables in Excel and use the formats shown below. Examples of the tables have been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup>

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE

**EXAMPLE:**

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X
LEA 2	##	WASHINGTON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	FILLMORE HS	##			X		
LEA 3	##	TYLER HS	##		X		X	
LEA 4	##	VAN BUREN MS	##	X				
LEA 4	##	POLK ES	##			X		

<sup>1</sup> “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

**EXAMPLE:**

<b>SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS</b>							
<b>LEA NAME</b>	<b>LEA NCES ID #</b>	<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>SCHOOL NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>
LEA 1	##	MONROE ES	##	X			
LEA 1	##	JEFFERSON HS	##		X		X
LEA 2	##	ADAMS ES	##	X			
LEA 3	##	JACKSON ES	##	X			

**Please attach the two tables in a separate file and submit it with the application.**

**SEA has attached the two tables in a separate file and submitted it with its application.**

**B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

**Part 1:** The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA’s application with respect to each of the following actions:

- (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.
- (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.
- (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).

**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 the criteria it will use to assess the LEA’s commitment to do the following:

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
- (3) Align other resources with the interventions.
- (4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
- (5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

**SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.**

**SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.**

**Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:**

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 evaluate completeness of each application are 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 familiar with. 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 who 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 Retreat<sup>SM</sup> 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 CCSSO, the results must be included in the data analysis.

The district must describe the process implemented 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 it utilized to determine which schools they will 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 implemented 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.

**B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA:** In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA’s budget and application:

Please note that Section B-1 is a new section added for the FY 2010 application.

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA’s proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period<sup>2</sup> to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA’s proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? (*For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.*)

<sup>2</sup> “Pre-implementation” enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.

**Insert response to Section B-1 Additional Evaluation Criteria here:**

***How will the SEA review an LEA’s proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?***

The panel reviewing the application will pay close attention to the school level budget in relation to any pre-implementation strategies chosen by the LEA to ascertain if sufficient funds are necessary and allowable, if the activities align with the chosen model, and if the activities are part of the first year budget. The LEA must describe the pre-implementation activities and the costs associated with the activities.

***How will the SEA evaluate the LEA’s proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable?***

In determining whether a particular pre-implementation activity is allowable and necessary, the SEA review panel will assess whether the proposed activities are (1) directly related to the full and effective implementation of the selected intervention model (2) both reasonable and necessary for the implementation (3) addresses needs identified by the LEA and (4) will advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement.

**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 any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria for capacity as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for capacity for FY 2010.

**Insert response to Section C Capacity here:**

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.*

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, or the 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 (PART 1). TIMELINE:** An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Please note that Section D has been reformatted to separate the timeline into a different section for the FY 2010 application.

**Insert response to Section D (Part 1) Timeline here:**

*(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:

**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 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 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 45 days. Awards are expected to be announced within three weeks after submission deadline, but no later than June 1, 2011. Districts receiving grant awards may begin pre-implementation immediately, but no later than July 1, 2011.

**D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:**

(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 with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

(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 with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

(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.

(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.

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

(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.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

**Insert response to Section D (Parts 2-8) Descriptive Information here:**

*(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 districts must use the Dakota Step( indicator) to define their measurable goal which is 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). 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 as measured by Dakota STEP, the panel will take into consideration LEA and SEA implementation reports and the evaluation of the school's improvement plan. The school must then meet 80% of the measurable goals as stated in the school 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.**

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

South Dakota does not intend to provide services directly to schools.

## E. ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- 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.
- 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 "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as 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; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; 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:** The 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 any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.

**Insert response to Section F SEA Reservation here:**

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 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:** The 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.

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. A live meeting (webinar) was held in early December to receive feedback and provide information. A phone call was made with each Superintendent with one or more schools on the PLA list and personal input and questions were received. 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:** SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

**WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS**

**Enter State Name Here** South Dakota requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

**Waiver 1: Tier II waiver**

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”) that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG

funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.**

**Waiver 2: n-size waiver**

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]** 10.

Assurance

The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.**

**Waiver 3: New list waiver**

Because the State neither must nor elects to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2009 competition.

Assurance

The State assures that it has five or more unserved Tier I schools on its FY 2009 list.

**WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS**

**Enter State Name Here** South Dakota requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated 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, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

**Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver**

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, 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.

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

**Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 school year cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.**

**Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver**

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, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

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

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, 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.

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

**PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER**

**Enter State Name Here** South Dakota requests a waiver of the requirement indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

**Waiver 6: Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver**

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

**Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2009 carryover funds. An SEA that requested and received this waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver to apply to FY 2009 carryover funds in order to make them available for three full years for schools awarded SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

**ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS**

**(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)**

The State assures that, prior to submitting 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 its waiver request(s) 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 the above waiver request(s) 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.

**PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS**

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

Please note that for FY 2010, an SEA must develop or update its LEA application form to include information on any activities, as well as the budget for those activities, that LEAs plan to carry out during the pre-implementation period to help prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

**The SEA must submit its LEA application form with its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. The SEA should attach the LEA application form in a separate document.**

**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

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

**B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.**

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
  - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
  - 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.
- (2) 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.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
  - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
  - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
  - Align other resources with the interventions;
  - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
  - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) 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.
- (5) 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.
- (6) 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.
- (7) 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.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

**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 should cover three years of full implementation 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. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA’s three-year budget plan.

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

**Example:**

<b>LEA XX BUDGET</b>					
	<b>Year 1 Budget</b>		<b>Year 2 Budget</b>	<b>Year 3 Budget</b>	<b>Three-Year Total</b>
	<b>Pre-implementation</b>	<b>Year 1 - Full Implementation</b>			
<b>Tier I ES #1</b>	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
<b>Tier I ES #2</b>	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
<b>Tier I MS #1</b>	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
<b>Tier II HS #1</b>	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
<b>LEA-level Activities</b>	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$6,279,000</b>		<b>\$5,981,500</b>	<b>\$5,620,000</b>	<b>\$17,880,500</b>

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each 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;
- (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
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

**E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.**

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.

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- 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.



## APPENDIX A

### SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

#### Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

Congress appropriated \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in FY 2010. In addition, most States will be carrying over a portion of their FY 2009 SIG allocations, primarily due to the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG final requirements that if not every Tier I school in a State was served with FY 2009 SIG funds, the State was required to carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation, combine those funds with the State's FY 2010 SIG allocation, and award the combined funding to eligible LEAs consistent with the SIG final requirements. In FY 2009, the combination of \$3 billion in School Improvement Grant funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and \$546 million from the regular FY 2009 appropriation created a unique opportunity for the program to provide the substantial funding over a multi-year period to support the implementation of school intervention models. In response to this opportunity, the Department encouraged States to apply for a waiver extending the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds until September 30, 2013 so that States could use these funds to make three-year grant awards to LEAs to support the full and effective implementation of school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools. All States with approved FY 2009 SIG applications applied for and received this waiver to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds and, consistent with the final SIG requirements, are using FY 2009 funds to provide a full three years of funding (aka, "frontloading") to support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

The Department encouraged frontloading in FY 2009 because the extraordinary amount of SIG funding available in FY 2009 meant that, if those funds had been used to fund only the first year of implementation of a school intervention model, *i.e.*, to make first-year only awards, there would not have been sufficient funding for continuation awards in years two and three of the SIG award period (*i.e.*, SIG funding in FY 2009 was seven times the amount provided through the regular appropriation). Similarly, the estimated nearly \$1.4 billion in total SIG funding available in FY 2010 (an estimated \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG carryover funds plus the \$546 million FY 2010 SIG appropriation) is larger than the expected annual SIG appropriation over the next two fiscal years; if all funds available in FY 2010 were used to make the first year of three-year awards to LEAs for services to eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, there would not be sufficient funds to make continuation awards in subsequent fiscal years.

## **Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations**

Continuing the practice of frontloading SIG funds in FY 2010 with respect to all SIG funds that are available for the FY 2010 competition (FY 2009 carryover funds plus the FY 2010 appropriation) would, in many States, limit the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that can be served as a result of the FY 2010 SIG competition. For this reason, the Department believes that, for most States, the most effective method of awarding FY 2010 SIG funds to serve the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools that have the capacity to fully and effectively implement a school intervention model is to frontload FY 2009 carryover funds while using FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year only awards.

For example, if a State has \$36 million in FY 2009 carryover SIG funds and \$21 million in FY 2010 funds, and awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of \$1 million per year over three years, the SEA would be able to fund 12 schools with FY 2009 carryover funds (*i.e.*, the \$36 million would cover all three years of funding for those 12 schools), plus an additional 21 schools with FY 2010 funds (*i.e.*, the \$21 million would cover the first year of funding for each of those schools, and the second and third years would be funded through continuation grants from subsequent SIG appropriations). Thus, the State would be able to support interventions in a total of 33 schools. However, if the same State elected to frontload all funds available for its FY 2010 SIG competition (FY 2009 carryover funds and its FY 2010 allocation), it would be able to fund interventions in only 19 schools (\$57 million divided by \$3 million per school over three years).

LEAs that receive first-year only awards would continue to implement intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools over a three-year award period; however, second- and third-year continuation grants would be awarded from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years. This practice of making first-year awards from one year's appropriation and continuation awards from funds appropriated in subsequent fiscal years is similar to the practice used for many U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs.

States with FY 2009 SIG carryover funds are invited to apply, as in their FY 2009 applications, for the waiver to extend the period of availability of these funds for one additional year to September 30, 2014. States that did not carry over FY 2009 SIG funds, or that carried over only a small amount of such funds, need not apply for this waiver; such States will use all available FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year awards to LEAs in their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

## **Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap**

For FY 2010, States continue to have flexibility to award up to \$2 million annually for each participating school. This flexibility applies both to funds that are frontloaded and those that are used for first-year only awards. As in FY 2009, this higher limit will permit an SEA to award the amount that the Department believes typically would be required for the successful implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model in a Tier I or Tier II school

(e.g., a school of 500 students might require \$1 million annually, whereas a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million annually).

In addition, the annual \$2 million per school cap, which permits total per-school funding of up to \$6 million over three years, reflects the continuing priority on serving Tier I or Tier II schools. An SEA must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve, are awarded sufficient school improvement funding to fully and effectively implement the selected school intervention models over the period of availability of the funds before the SEA awards any funds for Tier III schools.

The following describes the requirements and priorities that apply to LEA budgets and SEA allocations.

### **LEA Budgets**

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period and should take into account the following:

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.
3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).
- 7.

## **SEA Allocations to LEAs**

An SEA must allocate the LEA share of school improvement funds (*i.e.*, 95 percent of the SEA's allocation from the Department) in accordance with the following requirements:

1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.
4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.
5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.
7. Note that the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG requirements, under which an SEA that does not serve all of its Tier I schools must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation to the following year, does not apply to FY 2010 SIG funds.

An SEA's School Improvement Grant award to an LEA must:

1. Include not less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).
2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA

to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An SEA may reduce an LEA's requested budget by any amounts proposed for interventions in one or more schools that the SEA does not approve the LEA to serve (*i.e.*, because the LEA does not have the capacity to serve the school or because the SEA is approving only a portion of Tier I and Tier II schools in certain LEAs in order to serve Tier I and Tier II schools across the State). An SEA also may reduce award amounts if it determines that an LEA can implement its planned interventions with less than the amount of funding requested in its budget.

3. Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.
5. Apportion any FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver to extend the period of availability to September 30, 2014).
6. Use FY 2010 school improvement funds to make the first year of three-year grant awards to LEAs (unless the SEA has received a waiver of the period of availability for its FY 2010 funds). Continuation awards for years 2 and 3 would come from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

## APPENDIX B

	<b>Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier</b>	<b>Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier</b>
<b>Tier I</b>	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” <sup>‡</sup>	Title I eligible <sup>§</sup> elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier II</b>	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier III</b>	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. <sup>**</sup>	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two years.</li> </ul>

<sup>‡</sup> “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

(a)(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

<sup>§</sup> For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

<sup>\*\*</sup> Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.



**south dakota**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**Learning. Leadership. Service.**

700 Governors Drive  
Pierre, SD 57501-2291

**T** 605.773.3134  
**F** 605.773.6139  
[www.doe.sd.gov](http://www.doe.sd.gov)

### **South Dakota's Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools**

South Dakota developed its list of Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) schools using the following definitions. In developing its PLA list, the state identified two groups of schools. The first group consists of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as listed in the state's NCLB Report Card for 2010. These schools include elementary, middle, and high schools. Elementary schools are defined in ARSD 24:43:01:01 (38) as a school consisting of any combination of grades from kindergarten through eighth grade. ARSD 24:43:01:01 (41) defines a secondary school as one consisting of any combination of three or more consecutive grades, including ninth grade through twelfth grade. Secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I Part A funds were the second group of schools identified. School eligibility for Title I services has been determined by each district through its chosen ranking procedure as documented in its consolidated application for the 2010-2011 school year.

South Dakota considered two factors, proficiency and lack of progress, in identifying its list of PLA schools. The two factors, proficiency and lack of progress, were weighted equally; added to the list are any Title I high schools that have a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a three year period. Secondary and elementary schools were also weighted equally. South Dakota has chosen not to expand its list to identify additional schools as eligible for School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds.

#### **Proficiency**

Proficiency was determined based on academic achievement of the "all students" group on the DSTEP for 2010. Academic achievement and lack of progress were based solely on results from the Dakota State Test of Educational Progress (DSTEP) reading and math assessments including the alternate, DSTEP-A. Proficiency includes any student who is proficient or advanced. The "all students" group included all students who took the test who met the state's definition of full academic year as per its approved accountability workbook. Reading and math results were combined to develop a single percentage score for each school. The numerator was determined by calculating the total number of proficient and advanced students in the "all students" group in reading and in math for each school in 2010. The total number of proficient students in reading and mathematics were added together. The denominator was determined by calculating the total number of students in the "all students" group in the school who took the DSTEP reading and mathematics assessments in 2010 who met the state's criteria for full academic year. The total number of students tested in reading and math were added together. The numerator was divided by the denominator to determine the percent proficient in reading and mathematics, combined, in

the school. This score was used to rank each set of schools from highest to lowest in terms of proficiency of the “all students” group on the DSTEP reading and mathematics assessments combined.

### **Lack of Progress**

Lack of progress was determined to identify schools that are lowest achieving over multiple years. South Dakota computed lack of progress over three years. In order to look at lack of progress, the steps described to determine proficiency as described above were repeated for the DSTEP assessment results for each school. Rankings for three years were added together for a total ranking. This total combined ranking score was utilized to rank each set of schools from highest to lowest in terms of lack of progress.

### **Tier I**

To determine the 5% or 5 lowest achieving schools within this group of Title I schools, proficiency and lack of progress were calculated for each school. Proficiency and lack of progress were added together and rank ordered highest to lowest. The schools were chosen from the bottom 5% or 5 of that ranking. These schools were identified as Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) for this tier. Added to the list would be any Title I high schools that have a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a three year period.

### **Tier II**

Tier II schools are secondary schools eligible, but not receiving, Title I funds. School eligibility for Title I services was determined by each district for the school year. To determine the lowest achieving 5 % or 5 schools within this group of schools, proficiency and lack of progress were calculated for each school. Proficiency and lack of progress were added together and rank ordered highest to lowest. The schools were chosen from the bottom 5% or 5 of that ranking. These schools were identified as Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) for this tier. At this point, schools with less than ten students tested (consistent with the state’s minimum “n” of 10 as per waiver 2) were excluded from the full list to protect personally identifiable information for individual students in these small schools. The schools at the bottom of that proficiency ranking were noted. Added to the list would be any eligible, but not participating, Title I high schools that have a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a three year period.

### **Tier III**

Five percent or 5 Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring were identified as Tier I schools. The remaining are listed as Tier III schools. In addition, the state included in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest achieving schools in accordance with the n-size waiver. Also included in the Tier III list are Tier III schools receiving FY 2009 grants. These schools may only apply for FY 2010 funds if applying for one of the intervention models, in which case the FY 2009 grant will be rescinded.



South Dakota  
PLA (Persistently Low-Achieving) Schools 2010

Tier I

District	School
Shannon County 65-1	Shannon County Alternative
Smee 15-3	Wakpala High School
Todd County 66-1	He Dog School
Todd County 66-1	Spring Creek School
Todd County 66-1	Todd County High School

Tier II

District	School
Canistota 43-1	Canistota High School
Faith 46-2	Faith High School
Grant-Deuel 25-3	Grant-Deuel High School
Iroquois 02-3	Iroquois High School
Sioux Falls 49-5	Joe Foss School
Stanley County 57-1	Stanley County High School
Waubay	Waubay HS

Excluded from Tier II List

District	School	Reason for Exclusion
Bison 52-1	Bison High School	Less than ten tested students 2010
Lead-Deadwood 40-1	Lead-Deadwood Career & Te	GED Prep School
Redfield 56-4	Redfield GSM Alternative	Less than ten tested students 2010
Roslyn 18-2	Roslyn Hi Sch	School Closed
Sioux Falls 49-5	FLEX	Less than ten tested students 2010
Sioux Falls 49-5	Structured Teaching Program	Less than ten tested students 2010
Sioux Falls 49-5	Success Academy	Less than ten tested students 2010

Tier III

District	School
Andes Central 11-1	Andes Central Elementary*
Belle Fourche 09-1	Belle Fourche MS
Bennett County 03-1	Bennett County Jr High
Bennett County 03-1	Martin Elem
Chamberlain 07-1	Chamberlain Middle School
Eagle Butte 20-1	C-EB Upper Elementary
Eagle Butte 20-1	Eagle Butte Elementary
Hitchcock-Tulare 56-6	Glendale Colony Elem
Huron 02-2	Huron Middle School
Ipswich Public 22-6	Rosette Colony Elem
Kadoka Area 35-2	Kadoka Elementary School
McLaughlin 15-2	McLaughlin Elementary
McLaughlin 15-2	McLaughlin Jr. High
Mobridge-Pollock 62-6	Freeman Davis Elem
Mobridge-Pollock 62-6	General Beadle Elementary
Mobridge-Pollock 62-6	Mobridge Middle School
Oelrichs 23-3	Oelrichs Elem
Oelrichs 23-3	Oelrichs Jr Hi
Rapid City 51-4	General Beadle Elementary*
Rapid City 51-4	Horace Mann Elementary*
Rapid City 51-4	Knollwood Heights Elem*
Rapid City 51-4	North Middle Sch
Rapid City 51-4	Valley View Elementary*
Redfield 56-4	Redfield GSM Alternative**
Shannon County 65-1	Batesland Elementary
Shannon County 65-1	Red Shirt Table Elementary
Shannon County 65-1	Rockyford Lower
Shannon County 65-1	Rockyford Upper
Shannon County 65-1	Wolf Creek Lower
Shannon County 65-1	Wolf Creek Upper
Sioux Falls 49-5	Anne Sullivan Elementary*
Sioux Falls 49-5	Cleveland Elementary*
Sioux Falls 49-5	FLEX Secondary**
Sioux Falls 49-5	Garfield Elementary*
Sioux Falls 49-5	Hawthorne Elementary*
Sioux Falls 49-5	Hayward Elementary*
Sioux Falls 49-5	Laura B. Anderson Elem*
Sioux Falls 49-5	Longfellow Elementary*
Sioux Falls 49-5	Lowell Elementary*
Sioux Falls 49-5	Terry Redlin Elementary*
Sisseton 54-2	Sisseton Middle School
Sisseton 54-2	Sisseton Elementary School
Smee 15-3	Wakpala Elementary*
Todd County 66-1	Littleburg Elementary
Todd County 66-1	North Elementary
Todd County 66-1	O'Kreek Elementary

Todd County 66-1	Rosebud Elementary
Todd County 66-1	South Elementary
Todd County 66-1	Todd County MS
Wagner Community 11-4	Wagner Elementary School
Wagner Community 11-4	Wagner Middle School
Wagner Community 11-4	Wagner Primary School
Watertown 14-4	Watertown High School
White River 47-1	Norris Elementary
White River 47-1	White River Elementary
White River 47-1	White River High School
White River 47-1	White River Middle Sch
Yankton 63-3	Webster Elem

\*Tier III schools receiving an FY 2009 Grant – may only reapply if new application is for one of the intervention models in which case the FY 2009 Grant would be rescinded

\*\*Secondary schools placed in Tier III due to the n-size wavier

**SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS**

<b>LEA NAME</b>	<b>LEA NCES ID #</b>	<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>SCHOOL NCES ID #</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>
Andes Central	4639540	Andes Central Elem	00359			X	
New Underwood	4650670	New Underwood High School	00464		X		
Rapid City	4659820	General Beadle Elem	00536			X	
Rapid City	4659820	Horace Mann Elem	00550			X	
Rapid City	4659820	Knollwood Elem	00539			X	
Rapid City	4659820	Valley View Elem	00969			X	
Sioux Falls	4666270	Anne Sullivan	00770			X	
Sioux Falls	4666270	Axtell Immersion Center	01170	X			
Sioux Falls	4666270	Cleveland Elem	00581			X	
Sioux Falls	4666270	Garfield Elem	00587			X	
Sioux Falls	4666270	Hawthorne Elem	00936			X	
Sioux Falls	4666270	Hayward Elem	00590			X	
Sioux Falls	4666270	Laura B. Anderson Elem	00597			X	
Sioux Falls	4666270	Longfellow Elem	00601			X	
Sioux Falls	4666270	Lowell Elem	00602			X	
Sioux Falls	4666270	Terry Redlin Elem	00579			X	
Smee	4675600	Wakpala Elem	00698			X	
Smee	4675600	Wakpala HS	00699			X	

## SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Belle Fourche 09-1	4605610	Belle Fourche MS	01117			X		
Bennett County 03-1	4606240	Bennett County Jr High	01015			X		
Bennett County 03-1	4606240	Martin Elem	00045			X		
Canistota 43-1	4610320	Canistota High School	00105		X			
Chamberlain 07-1	4612000	Chamberlain Middle School	00889			X		
Eagle Butte 20-1	4620100	C-EB Upper Elementary	00605			X		
Eagle Butte 20-1	4620100	Eagle Butte Elementary	01268			X		
Faith 46-2	4622940	Faith High School	00806		X			
Grant-Deuel 25-3	4629340	Grant-Deuel High School	00236		X			
Hitchcock-Tulare 56-6	4600046	Glendale Colony Elem	01166			X		
Huron 02-2	4635480	Huron Middle School	00314			X		
Ipswich Public 22-6	4636060	Rosette Colony Elem	00334			X		
Iroquois 02-3	4636150	Iroquois High School	00339		X			
Kadoka Area 35-2	4680437	Kadoka Elementary School	01249			X		
McLaughlin 15-2	4646380	McLaughlin Elementary	00415			X		
McLaughlin 15-2	4646380	McLaughlin Jr. High	00922			X		
Mobridge-Pollock 62-6	4680441	Freeman Davis Elem	00486			X		
Mobridge-Pollock 62-6	4680441	General Beadle Elementary	00493			X		
Mobridge-Pollock 62-6	4680441	Mobridge Middle School	00450			X		
Oelrichs 23-3	4652770	Oelrichs Elem	00481			X		
Oelrichs 23-3	4652770	Oelrichs Jr Hi	00608			X		
Rapid City 51-4	4659820	North Middle Sch	00532			X		
Shannon County 65-1	4665460	Batesland Elementary	00573			X		
Shannon County 65-1	4665460	Red Shirt Table Elementar	00575			X		
Shannon County 65-1	4665460	Rockyford Lower	00576			X		
Shannon County 65-1	4665460	Rockyford Upper	01264			X		
Shannon County 65-1	4665460	Shannon County Alternativ	01273	X				
Shannon County 65-1	4665460	Wolf Creek Lower	00574			X		
Shannon County 65-1	4665460	Wolf Creek Upper	01265			X		
Sioux Falls 49-5	4666270	Joe Foss School	00077		X			
Sisseton 54-2	4600053	Sisseton Middle School	01258			X		
Sisseton 54-2	4600053	Sisseton Elementary Schoo	01241			X		
Smee 15-3	4675600	Wakpala HS	00699	X				

Stanley County 57-1	4624850	Stanley County High School	00217		X			
Todd County 66-1	4672090	He Dog School	00669	X				
Todd County 66-1	4672090	Littleburg Elementary	00506			X		
Todd County 66-1	4672090	North Elementary	00871			X		
Todd County 66-1	4672090	O'Kreek Elementary	00509			X		
Todd County 66-1	4672090	Rosebud Elementary	00675			X		
Todd County 66-1	4672090	South Elementary	01041			X		
Todd County 66-1	4672090	Spring Creek School	00677	X				
Todd County 66-1	4672090	Todd County High School	00678	X				
Todd County 66-1	4672090	Todd County MS	00814			X		
Wagner Community 11-4	4675420	Wagner Elementary School	00694			X		
Wagner Community 11-4	4675420	Wagner Middle School	00942			X		
Wagner Community 11-4	4675420	Wagner Primary School	01278			X		
Watertown 14-4	4676620	Watertown High School	00717			X		
Waubay 18-3	4676680	Waubay Hi Sch	00720		X			
White River 47-1	4678570	Norris Elementary	00749			X		
White River 47-1	4678570	White River Elementary	00753			X		
White River 47-1	4678570	White River High School	00754			X		
White River 47-1	4678570	White River Middle Sch	00951			X		
Yankton 63-3	4680430	Webster Elem	01009			X		

**Excluded from Tier II List**

Bison 52-1	4607050	Bison High School	00055	Less than ten tested students 2010
Lead-Deadwood 40-1	4641300	Lead-Deadwood Career & Te	01145	GED Prep School
Redfield 56-4	4660450	Redfield GSM Alternative	01102	Less than ten tested students 2010
Roslyn 18-2	4663400	Roslyn Hi Sch	00561	School Closed
Sioux Falls 49-5	4666270	FLEX	01123	Less than ten tested students 2010
Sioux Falls 49-5	4666270	Structured Teaching Progr	01138	Less than ten tested students 2010
Sioux Falls 49-5	4666270	Success Academy	01121	Less than ten tested students 2010



**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**  
?

**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:		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:	
<b>I certify that the program person identified above is authorized to act on behalf of the institution with regard to the School Improvement Grants.</b>  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:	_____ <b>Signature of authorized SD DOE staff person</b>

**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](mailto:Kristine.Harms@state.sd.us)

[Beth.Schiltz@state.sd.us](mailto:Beth.Schiltz@state.sd.us)

For fiscal questions:

Rob Huffman (773-4600)

Paul Schreiner (773-7108)

[Robyn.Huffman@state.sd.us](mailto:Robyn.Huffman@state.sd.us)

[Paul.Schreiner@state.sd.us](mailto: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) (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.*
  - 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 Retreat<sup>SM</sup> 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 application availability 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)** (Tier I & II) The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

- a. Describe the LEA's capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application. *What capacity does the district have to execute and support a turnaround or transformational model? Will the district contract with any person or organization to assist with the implementation of the turnaround or transformational model? What resources does the district have in terms of staffing, funding, support, partnerships, etc. that will assist the district in successfully implementing the chosen interventions? Differentiate what has already taken place and detailed plans for the future.*
- 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.*

**(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.*



- 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, Math Counts, Reading Up, 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)** (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**.*
- (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.*
- (7)** (Tier III) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. *Briefly describe the activities for all Tier III schools served. Specifics of the activities will be provided in each school section.*
- (8)** (Tier III) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds. *List the reading and math annual goals for each of the Tier III schools the district commits to serve. The districts must use the Dakota Step (indicator) to define their measurable goals which are based upon the percent of proficient students. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year.) Other goals should be set that are measurable and specify the indicator (district assessments) that will be used during each of the grant years.*

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

**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.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Example: Professional development conference – New York  
Airfare - \$550  
Registration - \$250  
Meals – 3 days @ \$36 per day = \$108  
Lodging – 2 days @ \$175 = \$350  
Miscellaneous – Cab - \$50

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

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

**Grant Periods:**

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

Personnel:

Employee Benefits:

Travel:

Equipment:

Supplies:

Contractual:

Professional Development:

Indirect Costs

**(Name) 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			
<b>Name of School &amp; Tier</b>					
<b>Name of School &amp; Tier</b>					
<b>Name of School &amp; Tier</b>					
<b>Name of School &amp; Tier</b>					
<b>District - Level Activities</b>					
<b>Total Costs</b>					

\*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.

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT  
SCORING RUBRIC  
LEA APPLICATIONS**

**Reviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_

**District:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Submitted By:** \_\_\_\_\_

**School(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Tier(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Sections</b>	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(1) (Tier I, II and III) Descriptive Information</b>  a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome. b. Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) designed for the purpose of the SIG application. c. Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment. d. Broadly describe the results of the review. (Summarize the results of the CNA for each school.) e. List the strengths and weaknesses for each school based on the results of the CNA. f. Provide the rationale the district used to determine which schools to serve with SIG funds and which schools not to serve.	a.	a.	a.
	b.	b.	b.
	c.	c.	c.
	d.	d.	d.
	e.	e.	e.
	f.	f.	f.

**1. Descriptive Information Comments:**

Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(2) (Tier I and II) LEA Capacity – resources available for implementation of selected model.</b> a. Describe the LEA’s capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application. b. Describe district administrative oversight.	a.	a.	a.
	b.	b.	b.
<b>2. LEA Capacity Comments:</b>			



Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 Points assigned for each component)
<b>(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.</b>			
<b>3. Lacks Capacity Comments:</b>			
<b>(4) (Tier I and II) Rationale for the selection of an intervention model.</b> a. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. b. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. c. Align other resources with the interventions. d. Modify its practice or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. e. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.	a.	a.	a.
	b.	b.	b.
	c.	c.	c.
	d.	d.	d.
	e.	e.	e.
<b>4. Rationale Comments:</b>			

Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(5) (Tier I and II) 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 application</b>			
<b>5. Timeline Comments:</b>			
<b>(6) (Tier I and 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 receives school improvement funds.</b>			
<b>6. Annual Goals Comments:</b>			

Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 points assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(7) (Tier III) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement</b>			
<b>7. Tier III Schools Comments:</b>			
<b>(8) (Tier III) The LEA must describe the goals it has established in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.</b>			
<b>8. Tier III Schools Comments:</b>			

Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(9) (Tier I and 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.</b>			
<b>9. Stakeholder Comments:</b>			

**Budget Narrative and Proposed Budget**

<p><b>Sections</b></p>	<p><b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)</p>	<p><b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)</p>	<p><b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)</p>
<p>(Tier I, II and III) A budget narrative has been completed in the format requested in the application.</p>			
<p>(Tier I, II, and III) The LEA has requested sufficient funds to fully implement interventions selected for each school.</p>			
<p>(Tier I, II and III) Signed budget by the <b>Business Manager and the Superintendent</b> is provided.</p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>			

**Approvals**

Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(Tier I, II and III) LEA School Board, Superintendent, and Principal have signed off on the proposal.</b>			
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Total Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

*[A value in any column other than the Strong column will require a revision before the grant can be awarded.]*

**Possible Points**

Districts with just Tier I schools - 42 possible points  
 Districts with just Tier II schools - 40 possible points  
 Districts with just Tier III schools – points may vary depending on application and interventions

Districts with Tier I & II schools - 42 possible points  
 Districts with Tier I & III schools – 46 possible points  
 Districts with Tier II & III schools - 44 possible points  
 Districts with schools in all 3 Tiers - 46 possible points

*Applications will be ranked according to percent of possible points*

# School Improvement Grants

## School Level Section Tiers I, II, and III

<b>Name of School:</b>					Grades Served:		
TIER I	TIER II	INTERVENTION				Tier III	Intervention
		turnaround	restart	closure	transformation		

### DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

(1) (Tier I, II, & III) The LEA has analyzed the needs of the school and selected an intervention for the school.

- 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 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.*
- Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the school's comprehensive needs assessment designed for the purpose of the SIG application. *Your answer must address data within the four lenses of the Data Retreat<sup>SM</sup> 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.*
- Describe the process used to complete the school'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.*
- Broadly describe the results of that review. *Summarize the results of the CNA for this school.*
- List the strengths and weaknesses for this school based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment. *These should be brief statements or phrases. Prioritize the areas that will be addressed with SIG funds.*
- Provide the rationale used to commit to serve this school with SIG funds. *Why is this school served?*

(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. *Describe the district's capacity to implement the selected intervention model. Indicate resources available to the district such as human capital, funding sources, partnerships, etc. that ensure the district's capacity to implement the chosen model for this school. Differentiate what has already taken place and detailed plans for the future.*

- (3) (Tier I & II - mandatory; Tier III - optional) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. *Indicate the process used up to this point for selection of external providers. Provide a detailed plan for this process in the future. Who will be involved in the selection procedure? What criteria have been set?*
- (4) (Tier I & II - mandatory; Tier III - optional) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Check the intervention model and answer the questions pertaining to the intervention model chosen for this Tier I or II school. If this is a Tier III school, complete if using one of the four intervention models or skip to question #7.

\*\*\*\*\*

## The Turnaround Model

### *Section I.A.2(a)*

- a. Describe the process the district will use to replace the principal and the operational flexibility the new principal will be given. [Section I.A.2(a)(i)]
- *When will the contract with the current principal end?*
  - *What criteria will be used in selecting a new principal?*
  - *What is the process that will be used to select the new principal?*
  - *Who will be involved in the decision making?*
  - *When will the process take place? If the principal has been replaced recently, describe the circumstances and process.*
  - *How will the principal be Included in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting?*
  - *How will this flexibility help the new principal implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates?*
- b. Describe the process the district will use to replace staff and refresh the teacher pool for this school. [Section I.A.2(a)(ii)]
- *What locally adopted competencies will be used to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment?*
  - *What is the district's definition of "staff"? Does this include both teachers and paraprofessionals?*
  - *How will the district screen all existing staff?*
  - *What is the process for determining which staff remains in the school? No more than 50 percent of existing staff can be rehired. What is the current pool of teachers and paras? Determine the 50% threshold of staff in each category that can be rehired.*



- *How will new staff be selected? Describe criteria used to determine the most effective staff. Describe criteria used in selecting/hiring effective staff.*
- c. What strategies are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school? [Section I.A.2(a)(ii)] *(Examples include: financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions.)*
- d. How will the district provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development?
  - *List resources available to new staff.*
  - *Will there be a mentoring program or literacy and/or math coaches available?*
  - *How will the professional development be aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program?*
  - *Indicate how the professional development will be designed in collaboration with school staff.*
- e. Describe the new governance structure that will be adopted for this school.
  - *The structure may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the district, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent.*
  - *What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) will be provided to the school?*
  - *What changes in operational practices will be made?*
- f. Describe how an instructional program will be determined and designed.
  - *What data will be used to identify the instructional program to be used? How will it be used?*
  - *How will the school ensure that the instructional program is research-based?*
  - *How will vertical alignment from one grade to the next be determined and ensured?*
  - *How will the school ensure alignment with State academic standards?*
- g. Describe the process the school will use to promote the continuous use of student data.
  - *Indicate the use of student data such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments.*
  - *How will student data be used to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students?*
- h. Describe how the school will increase learning time.
  - *Indicate how learning time will be increased such as using a longer school day, week, or year schedule.*
  - *Describe the current learning time and the amount of time to be added to significantly increase the total number of school hours (a minimum of 300 additional hours per school year is supported by research) .*
  - *Indicate what the additional time will be used for (a) instruction in core academic subjects (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded*

*education, and/or (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.*

- *If extended learning time also includes a before- or after-school instructional program, indicate how the program will be available to all students in the school and provided at a time when most students would be able to participate.*

i. How will the school provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students?

- *Describe how the needs of students in this school were analyzed to determine which social-emotional and community-oriented services will be appropriate and useful under the circumstances.*
- *Indicate services offered to students such as: include health, nutrition, or social services that may be provided in partnership with local service providers.*
- *Indicate other services that may be offered such as a family literacy program for parents who need to improve their literacy skills in order to support their children's learning.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **The Restart Model**

### *Section I.A.2(b)*

a. Describe the rigorous review process the district undertook to select a partner to restart the school.

- *Are there qualified charter management organizations (CMOs) or education management organizations (EMOs) willing to partner with the district to start a new school (or convert an existing school) in this location? Describe possible partnerships.*
- *How will the new school operation result in acceptable student growth for the student population to be served?*
- *How will support be provided to staff that are reassigned to other schools as a result of the restart?*
- *What performance expectations will be contractually specified for the restart partner?*
- *Is the LEA prepared to terminate the contract if performance expectations are not met?*

b. How will the district ensure that the new school will enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school?

c. How will funds from this grant be used to support the restart model?

\*\*\*\*\*

☐ **School Closure Model**

*Section I.A.2(c)*

- a. Describe the process the district used to determine to close this school.
  - *How were decisions based on data? How is this transparent to the school and local community?*
  - *What is the impact of school closure to the school’s neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?*
  - *How does school closure fit within the LEA’s overall reform efforts?*
  
- b. Which higher-achieving schools have been identified that have the capacity to receive students from this school?
  - *Indicate that these schools are in close proximity of the school to be closed.*
  - *How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?*
  - *How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?*
  - *How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?*

\*\*\*\*\*

☐ **The Transformation Model**

*Section I.A.2(d)*

**Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.** [Section I.A.2(d)(1)]

- a. Describe the process the district will use to replace the principal. [Section I.A.2(d)(1)(i)(A)]
  - *When will the contract with the current principal end?*
  - *What criteria will be used in selecting a new principal?*
  - *What is the process that will be used to select the new principal?*
  - *Who will be involved in the decision making?*
  - *When will the process take place? If the principal has been replaced recently, describe the circumstances and process.*
  
- b. Describe how the school will use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals. [Section I.A.2(d)(1)(i)(B)]
  - *How will data on student growth be a significant factor in the evaluation system?*
  - *What other factors will be used (multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates)?*
  - *How will the school define student growth in accordance with definitions related to this notice (the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time)? For grades 3-8 and 11, student growth data must be based on student scores on the Dakota STEP.*
  - *Are the evaluation systems designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement?*

- *How will the district identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates?*
  - *How will the district identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so?*
  - *How will the district provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction)?*
  - *How will the school ensure that the professional development is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program?*
  - *How will the school ensure that the professional development is designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies?*
  - *What strategies are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school? [Section I.A.2(a)(ii)] (Examples include: financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions).*
- c. Describe any optional activity the school chooses to implement to develop teacher and school leader effectiveness.

**Comprehensive instructional reform strategies**

- d. Describe how an instructional program will be determined and designed.
- *What data will be used to identify the instructional program to be used? How will it be used?*
  - *How will the school ensure that the instructional program is research-based?*
  - *How will vertical alignment from one grade to the next be determined and ensured?*
  - *How will the school ensure alignment with State academic standards?*
- e. Describe the process the school will use to promote the continuous use of student data.
- *Indicate the use of student data such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments.*
  - *How will student data be used to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students?*
- f. Describe any optional instructional reform strategy the school chooses to implement.

**Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools**

- g. Describe how the school will increase learning time.
- *Indicate how learning time will be increased such as using a longer school day, week, or year schedule.*
  - *Describe the current learning time and the amount of time to be added to significantly increase the total number of school hours (a minimum of 300 additional hours per school year is supported by research).*
  - *Indicate what the additional time will be used for (a) instruction in core academic subjects (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded*

*education,, and/or (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.*

- *If extended learning time also includes a before- or after-school instructional program, indicate how the program will be available to all students in the school and provided at a time when most students would be able to participate.*

h. How will the school provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students?

- *Describe how the needs of students in this school were analyzed to determine which social-emotional and community-oriented services will be appropriate and useful under the circumstances.*
- *Indicate services offered to students such as: include health, nutrition, or social services that may be provided in partnership with local service providers.*
- *Indicate other services that may be offered such as a family literacy program for parents who need to improve their literacy skills in order to support their children’s learning.*

Providing operational flexibility and sustained support

i. Describe the operational flexibility that will be given to this school.

- *What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) will be provided to the school?*
- *What changes in operational practices will be made?*
- *How will these changes lead to substantial improvement in student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates?*

j. Describe the ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support that will be provided to the school.

- *Who will provide the assistance (the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization)?*
- *What kind of support will be provided and how often?*

k. Describe any other optional strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support.

\*\*\*\*\*

(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.

- Describe the timeline that addresses the steps the district will take for this school, if it is a Tier I or II school. *Indicate major events and benchmarks for this school over the three year implementation time period, unless a shorter time period is needed and reflected in the budget as well.*

(6) (Tier I, II, & III) 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, Tier II and Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds. The LEA should also describe the other measurable goals that are set to show student progress.

► List the reading and math annual goals for this Tier I, II or III school, if applicable. *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.*

- (7) (Tier III) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. *Describe in detail how the SIG funds will be used to improve academic achievement in this school, if it is a Tier III school. Indicate how these activities are designed to meet the specific needs of this school, its teachers, and its students.*
- (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. Identify the stakeholders for this school and describe the consultation that took place. *Describe consultation with school administration, teachers and other staff, and parents and community members. Indicate when and how the consultation took place within the timeframe while developing the LEA and school application for SIG funds.*

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

#### **Budget categories for consideration in required budget narrative.**

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

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 digital cameras, DVD

players, laptop computers and desktop computers. The grantee will be expected to maintain an equipment inventory list.

Examples: Desktop computers - 3 @ \$1200 = \$3600  
Laptop computer -1 @ \$900 = \$900

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

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

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

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

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

Example: Professional development conference – New York  
Airfare - \$550  
Registration - \$250  
Meals – 3 days @ \$36 per day = \$108  
Lodging – 2 days @ \$175 = \$350  
Miscellaneous – Cab - \$50

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

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

**Grant Periods:**

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

**Budget Information**  
**American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)**  
**Title I School Improvement 1003(g)**

Name of School:

**Budget Summary**

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/11-6/30/12 (a)		** Project Year 2 7/01/12-6/30/13 (b)	** Project Year 3 7/1/13-6/30-14 (c)	Project Total (f)
	Pre- implementation	Year I - Full Implementation			
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)

\*\* Contingent upon continued federal funding



**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS  
SCORING RUBRIC  
SCHOOL LEVEL (TIER I & II) REVIEW**

**Reviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_

**District:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Submitted By:** \_\_\_\_\_

**School:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Tier:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Sections</b>	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(1) Descriptive Information</b>  a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined outcomes. b. Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) designed for the purpose of the SIG application. c. Describe the process used to complete the district's CNA conducted for the purpose of the SIG application. d. Broadly describe the results of the review - summarize the results of the CNA for this school. e. List the strengths and weaknesses for this school based on the results of the CNA. f. Provide the rationale the district used to commit to serve this school with SIG funds.	a.	a.	a.
	b.	b.	b.
	c.	c.	c.
	d.	d.	d.
	e.	e.	e.
	f.	f.	f.

**(1) Descriptive Information Comments**

<b>Sections</b>	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(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 selected school intervention model.</b>			
<b>(2) LEA Capacity Comments:</b>			

Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.</b>			
<b>(3) Selection of External Provider(s) Comments:</b>			
<b>(4) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Select the intervention model chosen for this Tier I or Tier II school.</b>			
<b>(4) Intervention Model Selection Comments:</b>			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Sections</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)</p>
<p><b>(A) The Turnaround Model</b> <i>[Section I.A.2(a)]</i></p>			
<p>a) Describe the process the district will use to replace the principal and the operational flexibility the new principal will be given.</p> <p>b) Describe the process the district will use to replace staff and refresh the teacher pool for this school.</p> <p>c) What strategies are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school?</p> <p>d) How will the district provide staff on-going, high quality job-embedded professional development?</p> <p>e) Describe the new governance structure that will be adopted for this school.</p> <p>f) Describe how an instructional program will be determined and designed.</p> <p>g) Describe the process the district will use to promote the continuous use of student data.</p> <p>h) Describe how the district will increase learning time.</p> <p>i) How will the school provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students?</p>	a.	a	a
	b	b	b
	c	c	c
	d	d	d
	e	e	e
	f	f	f
	g	g	g
	h	h	h
	i	i	i

**(A) Turnaround Model Comments:**

Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(B) The Restart Model</b> [ <i>Section I.A.2 (b)</i> ]			
a) Describe the rigorous review process the district undertook to select a partner to restart the school. b) How will the district ensure that the new school will enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school? c) How will funds from this grant be used to support the restart model?	a	a	a
	b	b	b
	c	c	c
<b>(B) Restart Model Comments:</b>			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Sections</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)</p>
<p><b>(C) School Closure Model</b> [<i>Section I.A.2 (c)</i>]</p>			
<p>a) Describe the process the district used to determine to close this school.</p>	<p>a</p>	<p>a</p>	<p>a</p>
<p>b) Which higher achieving schools have been identified that have the capacity to receive students from this school?</p>	<p>b</p>	<p>b</p>	<p>b.</p>
<p><b>(C) School Closure Comments:</b></p>			

Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(D) The Transformational Model</b> <i>[Section I.A.2(d)]</i>			
a) Describe the process the district will use to replace the principal. b) Describe how the district will use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals. c) Describe any optional activity the LEA chooses to implement to develop teacher and school leader effectiveness. d) Describe how an instructional program will be determined and designed. e) Describe the process the district will use to promote the continuous use of student data. f) Describe any optional instructional reform strategy the LEA chooses to implement. g) Describe how the district will increase learning time. h) How will the school provide appropriate social-emotional and community oriented serves and supports for students? i) Describe the operational flexibility that will be given to this school. j) Describe the ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support that will be provided to the school k) Describe any other optional strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support.	a. b. c. d. e. f. g. h i. j k.	a b c. d e f g h i. j k.	a b. c d e. f. g. h i. j k.



**(D) Transformational Model Comments:**

Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(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 application</b>			
<b>(5) Timeline Comments:</b>			
<b>(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, II, and III schools that receives school improvement funds.</b>			
<b>(6) Annual Goals Comments:</b>			

**Question (7) is a Tier III school only question and is not application for these applications.**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Sections</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)</p>
<p><b>(8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools. Identify the stakeholders for this school and describe the consultation that took place.</b></p>			
<p><b>(8) Consultation Comments:</b></p>			

**Budget Narrative and Proposed Budget**

<p><b>Sections</b></p>	<p><b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)</p>	<p><b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)</p>	<p><b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)</p>
<p>A budget narrative has been completed in the format requested in the application.</p>			
<p>The LEA has requested sufficient funds to fully implement interventions selected for each school.</p>			
<p>Signed budget by the <b>Business Manager and the Superintendent</b> is provided.</p>			
<p>Comments:</p>			

**Approvals**

Sections	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>LEA School Board, Superintendent, and Principal have signed off on the proposal.</b>			
Comments:			

**Total Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

*[A value in any column other than the Strong column will require a revision before the grant can be awarded.]*

**Possible Points**

32 possible points - General Section (all applications must have, plus points from one of the models)

18 possible points - Turnaround Model

6 possible points - Restart Model

4 possible points - Closure Model

22 possible points - Transformational Model

*Applications will be ranked according to percentage of possible points.*

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT  
SCORING RUBRIC  
TIER III OTHER MODEL APPLICATIONS**

**Reviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_

**District:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Submitted By:** \_\_\_\_\_

**School:** \_\_\_\_\_

Some questions do not appear in this rubric as they do not pertain to Tier III applicants.

<b>Sections</b>	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(1) Descriptive Information</b>  a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined outcomes. b. Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district’s comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) designed for the purpose of the SIG application. c. Describe the process used to complete the district’s CNA conducted for the purpose of the SIG application. d. Broadly describe the results of the review summarize the results of the CNA for this school. e. List the strengths and weaknesses for this school based on the results of the CNA. f. Provide the rationale the district used to commit to serve this school with SIG funds.	a.	a.	a.
	b.	b.	b.
	c.	c.	c.
	d.	d.	d.
	e.	e.	e.
	f.	f.	f.

**(1) Descriptive Information Comments:**

<b>Sections</b>	<b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)	<b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)	<b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)
<b>(3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality</b>			
<b>(3) Selection of External Providers Comments:</b>			
<b>(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, II, and III schools that receives school improvement funds. (must include both reading and math and must be measurable using Dakota STEP)</b>			
<b>(6) Annual Goals Comments:</b>			

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Sections</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)</p>
<b>(7) Other Model</b>			
<p>a. Detail description of how the SIG funds will be used to improve academic achievement in the school.</p> <p>b. Indicate how these activities are designed to meet the specific needs of the school, its teachers and its students.</p>	a.	a.	a.
	b.	b.	b.
<b>(7) Other Model Comments:</b>			



**Budget Narrative and Proposed Budget**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Sections</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)</p>
<p>A budget narrative has been completed in the format requested in the application.</p>			
<p>The LEA has requested sufficient funds to fully implement interventions selected for each school.</p>			
<p>Signed budget by the <b>Business Manager</b> <i>and</i> the <b>Superintendent</b> is provided.</p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>			

**Approvals**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Sections</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Strong</b> Responses were thorough with sufficient detail (2 points assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Moderate</b> Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications (1 point assigned for each component)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Limited</b> Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given (0 points assigned for each component)</p>
<p><b>LEA School Board, Superintendent, and Principal have signed off on the proposal.</b></p>			
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>			

**Total Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

*[A value in any column other than the Strong column will require a revision before the grant can be awarded.]*

**Possible Points** - 28 possible points

*Applicants will be ranked according to percent of possible points*

## Comments for waivers South Dakota is apply

**Waiver #2:** N-size Waiver: In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the "all students" group in the grades assessed is less than 10.

- We are a small school and do have some grades with less than 10 student. I agree with this waiver
- Agree with the State's position and request for waiver.
- Yes, apply for this.
- The size of 10 should not be used. This is not enough children to make a determination--this should be waived.
- It costs more to educate the students when smaller number of students exist, therefore it makes sense to waive the groups that are less than 10.
- I agree with this waiver.
- The state should apply for this waiver. While I do not know the number of schools this would affect, it makes sense that this size of group is statistically so small that one student may be the reason the school is persistently low achieving--and you cannot generalize from one student that the school itself is the problem.
- Agree that schools with low N size be removed from the list of persistently low achieving schools Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III.
- This will allow very small school to be excluded. I agree with this because the small numbers will skew the data.
- some country schools may have less than 10 students and could probably use some help if they are low-achieving.
- Yes, I think that would be good to do that
- Agree

**Waiver #4:** School Improvement Timeline Waiver: Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit districts to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011-2012 school year a "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

- I agree with this waiver because it will take time for a new model to become effective
- Agree with the State's position and request for waiver.
- Yes, apply for this.
- Should be waived.
- This should be waved as it brings with it new funding sources to enhance student achievement.
- This is a good idea. Implementing one of these models should allow the school to restart the school improvement timeline.
- It makes sense to allow schools to start over in the school improvement timeline--although I do have concerns that allowing schools to start over may be erroneously used as "proof" that the Turnaround process itself was responsible for the school showing up as having improved.
- Agree
- Great!
- Good idea!
- Yes
- Agree

**Waiver #6:** Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver: Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the state and all of its districts to September 30, 2014.

- Agree with the State's position and request for waiver.
- Yes, apply for this.
- Because of the dollars that came in to the state his waiver should occur. Prudent spending will occur if there is more time to make these important decisions over a longer period of time.
- We support the additional use of carryover funds as it only serves to enhance the abilities of schools to meet the needs of its students.
- This waiver would be very helpful. I am in favor of extending the carryover availability as stated above.
- This waiver is necessary to ensure that schools will have funds available for a long enough period of time to bring about the degree of change needed.
- Agree
- This will allow schools to work on long term solutions.
- Good idea!
- Yes, I think they should be able to carryover funds that have not been used.
- agree

# COP (Committee of Practitioners) and Stakeholders - SIG Grant Live Meeting (Webinar)

**When: Wednesday, Dec 1, 2010 9:30 AM (CST)**

Beth Schiltz has invited you to attend an online meeting using Live Meeting.

[Join the meeting.](#)

## Audio Information

### Telephone conferencing

Choose one of the following:

- Start Live Meeting client, and then in Voice & Video pane under Join Audio options, click Call Me. The conferencing service will call you at the number you specify. (Recommended)
- Use the information below to connect:  
Toll-free: +1 (866) 410-8397  
Participant code: 6057734716

## First Time Users:

To save time before the meeting, [check your system](#) to make sure it is ready to use Microsoft Office Live Meeting.

## Troubleshooting

Unable to join the meeting? Follow these steps:

1. Copy this address and paste it into your web browser:  
<https://www.livemeeting.com/cc/stateofsd1/join>
2. Copy and paste the required information:  
Meeting ID: DFCK23  
Location:

## Notice

Microsoft Office Live Meeting can be used to record meetings. By participating in this meeting, you agree that your communications may be monitored or recorded at any time during the meeting.

## Public Notification of Meeting

The link to the public notification of the meeting for input into the state SIG application

<http://doe.sd.gov/oess/cop.asp>

- Dec. 2010 Agenda