

School Improvement Grants

Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

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, 2016

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. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

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 five 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 five 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). 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.

ESEA Flexibility

An SEA that has received ESEA flexibility no longer identifies Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; instead, it identifies priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools. Accordingly, if it chooses, an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request may select the "**priority schools list waiver**" in Section H of the SEA application for SIG funds. This waiver permits the SEA to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools.

Through its approved ESEA flexibility request, an SEA has already received a waiver that permits its LEAs to apply for SIG funds to serve priority schools that are not otherwise eligible to receive SIG funds because they are not identified as Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The waiver offered in this application goes beyond this previously granted waiver to permit the SEA to actually use its priority schools list as its SIG list. An additional waiver offered will allow the SEA to add its focus schools list to the SIG list.

Availability of Funds

The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, provided \$506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2013.

FY 2013 SIG funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2015.

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 SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2013 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2013 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 SIG 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.

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 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

This application is for use only by SEAs that will make new awards. New awards are defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New three-year awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any unobligated SIG funds from previous competitions not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

The Department will require those SEAs that will use FY 2013 funds solely for continuation awards to submit a SIG application. However, those SEAs using FY 2013 funds solely for continuation purposes are only required to complete the Continuation Awards Only Application for FY 2013 School Improvement Grants Program located at the end of this application.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2013 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to OESE.OST@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, Group Leader
Office of School Turnaround
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 November 22, 2013.

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.

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: Shannon Malone Position and Office: Title I Administrator, Office of Title I Contact's Mailing Address: 800 Governors Drive Pierre, SD 57501 Telephone: 605-773-6509 Fax: 605-773-3782 Email address: shannon.malone@state.sd.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Melody Schopp	Telephone: 605-773-5669
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X	Date: 11/21/2013
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Part 1 (Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools): Not applicable as South Dakota is requesting Priority School List Waiver and the Focus School List Waiver.

Part 2 (Eligible Schools List): Please see attached excel spreadsheet of eligible schools.

Part 3 (Terminated Awards): South Dakota does not have any awards to terminate.

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

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:

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. 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.

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

The LEA application asks the district to explain its comprehensive needs assessment process it conducted to determine which of its priority and focus 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 RetreatSM process: Student, Professional Practices, Programs & Structures, and Family & Community Data (consistent with current SEA requirements). An evaluation of current practices and programs is required in the third lens of data review.

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. 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 priority 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. 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 priority school identified in the LEA’s application 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 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.***

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 included in the LEA application.

- (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. LEA application 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:

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA’s proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² 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.

(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?

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.

² “Pre-implementation” enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014–2015 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

C. TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

LEA applications will undergo review by a panel with facilitation. 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: Responses were attempted but lacking specificity

Not Evident: No response was given or response was unclear and lacked many details and evidence

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. 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, 2014. Districts receiving grant awards may begin pre-implementation immediately, but no later than July 1, 2014.

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

(1) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its priority schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more priority schools, in an LEA that is not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

The LEA will describe the process for reviewing the schools goals for student achievement for each of its priority and focus schools. Each school in the school application will state the reading and math annual goals, which must be measurable and specify the indicator (district assessment for 2014-15, Smarter Balanced Assessment for 2015-16 and 2016-17) that will be used during each of the grant years. The application review panel will determine if the goals are challenging and reasonable.

LEAs will submit data annually for each priority and focus school. SD DOE staff will be convened to assess each school’s progress towards meeting their goals. If one or more of the district’s priority and focus 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. SD DOE staff will make a recommendation as to continue the grant or not. 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.

The SEA will monitor data relating to the achievement indicators and leading indicators (examples include school year minutes, teacher attendance rate, increased learning time, etc.). Some of this data can be found within our longitudinal data system and through ED Facts. Remaining data not found in these systems will be collected by contacting the schools individually. All data will be reported to US Department of Education. The SD DOE will analyze the data as part of the review process (both in January and May) to determine if goals are met and progress is being made.

(2) 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. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

Not applicable as we are using our priority and focus school list.

(3) 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 priority 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. Concerns will be addressed in a timely manner in order to keep implementation on track and address issues that might arise. Periodic on-site visits will take place as needed, but at least once each year. During these on-site visits, DOE staff will visit with the principal and leadership team and review the grant requirements and the strategies implemented as indicated in the school's application. This visit is an informal visit and a chance for the DOE and school administration to discuss the schools' interventions, progress, and any questions/concerns that the school or DOE may have.

School Support Team (SST) members are assigned to all our priority and focus schools and will provide technical assistance and support. The SST members will be the main point of contact for the school throughout the year and are required to meet with their assigned school monthly. The SSTs attend DOE data analysis sessions to review data and SD LEAP information for the schools.

DOE Title I staff will formally assess implementation and effectiveness of the grant two times a year; once mid-year around January and once at the end of the year in May. At the mid-year review, DOE will review the Goals and Objectives the school has created and monitor the progress (See **Appendix A**). The federal requirements of the intervention model the school chose to implement will be reviewed within SD LEAP (Indistar) through the indicators of effective practice (examples include indicators regarding increased learning time, strong leadership, family and community engagement, curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and teacher effectiveness). At the end of the school year, DOE will send out a survey to be completed by the principal (See **Appendix B**). This survey will be reviewed by DOE staff and feedback will be provided as needed to the schools. Additional content and issue experts will be summoned as needed and appropriate department staff will be asked to participate.

(4) 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 SEA panel reviewing the applications will review all answers and record a score based on a rubric. 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.

(5) Describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

Not applicable as we are using our priority and focus school list.

(6) If the SEA intends to take over any or any priority 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.

(7) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools, and for priority schools indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in

each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

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

³ 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.

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

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 outlined in the final requirements.
- 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 priority and focus school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a priority and focus 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 priority and focus school.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG 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.

The SEA will reserve five percent of its SIG funds for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance. These activities will include providing information on grant requirements to eligible LEAs, reviewing applications, selecting successful grant applicants, monitoring the implementation of approved grant projects, evaluating project outcomes, providing additional assistance as needed, and distributing funds to approved projects.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

By checking this box, the SEA assures that it has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

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.

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 its priority and focus schools.

Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver

In order to enable the State to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority and focus schools that meet the definition of “priority and focus schools” in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility* and that were identified in accordance with its approved request for ESEA flexibility, waive the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the SIG final requirements.

Assurance

The State assures that its methodology for identifying priority and focus schools, approved through its ESEA flexibility request, provides an acceptable alternative methodology for identifying the State’s lowest-performing schools and thus is an appropriate replacement for the eligibility requirements and definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools in the SIG final requirements.

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2013 funds for the purpose of making three-year awards to eligible LEAs.

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2013 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2017.

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

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.

Appendix A- Goals and Objectives Form- Submitted Through SD LEAP

Goals and Objectives Form

SIG Schools- At minimum please complete an academic goal (both math and reading) for improving achievement for all students.

To complete this form:

1. Enter the information for each goal.
2. Select "Repeat" to add additional goals (scroll down to the empty fields to add information regarding the additional goals for all students or subgroups)
3. Click "Save" at the bottom of the form to save responses.
4. To submit the report, return to the dashboard, go to the Required Reports Tab and click the "submit" button next to the Goals and Objectives Form.

Please answer the following questions for each goal:

1. Which area is the goal for:

Math Reading Attendance Graduation Other

2. Which student group does the goal focus on: (Check all that apply to this specific goal)

All Students Economic Disadvantaged Hispanic Native American
 White Two or more races Hawaiian Pacific Asian
 Black Limited English Proficient Special Education

3. Which Grade Level(s)? (Check all that apply to this specific goal)

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 High School

4. What is your Goal? (SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timely)

5. How will the school evaluate whether you have met this goal?

Measurable objective(s) to meet goal	Measurement Tool	Targeted student grades	Fall Benchmark Results- Please give results or explain progress	Winter Progress Check- Please give results or explain progress	Spring Progress Results- Please give results or explain progress

6. List the major strategies being used within the school to accomplish this goal?

Appendix B- End of Year Report- Submitted at the end of the school year

Name of District	
Name of School	
Name of Principal	
<p>What gains in reading has the school shown over the course of this grant year? Please explain measurement tool and the results. *</p> <p>As Smarter Balanced information will not be released this year, what other information is available to provide evidence that gains have occurred from activities implemented through the grant?</p>	
<p>What gains in math has the school shown over the course of this grant year? Please explain measurement tool and the results. *</p> <p>As Smarter Balanced information will not be released this year, what other information is available to provide evidence that gains have occurred from activities implemented through the grant?</p>	
<p>What strategies or interventions were implemented during this school year to help increase academic achievement? *</p>	
<p>Were there any activities that were budgeted in your SIG grant that were not implemented this year?</p> <p>If yes, please explain. If no, skip to next question.</p>	
<p>Do you anticipate using all of your 2013-14 grant allocation by June 30, 2014?</p> <p>If you check no, understand that the funds do not automatically carry over to the next grant year. A Carry-Over Request Form must be completed and approved by SDDOE to carry over requested amounts. The carry-over is not guaranteed and must align with the current SIG program if you choose to apply for carry-over. The form will be emailed to schools.</p>	
<p>Please add any information on how the School Improvement Grant has impacted your school. Explain any significant gains or accomplishments throughout the school, whether it is reading, math, climate, parent engagement, etc.</p>	



south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Learning. Leadership. Service.

School Improvement Grant
LEA (District) Application

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

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, 2017

**FY 2013
School Improvement Grant (SIG)
Cover page**

LEA Name:	LEA Mailing Address:	
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: . Position and Office: Contact's Mailing Address:	Telephone: Fax: Email address:	
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name):		Telephone:
I certify that the program person identified above is authorized to act on behalf of the institution with regard to the School Improvement Grants. X _____ Signature of the LEA Superintendent		Date:
The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.		

ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION STATEMENT: The above named applicant assures the South Dakota Department of Education that these projects will be administered in compliance with the assurances contained in its current consolidated application for the Title I part A program, with state and federal laws and regulations applicable to the use of these funds, that the information contained in this application is accurate and complete.

Name of Authorized Representative (Type or Print):

Original Signature of Authorized Representative:

Date: _____

SD Department of Education use only	
Date Received:	_____ Signature of authorized SD DOE staff person

Guidelines

Purpose of 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 five 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 five 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). 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.

ESEA Flexibility

An SEA that has received ESEA flexibility no longer identifies Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; instead, it identifies priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools. Accordingly, if it chooses, an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request may select the "**priority schools list waiver**" in Section H of the SEA application for SIG funds. This waiver permits the SEA to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools. An additional waiver is in place to add the list focus schools to the SIG list.

Through its approved ESEA flexibility request, an SEA has already received a waiver that permits its LEAs to apply for SIG funds to serve priority schools that are not otherwise eligible to receive SIG funds because they are not identified as Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The waiver offered in this application goes beyond this previously granted waiver to permit the SEA to actually use its priority schools list as its SIG list.

Allocations

Federal requirements set the minimum award for each school at \$50,000 and the maximum award at \$2,000,000 per year.

Under this competition, South Dakota has \$1.37 million in Federal FY 2013 funds available, plus a limited amount of uncommitted funds from previous competitions, to award 3 year projects. Therefore, the maximum combined three year total award amount a school could receive is approximately \$1.4 million. The minimum award amount for each school is \$50,000 per year.

In previous years, South Dakota SIG awards averaged \$175,000 per year per school. SD DOE reserves the right to make awards for less than the amount requested based on what is reasonable and necessary.

Based on Need and Commitment

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 priority or focus schools.

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 priority school that the LEA commits to serve: Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, or Transformational Models.

Four Models

Districts with priority and focus 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 priority or focus schools that currently do not have Tier I or Tier II School Improvement Grants for the 2013-2014 school year.

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:

Pre-implementation	Award Notification – June 30, 2014
Project Year 1:	July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015
Project Year 2:	July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016
Project Year 3:	July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017

The SEA must renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to each priority or focus 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. 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 and school applications will undergo review by a panel with facilitation. Panel members will be recruited with expertise in curriculum, administration, and teacher evaluation. A rubric will be used to determine if LEA applications/school applications meet the requirements of the grant and warrant approval. Each element will be scored based on the following scoring rubric:

Strong: 3 points- Responses were thorough with sufficient detail

Moderate: 2 points- Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications

Limited: 1 point- Responses were attempted but lacking specificity

Not Evident: 0 points- No response was given or response was unclear and lacked many details and evidence

The complete scoring rubric is attached at the end of this document and at the end of the school application.

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. 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. Districts receiving grant awards may begin pre-implementation immediately, but no later than the first contract day for the 2014-2015 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 Shawna Poitra (shawna.poitra@state.sd.us). **A follow-up paper copy of the original LEA cover page signed by the authorized representative and the**

superintendent and the original School cover page signed by the principal must be mailed to SD DOE (800 Governors Drive, Pierre, SD 57501).

Technical Assistance

A Live Meeting will be held to provide LEAs with the LEA application and School Sections. An overview of 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 be available to help districts as they design their SIG applications.

Contact Information

For grant application questions:

Shannon Malone (773-6509)

shannon.malone@state.sd.us

Shawna Poitra (773-8065)

shawna.poitra@state.sd.us

For fiscal questions:

Rob Huffman (773-4600)

robyn.huffman@state.sd.us

Cody Stoeser (773-7108)

cody.stoeser@state.sd.us

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 priority and focus school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that each priority and focus school will implement.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	INTERVENTION			
		Turn-around	Restart	Closure	Transformation

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant. Please answer these questions from a district perspective, taking into consideration each of the district's priority and focus schools.

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school for the purpose of the SIG application 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 analysis 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 RetreatSM process: Student, Professional Practices, Programs & Structures, and Family & Community Data. Include an evaluation of current practices and programs as required in the third lens of data review.*
- 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 priority and focus 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.*

(2) **The LEA assures that each priority and focus school that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.**

(3) **The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—**

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 transformation model? (Examples may include describing credentials of qualified staff, support of turnaround efforts by school board/community, new staff ready to implement change, etc.) Will the district contract with any person or organization to assist with the implementation of the turnaround or transformation model? Differentiate what has already taken place and detailed plans for the future. Who from the district will provide oversight of the SIG and how that will be accomplished?*

b. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. *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. Examples may include non-renewal of current principal, held data retreat, met with staff to plan for upcoming PD, held school board meeting to explain change, etc. Broadly address all of the schools the district has committed to serve. School level applications will contain specific actions and timelines the district will meet in implementing the interventions for each school.*

c. 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. (Is there a process for Requests for Proposals (RFPs)? Is there an MOU or contract in place to hold provider accountable? Are performance measures established? Will the provider be reviewed regularly?) Provide a detailed plan for this process in the future. Who will be involved in the selection procedure? What criteria have been set?*

d. 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 21st Century Grants, MTSS, Math Counts, etc. Address resources in terms of funding, staffing, partnerships, and support.*

e. Modify its practices, procedures, 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. Examples may include governance structures, business processes, union and board agreements, hiring and staffing practices, flexibilities in budgeting, time/schedules, curriculum, assessments, etc. What barriers exist? Indicate the willingness of the district to modify procedures along the way if needed.*

f. 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, building staff capacity, repurposing staff, re-evaluating partner agreements, and other resources that will be needed to sustain the reforms. Describe which activities will be sustained and which, if any, will be terminated.*

(4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each priority and focus school identified in the LEA's application. *Highlight major events and benchmarks for all schools over the three year implementation time period. If asking for pre-implementation costs (for activities from award date to June 30, 2014. Examples include: Hold community meetings to review school performance; compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data; Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model), describe what the funds will cover. The timeline should be from the district perspective.*

(5) The LEA must review each priority and focus school that receives School Improvement Grant funds. *Describe how the LEA will monitor annual goals for student achievement, which may be documented in SD LEAP. (Each school must have a reading and math annual goal, which must be measurable and specify the indicator (district assessment for 2014-15, Smarter Balanced Assessment for 2015-16 and 2016-17) that will be used during each of the grant years.) Indicate how progress will be measured towards each of the requirements for the selected intervention model. If progress is not shown, describe the action steps the district may take.*

(6) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its priority and focus schools. *Describe consultation with school administration, teachers and other staff, and parents and community members. Indicate when and how the consultation took place.*

(7) The LEA may apply for district-level funds to provide activities for all eligible priority and focus schools in their district receiving a SIG award. If the LEA has more than one priority and focus school eligible for funds, describe any district-level activities the LEA is applying for. (Ex. District has three eligible priority and focus schools that received SIG funds and will provide professional development to all three schools out of district-level funds rather than individual SIG school funds.) *Describe the district-level activity and the amount requested for each activity. Who at the district level is monitoring these activities?*

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each priority and focus 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 priority and focus school it commits to serve; and
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's priority and focus schools.

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 priority and focus 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 priority and focus schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 (not to exceed \$6,000,000 per school over three years).

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Priority School #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
Priority School #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
Focus School #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
Focus School #2	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
LEA-level Activities		250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
Total Budget	\$1,216,750	\$5,062,250	\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$17,880,500

(Name) School District

Budget Information
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)

Budget Summary

Schools	Pre-implementation (Optional) Award Notification- 6/30/14	Project Year 1 7/1/14-6/30/15	**Project Year 2 7/1/15 - 6/30/16	**Project Year 3 7/1/16 - 6/30/17	Three-Year Total
Name of School					
Name of School					
Name of School					
Name of School					
***District - Level Activities					
Total Costs					

*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)
** Contingent upon renewed federal funding
***Only applicable for LEAs with more than one eligible priority and focus school applying for grant

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 priority and focus 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 priority and focus school, that it serves with school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a priority or focus 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;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select, and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and
- (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT
SCORING RUBRIC
LEA APPLICATIONS**

Reviewer: _____

District: _____

Submitted By: _____

School(s): _____

Questions within LEA SIG Application

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school for the purpose of the SIG application and selected an intervention for each school. (Must be at the district level.)

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong -3 points	Moderate-2 points	Limited-1 point	Not Evident-0 points
a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the committee including the members and positions.	Response included details of the committee including the members and positions.	Response was missing details of the committee such as the members and/or positions.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of a committee that conducted the needs assessment.
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.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the data sources analyzed as part of the CNA.	Response included details of the data sources analyzed as part of the CNA.	Response was missing details of the data sources analyzed as part of the CNA.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence that data sources were analyzed as part of the CNA.
c. Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the district's CNA process.	Response included details of the district's CNA process.	Response was missing details of the district's CNA process.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the district's CNA process.
d. Broadly describe the results of the review. (Summarize the results of the CNA for each eligible SIG school that is applying.)		Response was thorough and included specific details of the district's CNA results, including a summarization of each school's results.	Response included details of the district's CNA results, including a summarization of each school's results.	Response was missing details of the district's CNA results or the school's summarization.	Response was unclear and lacked details of the district's CNA results and each school's summarization.
e. List the strengths and weaknesses for each eligible SIG school that is applying based on the results of the CNA.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the strengths and weaknesses for each eligible SIG school.	Response included details of the strengths and weaknesses for each eligible SIG school.	Response was missing details of the strengths and weaknesses for each eligible SIG school.	Response was unclear and lacked details of the strengths and weaknesses for each eligible SIG school.

Needs Analysis Comments:

Questions within LEA SIG Application

(3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken , or will take to---

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
a. Describe the LEA’s capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the LEA’s capacity to serve the identified SIG schools.	Response included details of the LEA’s capacity to serve the identified SIG schools.	Response was missing details of the LEA’s capacity to serve the identified SIG schools.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the LEA’s capacity to serve the identified SIG schools.
b. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the one of the four models.		Response was thorough and included specific details of what has taken place to date to design and implement a model in the eligible schools.	Response included details of what has taken place to date to design and implement a model in the eligible schools.	Response was missing details of what has taken place to date to design and implement a model in the eligible schools.	Response was unclear and lacked details of what has taken place to date to design and implement a model in the eligible schools.
c. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the LEA’s process to select external providers.	Response included details of the LEA’s process to select external providers.	Response was missing details of the LEA’s process to select external providers.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of a process to select external providers in the LEA.
d. Align other resources with the interventions.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the how other LEA resources are aligned to support interventions.	Response included details of the how other LEA resources are aligned to support interventions.	Response was missing details of the how other LEA resources are aligned to support interventions.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence that the LEA has aligned resources to support interventions.
e. Modify its practices, procedures, or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.		Response was thorough and included specific details of any policies, procedures, or practices that need modification.	Response included details of any policies, procedures, or practices that need modification.	Response was missing details of any policies, procedures, or practices that need modification.	Response was unclear and lacked details of any policies, procedures, or practices that need modification.

f. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.		Response was thorough and included specific details and evidence of how the LEA plans to sustain efforts after the grant ends.	Response included details and evidence of how the LEA plans to sustain efforts after the grant ends.	Response was missing details and evidence of how the LEA plans to sustain efforts after the grant ends.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the LEA plans to sustain efforts after the grant ends.
---	--	--	--	---	--

Actions Taken Comments:

Questions within LEA SIG Application					
Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each priority and focus school identified in the application.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the timeline needed to implement the chosen interventions in each school.	Response included details of the timeline needed to implement the chosen interventions in each school.	Response was missing details of the timeline needed to implement the chosen model in each school.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the timeline needed to implement the chosen interventions in each school.
Timeline Comments:					

Questions within LEA SIG Application					
Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(5) The LEA must review each Priority and Focus school that receives School Improvement Grant funds.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the LEA's process to review and monitor each eligible SIG school, including student achievement goals.	Response included details of the LEA's process to review and monitor each eligible SIG school, including student achievement goals.	Response was missing details of the LEA's process to review and monitor each eligible SIG school, including student achievement goals.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the LEA's process to review and monitor each eligible SIG school, including student achievement goals.
Priority and Focus School Review Comments:					

Questions within LEA SIG Application					
Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(6) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its priority and focus schools. (admin, staff, parents, community, school board)		Response was thorough and included specific details of the LEA’s consultation with relevant stakeholders.	Response included details of the LEA’s consultation with relevant stakeholders.	Response was missing details of the LEA’s consultation with relevant stakeholders.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the LEA’s consultation with relevant stakeholders.
Stakeholder Comments:					

Questions within LEA SIG Application					
Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(7) The LEA may apply for district-level funds to provide activities for all eligible priority and focus schools in their district receiving a SIG award. If the LEA has more than one priority and focus school eligible for funds, describe any district-level activities the LEA is applying for.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the district-level activities needed to implement the intervention models.	Response included details of the district-level activities needed to implement the intervention models.	Response was missing details of the district-level activities needed to implement the intervention models.	Response was unclear and lacked details of the district-level activities needed to implement the intervention models.
District-Level Comments:					

Questions within LEA SIG Application

Budget Narrative and Budget Table

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(8) A budget has been completed in the format requested in the application.		Budget was thorough with all columns completed correctly and included funds for all three years in the format requested for each school.	Budget was completed and included funds for all three years in the format requested for each school.	Budget was completed but was missing details and/or did not include funds for all three years in the format requested for each school.	Budget was not completed and/or did not include funds for all three years in the format requested for each school.
(9) The LEA has requested sufficient funds to fully implement interventions selected for each school, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.		Amount requested is appropriate and necessary to fully implement the chosen model within each school, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.	Amount requested is satisfactory to fully implement the chosen model within each school, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.	Amount requested is inadequate and or unreasonable to fully implement the chosen model within each school, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.	Amount requested does not justify evidence to fully implement the chosen model within each school, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.

Budget Narrative Comments:

Questions within LEA SIG Application

Approvals

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Not Evident-0 points
(10) LEA Superintendent and Authorized Representative have signed off on the proposal.		Signatures are present	Signatures are missing

Overall Application Comments:

Total Score: _____ **out of possible 54 points.** *A value in the **Limited or Not Evident** column will require a revision before the grant can be awarded. Applications will be ranked according to percent of possible points.*

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



south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Learning. Leadership. Service.

School Improvement Grant

School Application

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

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, 2017

FY 2013
School Improvement Grant (SIG)
School Cover Page

School Name:	School Mailing Address:
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority School	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus School
School Principal: Grade Span: Telephone: Fax: Email Address:	
I assure that the information in this application is accurate and feasible. The school will use the School Improvement Grant (SIG) to fully and effectively implement an intervention.	
X _____ Signature of the School Principal	Date:

School Improvement Grants

School Level Section

Intervention Chosen:	Transformation	Turnaround	Closure	Restart

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

- (1) The school has conducted a needs analysis which has revealed the need for a school improvement grant.
WHO was involved with the analysis; WHAT data was analyzed; WHEN the data was analyzed; and WHAT were the outcomes yielded from the results? Describe how the outcome of the needs analysis is connected to the intent of the School Improvement Grant.
- (2) Describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Check the intervention model below and answer the questions that follow pertaining to the intervention model chosen for this priority/focus school.

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*

paraprofessionals? 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 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?*
- 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 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.*
 - *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, including factors such as student growth and observation-based assessments. [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)? Define the indicator (assessment) the school will be using to determine growth.*
 - *Are the evaluation systems designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement?*
- c. Describe how the school will reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who have not done so. [Section I.A.2(d)(1)(i)(C)]
- *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?*

- d. Describe how the district will provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development. [Section I.A.2(d)(1)(i)(D)]
- *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)?*
 - *List resources available to new staff.*
 - *Will there be a mentoring program or literacy and/or math coaches available?*
 - *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?*
- e. Describe how the district will implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school? [Section I.A.2(d)(1)(i)(E)]
- *What strategies are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the transformation school? [Section I.A.2(a)(ii)] (Examples include: financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions).*

Comprehensive instructional reform strategies

- f. Describe how an instructional program will be determined and designed. [Section I.A.2(d)(2)(i)(A)]
- *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 academic standards?*
- g. Describe the process the school will use to promote the continuous use of student data. [Section I.A.2(d)(2)(i)(B)]
- *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?*
 - *Who is involved with the data review process and how often will data be reviewed?*

Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools

- h. Describe how the school will increase learning time. [Section I.A.2(d)(3)(i)(A)]
- *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.*
 - *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. Describe how the school will provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students? [Section I.A.2(d)(3)(i)(B)]

- *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

j. Describe the operational flexibility that will be given to this school. [Section I.A.2(d)(4)(i)(A)]

- *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?*

k. Describe the ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support that will be provided to the school. [Section I.A.2(d)(4)(i)(B)]

- *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?*

(3) Describe the timeline that addresses the steps the school will take for the appropriate activities within the chosen model. *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.*

(4) List the reading and math annual goals for this priority/focus school. *Schools must use the goals created as part of the priority/focus school process in SD LEAP. Copy and paste the goals for both math and reading into this question. (Each school must have a reading and math annual goal, which must be measurable and specify the indicator (district assessment for 2014-15, Smarter Balanced Assessment for 2015-16 and 2016-17) that will be used during each of the grant years.)*

(5) Give an overview of the interventions/strategies the school will be implementing with the SIG funds? *What personnel, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual, and professional development will be implemented? Explain what the SIG funds will purchase over the course of the next three years. Will the school apply for any pre-implementation costs? (Pre-implementation costs are for activities from award date to June 30, 2014. Examples include: Hold community meetings to review*

school performance; compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data; Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model), If so, what for?

- (6) The school assures to report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements (Achievement Indicators and Leading Indicators such as school year minutes, increased learning time, advanced coursework, dual enrollment coursework, teacher attendance, etc.)

BUDGET: Complete the budget for this particular priority/focus school.

Below is a description of the 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).

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).

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

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

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

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.

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

Indirect Costs: Grantees must have an approved restricted indirect cost rate before indirect cost may be charged to this program. The school can only apply indirect costs to the first \$25,000 of a contract.

Include a budget description for each year of the proposed 3 year project in the charts below. An example chart is below, followed by a chart for pre-implementation, year 1, year 2, and year 3.

Grant Periods:

Pre-implementation: Award Notification – June 30, 2014
(Optional- costs needed prior to start of grant on July 1, 2014. Example: stipends for staff to attend a training in June to prepare for implementing a program in August)

Project Year 1: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015
Project Year 2: July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016
Project Year 3: July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017

EXAMPLE: Grant Year 1

Category	Description of Activities: Describe specifically what will be purchased. Add or delete lines as necessary.	Requested Funding
Personnel:	.5 FTE Teacher to provide interventions in reading for grades K-2	\$20,000
	1 FTE Paraprofessional to assist math intervention teacher for grades K-5	\$15,000
	Staff incentives for making progress based on Student Learning Objectives for each teacher (20 teachers X \$500 possible)	\$10,000
Employee Benefits:	Benefits for .5 FTE teacher \$20,000 X 7.65% (Social Security-Medicare)	\$1,530
	Benefits for 1 FTE paraprofessional \$15,000 X 7.65% (Social Security-Medicare)	\$1,148
Travel:	Advancing Improvement in Education Conference in Austin Texas Sept 23-25, 2014 Meals, Lodging, Airfare, Miscellaneous for 3 staff	\$3,500
Equipment:	3 Desktop Computers (3 X \$1200) to be used in intervention room for reading strategies	\$3,600
	10 Laptop Computers (10 X 1000) for intervention room for math interventions	\$10,000
Supplies:	Books for Reading Intervention	\$900
	Software for Math Intervention Program for laptops	\$500
	Math Intervention manipulative to be used in Intervention Room	\$500
Contractual:	Contract with TIE to provide training for staff Student Learning Objectives (5 days throughout year)	\$7,500
Professional Development:	Book Study <u>Beyond the Bake Sale</u> –Lori Laughlin will facilitate book study with staff on early release days	\$2,500
	Registration for 3 staff for AIE Conference in Austin Texas	\$1500
Total Direct Costs:		\$78,178
Indirect Costs*:	District Rate of 2.95%	\$2,306
Total:		\$80,484

* The school can only apply indirect costs to the first \$25,000 of a contract.

Pre-Implementation: Award Notification- June 30, 2014 (Optional)

(Pre-implementation examples include: Hold community meetings to review school performance; compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data; Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model)

Category	Description of Activities: Describe specifically what will be purchased. Add or delete lines as necessary.	Requested Funding
Personnel:		
Employee Benefits:		
Travel:		
Equipment:		
Supplies:		
Contractual:		
Professional Development:		
Total Direct Costs:		
Indirect Costs*:		
Total:		

* The school can only apply indirect costs to the first \$25000 of a contract.

Grant Year 1: July 1, 2014- June 30, 2015

Category	Description of Activities: Describe specifically what will be purchased. Add or delete lines as necessary.	Requested Funding
Personnel:		
Employee Benefits:		
Travel:		
Equipment:		
Supplies:		
Contractual:		
Professional Development:		
Total Direct Costs:		
Indirect Costs*:		
Total:		

*The school can only apply indirect costs to the first \$25000 of a contract.

Grant Year 2: July 1, 2015- June 30, 2016
(Contingent on Funding)

Category	Description of Activities: Describe specifically what will be purchased. Add or delete lines as necessary.	Requested Funding
Personnel:		
Employee Benefits:		
Travel:		
Equipment:		
Supplies:		
Contractual:		
Professional Development:		
Total Direct Costs:		
Indirect Costs*:		
Total:		

* The school can only apply indirect costs to the first \$25000 of a contract.

Grant Year 3: July 1, 2016- June 30, 2017
(Contingent on Funding)

Category	Description of Activities: Describe specifically what will be purchased. Add or delete lines as necessary.	Requested Funding
Personnel:		
Employee Benefits:		
Travel:		
Equipment:		
Supplies:		
Contractual:		
Professional Development:		
Total Direct Costs:		
Indirect Costs*:		
Total:		

* The school can only apply indirect costs to the first \$25000 of a contract.

Budget Information
Title I School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

Name of School:

Budget Summary

Budget Categories	Pre-implementation (Optional) Award Notification- 6/30/14	Project Year 1 7/1/14-6/30/15	** Project Year 2 7/01/15-6/30/16	** Project Year 3 7/1/16-6/30-17	Project Total
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) and the school can only apply indirect costs to the first \$25000 of a contract.

** Contingent upon continued federal funding

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT
SCORING RUBRIC
SCHOOL APPLICATIONS**

Reviewer: _____

Submitted By: _____

Focus: _____

Priority: _____

District: _____

School: _____

Model Chosen: _____

Questions within the School SIG Application

Questions to Review	Score	Strong -3 points	Moderate-2 points	Limited-1 point	Not Evident-0 points
<p>(1) The school has conducted a needs analysis which has revealed the need for a School Improvement Grant.</p>		<p>Sufficient data, using multiple sources, has been analyzed by multiple staff members and a clear rational justifies the need for a School Improvement Grant.</p>	<p>Sufficient data was analyzed and a rational justifies the need for School Improvement Grant.</p>	<p>Data was analyzed, but lacks a justification as to why the school needs a School Improvement Grant. Multiple staff members were not involved in the process.</p>	<p>There is no evidence that data was analyzed and no justification is provided for the need for a School Improvement Grant.</p>
<p>Needs Analysis Comments:</p>					

Questions within School SIG Application

(2) The School 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.

(A) The Turnaround Model

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
a. Describe the process the district will use to replace the principal and the operational flexibility the new principal will be given.		Response was thorough and included specific details regarding the process used to replace the principal and allow the new principal flexibility.	Response included details regarding the process used to replace principal and allow the new principal flexibility.	Response was missing details regarding the process used to replace the principal and/or allow the new principal flexibility.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of a process to replace the principal. It was unclear how the new principal would be provided flexibility.
b. Describe the process the district will use to replace staff and refresh the teacher pool for this school.		Response was thorough and included specific details regarding the process to screen and replace staff.	Response included details regarding the process to screen and replace staff.	Response was missing details regarding the process used to screen and replace staff.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of a process to screen and replace 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?		Response was thorough and included specific details regarding strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff.	Response included details regarding strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff.	Response was missing details regarding strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the strategies in place to recruit, place, and retain staff.
d. How will the district provide staff on-going, high quality job-embedded professional development?		Response was thorough and included specific details regarding the professional development provided to staff.	Response included details regarding the professional development provided to staff.	Response was missing details regarding the professional development provided to staff.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the professional development provided to staff.

e. Describe the new governance structure that will be adopted for this school.		Response was thorough and included specific details regarding the new governance structure to be in place.	Response included details regarding the new governance structure to be in place.	Response was missing details regarding the new governance structure to be in place.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the new governance structure to be in place.
f. Describe how an instructional program will be determined and designed.		Response was thorough and included specific details regarding the instructional program to be put in place.	Response included details regarding the instructional program to be put in place.	Response was missing details regarding the instructional program to be put in place.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of an instructional program to be put in place.
g. Describe the process the school will use to promote the continuous use of student data.		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the school will promote continuous use of data.	Response included details of how the school will promote continuous use of data.	Response was missing details regarding how the school will promote continuous use of data.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the school will promote the continuous use of data.
h. Describe how the school will increase learning time.		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the school will increase learning time.	Response included details of how the school will increase learning time.	Response was missing details of how the school will increase learning time.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the school will increase learning time.
i. How will the school provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students?		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the school will provide social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports.	Response included details of how the school will provide social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports.	Response was missing details of how the school will provide social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the school will provide social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports.

Turnaround Model Comments:

Questions within the School SIG Application

(B) The Restart Model

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
a. Describe the rigorous review process the district undertook to select a partner to restart the school.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the review process to select a partner to restart the school.	Response included details of the review process to select a partner to restart the school.	Response was missing details of the review process to select a partner to restart the school.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the review process 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?		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the district will ensure enrollment of former students.	Response included details of how the district will ensure enrollment of former students.	Response was missing details of how the district will ensure enrollment of former students.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the district will ensure enrollment of former students.
c. How will funds from this grant be used to support the restart model?		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the SIG funds will support the restart model.	Response included details of how the SIG funds will support the restart model.	Response was missing details of how the SIG funds will support the restart model.	Response was unclear and lacked details of how the SIG funds will support the restart model.

Restart Model Comments:

Questions within the School SIG Application

(C) The School Closure Model

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
a. Describe the process the district used to determine to close this school.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the process in place to determine to close the school.	Response included details of the process in place to determine to close the school.	Response was missing details of the process in place to determine to close the school.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of a process in place to determine to close the school.
b. Which higher achieving schools have been identified that have the capacity to receive students from this school?		Response was thorough and included specific details of the higher achieving school(s) in the area with capacity to serve students from this school.	Response included details of the higher achieving school(s) in the area with capacity to serve students from this school.	Response was missing details of the higher achieving school(s) in the area with capacity to serve students from this school.	Response was unclear and lacked details of the higher achieving school(s) in the area with capacity to serve students from this school.

School Closure Model Comments:

Questions within the School SIG Application

(D) The Transformation Model

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
a. Describe the process the district will use to replace the principal.		Response was thorough and included specific details regarding the process used to replace the principal.	Response included details regarding the process used to replace principal.	Response was missing details regarding the process used to replace the principal.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of a process to replace the principal.
b. Describe how the school will use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals, including factors such as student growth and observation-based assessments.		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the school will implement teacher and principal evaluations using student growth and observations.	Response included details of how the school will implement teacher and principal evaluations using student growth and observations.	Response was missing details of how the school will implement teacher and principal evaluations using student growth and observations.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the school will implement teacher and principal evaluations using student growth and observations.
c. Describe how the school will reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and HS graduation rates and identify and remove those who have not done so.		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the school will reward staff who have increased achievement and graduation rates and remove those who have not.	Response included details of how the school will reward staff who have increased achievement and graduation rates and remove those who have not.	Response was missing details of how the school will reward staff who have increased achievement and graduation rates and remove those who have not.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the school will reward staff who have increased achievement and graduation rates and remove those who have not.
d. Describe how the district will provide staff ongoing, high quality, job-embedded professional development.		Response was thorough and included specific details regarding the professional development provided to staff.	Response included details regarding the professional development provided to staff.	Response was missing details regarding the professional development provided to staff.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the professional development provided to staff.

e. Describe how the district will implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a transformation school.		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the district will recruit, place, and retain staff.	Response included details of how the district will recruit, place, and retain staff.	Response was missing details of how the district will recruit, place, and retain staff.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the district will recruit, place, and retain staff.
f. Describe how an instructional program will be determined and designed.		Response was thorough and included specific details regarding the instructional program to be in place.	Response included details regarding the instructional program to be in place.	Response was missing details regarding the instructional program to be in place.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of an instructional program to be put in place.
g. Describe the process the district will use to promote the continuous use of student data.		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the school will promote continuous use of data.	Response included details of how the school will promote continuous use of data.	Response was missing details regarding how the school will promote continuous use of data.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the school will promote the continuous use of data.
h. Describe how the school will increase learning time.		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the school will increase learning time.	Response included details of how the school will increase learning time.	Response was missing details of how the school will increase learning time.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the school will increase learning time.
i. Describe how the school will provide appropriate social-emotional and community oriented serves and supports for students.		Response was thorough and included specific details of how the school will provide social-emotional and community-orientated services and supports.	Response included details of how the school will provide social-emotional and community-orientated services and supports.	Response was missing details of how the school will provide social-emotional and community-orientated services and supports.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of how the school will provide social-emotional and community-orientated services and supports.
j. Describe the operational flexibility that will be given to this school.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the operational flexibility given to the school.	Response included details of the operational flexibility given to the school.	Response was missing details of the operational flexibility given to the school.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the operational flexibility given to the school.

k. Describe the ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support that will be provided to the school.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the intensive assistance and support provided to the school.	Response included details of the intensive assistance and support provided to the school.	Response was missing details of the intensive assistance and support provided to the school.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the intensive assistance and support provided to the school.
--	--	---	---	--	--

Transformation Model Comments:

Questions within the School SIG Application					
Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(3) Describe the timeline that addresses the steps the school will take for the appropriate activities within the chosen model.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the timeline needed to implement the chosen model.	Response included details of the timeline needed to implement the chosen model.	Response was missing details of the timeline needed to implement the chosen model.	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the timeline needed to implement the chosen model.
Timeline Comments:					

Questions within the School SIG Application					
Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(4) List the reading and math annual goals for this priority/focus school.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the math and reading goals for the school. Goals were SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely).	Response included details of the math and reading goals for the school. Goals were SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely).	Response was missing details of the math and reading goals for the school. (Goal may be missing a few details of the SMART Goal (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely)).	Response was unclear and lacked details and evidence of the math and reading goals for the school. Goals were not SMART Goals (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely).
Goals Comments:					

Questions within the School SIG Application

Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(5) Give an overview of the interventions/strategies the school will be implementing with the SIG funds.		Response was thorough and included specific interventions/strategies the school will implement to get an understanding of the SIG program.	Response included interventions/strategies the school will implement to get an understanding of the SIG program.	Response was missing interventions/strategies the school will implement to get an understanding of the SIG program.	Response was unclear and lacked interventions/strategies the school will implement to get an understanding of the SIG program.

Interventions/Strategies Comments:

Questions within the School SIG Application

Budget Narrative and Budget Table

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Moderate- 2 points	Limited- 1 point	Not Evident-0 points
(6) A budget narrative has been completed and includes three years in the format requested in the application.		Response was thorough and included specific details of the SIG budget for this school for all three years in the format requested.	Response included details of the SIG budget for this school for all three years in the format requested.	Response was missing details of the SIG budget for this school. Details were not included for all three years of grant in the format requested.	Response was unclear and missing many details of the SIG budget for this school. Details were not included for all three years of grant in the format requested.
(7) The school has requested sufficient funds to fully implement interventions selected, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.		Amount requested is appropriate and necessary to fully implement the chosen model, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.	Amount requested is satisfactory to fully implement the chosen model, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.	Amount requested is inadequate and/or unreasonable to fully implement the chosen model, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.	Amount requested does not justify evidence to fully implement the chosen model, including pre-implementation costs, if applicable.
Budget Narrative Comments:					

Questions within the School SIG Application

Approvals

Sub Questions to Review	Score	Strong- 3 points	Not Evident-0 points
(8) The School Principal has signed off on the proposal.		Signature is present.	Signature is missing.

Overall Application Comments:

Total Score:_____ *A value in the **Limited or Not Evident** column will require a revision before the grant can be awarded.*

Applications will be ranked according to percent of possible points.

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

Possible Points:

21 possible points - General Section - all applications must have, plus points from one of the models below:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 27 possible points - Turnaround Model | (Possible total of 48 for all questions if this model is selected) |
| 9 possible points - Restart Model | (Possible total of 30 for all questions if this model is selected) |
| 6 possible points - Closure Model | (Possible total of 27 for all questions if this model is selected) |
| 33 possible points - Transformational Model | (Possible total of 54 for all questions if this model is selected) |