



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

## **School Improvement Grants LEA (District) Application**

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

**CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A**



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

**Due Date**

**05/02/2011**

**South Dakota Department of Education**

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

**Grant Period Ends**

**June 30, 2014**

**FY 2010**

**School Improvement Grant (SIG)**

**Cover page**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Legal Name of Applicant:<br><b>Mobridge-Pollock School District 62-6</b>   | Applicant's Mailing Address:<br><b>1107 1<sup>st</sup> Ave. East<br/>Mobridge, SD 57601</b>                   |
| LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant<br>Name: <b>Tim Frederick</b><br>Position and Office: <b>Superintendent &amp; Federal<br/>Program Director</b><br>Contact's Mailing Address:<br><b>1107 1<sup>st</sup> Ave East<br/>Mobridge, SD 57601</b>                              | Telephone: <b>(605)845-9204</b><br>Fax: <b>(605)845-3455</b><br>Email address: <b>tim.frederick@k12.sd.us</b> |
| LEA Superintendent (Printed Name): <b>Tim Frederick</b>  | Telephone: <b>(605)845-9204</b>   |
| I certify that the program person identified above is authorized to act on behalf of the institution with regard to the School Improvement Grants.<br><br>X _____<br>Signature of the LEA Superintendent   | Date: <b>04/28/11</b>   |
| 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): **Tim Frederick**

Original Signature of Authorized Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

| SD Department of Education use only |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Date Received:                      | _____<br><b>Signature of authorized SD DOE staff person</b> |

**Guidelines**

***Purpose of Grant***

The School Improvement Grants (SIG) program is authorized by section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Under section 1003(g)(1) of the ESEA, the Secretary must “award grants to States to enable the States to provide subgrants to local educational agencies for the purpose of providing assistance for school improvement consistent with section 1116.” From a grant received pursuant to that provision, a State educational agency (SEA) must subgrant at least 95 percent of the funds it receives to its local educational agencies (LEAs) for school improvement activities. In awarding such subgrants, an SEA must “give priority to the local educational agencies with the lowest-achieving schools that demonstrate — (A) the greatest need for such funds; and (B) the strongest commitment to ensuring that such funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the goals under school and local educational improvement, corrective action, and restructuring plans under section 1116.” The regulatory requirements expand upon these provisions, further defining LEAs with the “greatest need” for SIG funds and the “strongest commitment” to ensuring that such funds are used to raise substantially student achievement in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State.

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010, which was signed into law by President Obama on December 16, 2009, included two critical changes to the SIG program. First, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 allows SEAs and LEAs to use SIG funds to serve certain “newly eligible” schools (*i.e.*, certain low-achieving schools that are not Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring). Second, the law increases the amount that an SEA may

award for each school participating in the SIG program from \$50,000 annually to \$2 million annually.

### ***Clarification of Available School Improvement Funds***

There are two opportunities for additional funding for Title I schools in improvement status. These funds are distributed according to statute in Title I Part A 1003(a) and 1003(g).

The funds available under School Improvement 1003(a) - Formula grants have been and will continue to be allocated on a formula basis to all districts with Title I schools in improvement. These funds are to be used at each Title I school in school improvement based on the allocation for that school.

School Improvement Grants 1003(g) are additional funds available to districts with Tier I, II, or III schools as identified as Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) schools. Districts may apply for these grants on behalf of Title I school in improvement, corrective action, restructuring, or alternative governance designated as Tier I schools. The remaining Title I schools in improvement status, listed as Tier III schools, may be served with SIG funds after priority schools are served. Districts may also apply for Tier II schools which are high schools eligible for, but not receiving Title I funds.

### ***Eligible Applicants***

An LEA that receives Title I, Part A funds and that has one or more Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools may apply for a SIG grant. Note that an LEA that is in improvement but that does not have any Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools is not eligible to receive SIG funds.

### ***Allocations***

The minimum award for each school will be \$50,000 per school for each of the three years (unless a shorter time period is needed). An LEAs maximum award will be no more than \$2 million per year for a three year period for each Tier I, II, or III school served.

If an SEA does not have sufficient SIG funds to support fully and effectively each school for which its LEAs have applied throughout the period of availability, an SEA must give priority to LEAs seeking to fund Tier I or Tier II schools.

### ***Based on Need and Commitment***

In addition to the objective measures used to determine need for the 1003(a) funds (poverty, enrollment, and level of need), each DISTRICT with eligible schools applying for funds under section SIG 1003(g) must demonstrate the need for the additional school improvement funds and commitment to carry out the requirements.

Greatest need: An LEA with the greatest need for a School Improvement Grant must have one or more schools in Tier I, II, or III.

Strongest Commitment: An LEA with the strongest commitment is an LEA that agrees to implement, and demonstrates the capacity to implement fully and effectively, one of the following

rigorous interventions in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve: Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, or Transformational Models.

#### ***Four Models***

Districts with Tier I or II schools must select one of the following models to implement.

**Turnaround model:** The LEA replaces the principal (although the LEA may retain a recently hired principal where a turnaround, restart, or transformation was instituted in past two years) and rehiring no more than 50% of the staff; gives greater principal autonomy; implements other prescribed and recommended strategies;

**Restart model:** The LEA converts or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, charter management organization, or education management organization;

**School closure:** The LEA closes the school and enrolls the students in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving; or

**Transformation model:** The LEA replaces the principal (although the LEA may retain a recently hired principal where a turnaround, restart, or transformation was instituted in past two years); implements a rigorous staff evaluation and development system; rewards staff who increase student achievement and/or graduation rates and removes staff who have not improved after ample opportunity; institutes comprehensive instructional reform; increases learning time and applies community-oriented school strategies; and provides greater operational flexibility and support for the school.

#### ***Conditions of Eligibility***

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

#### ***Waiver to Implement a Schoolwide Program***

Requests for waivers to enable a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school operating a targeted assistance program to operate a schoolwide program so it can implement a turnaround, restart, school closure, or transformational model should be made directly to the United States Department of Education. Such a waiver is necessary because a school operating a targeted assistance program may only provide Title I services to students who are most at risk of failing to meet State's student academic achievement standards; it may not provide services for the school as a whole. In order to operate a schoolwide program, a school must meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

The LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver. The waiver must be published for public comment prior to submission.

### ***Budget and Accounting***

The SIG 1003(g) awards must be used to **supplement** the level of funds available for the education of children in these schools. Therefore, these funds can supplement, but they **cannot be used to replace existing funding or services.**

The School Improvement Grant 1003(g) funds *must be tracked separately* from the Title I, Part A Basic Grant and the other Title I School Improvement funds distributed by formula under Section 1003(a). School Improvement funds are awarded for individual schools, therefore these funds must be accounted for at the individual school level.

Districts are to receipt improvement funds in the Title I revenue account and track each award separately by using a sub account number (operational unit and/or sub-object) for each Title I program. Expenditures for the School Improvement Grant 1003(g) funds should be tracked using the same sub account identifier.

### ***Duration***

Grant Periods:

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

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

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

These funds are contingent on renewed federal funding.

The SEA must renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to each Tier I or Tier II school that meets the annual student achievement goals established by the LEA and makes progress on the leading indicators. The SEA may renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to a school that does not meet its annual goals as it has discretion to examine factors such as the school's progress on the leading indicators or the fidelity with which it is implementing the model in deciding whether to renew the LEA's SIG grant. For a grant to be renewed with respect to a Tier III school, the school must meet the goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA, or make progress toward meeting those goals. See section II.C(a)(i)-(ii) of the final requirements. If the SEA determines that one or more of an LEA's schools do not warrant renewed funding, the SEA may continue to award the LEA SIG funds for other eligible schools. The SEA would reduce the LEA's grant, however, by the amount allocated for the schools for which funding is not being renewed.

### ***The Application Process***

*Review and Approval Process:* LEA applications will undergo review by a panel with facilitation. The panel will consist of members of the Committee of Practitioners and the School Support Team. Additional panel members will be recruited with expertise in curriculum, administration, and teacher evaluation. A rubric will be used to determine if LEA applications meet the

requirements of the grant and warrant approval. Each element will be scored based on the following scoring rubric:

**Strong:** Responses were thorough with sufficient detail

**Moderate:** Responses were satisfactory needing minor clarifications

**Limited or None:** Responses were attempted but lacking specificity or no response was given

The complete scoring rubric is attached at the end of the document.

The department will notify the LEAs of the day their application will be reviewed and will be asked to be available for a conference call if the panel has questions about their application. This will be an opportunity for districts to clarify the intent of their applications. Final scoring of the rubric and recommendations to the department will conclude the panel review process. LEAs with applications that are promising but do not fully meet each requirement will be contacted by the department for technical assistance in bringing the application into full compliance. LEA applications will not be approved unless all requirements are fully met.

*Timeline:* Upon approval of the State Application, the LEAs will be given a copy of the draft application package. A Live Meeting will be held at that time to go over the application and grant requirements. Districts will be asked to indicate their intent to apply for Tier I and II schools. Tier III applications will be sent out if warranted, based upon the number of Tier I and II schools LEAs intend to commit to serve and the amount of funding available. Technical assistance will be provided by department staff at the request of the district. LEA applications must be submitted within 30 working days. Awards are expected to be announced within three weeks after submission. Districts receiving grant awards may begin pre-implementation immediately, but no later than the first contract day for the 2011-2012 school year.

Applications must be submitted electronically by email. The application may be single spaced with appropriate spacing between sections, with font size of 12 or greater. Electronic submissions must be sent to Beth Schiltz. A follow-up paper copy of the cover page signed by the authorized representative and the school principal must be sent.

### ***Technical Assistance***

A Live Meeting will be held to provide LEAs with the LEA application and School Sections. An over view of PLA identification, SIG requirements, the four intervention models, and application procedures will be provided.

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

**Contact Information**

For grant application questions:

Dr. Kristine Harms (773-6509)

Beth Schiltz (773-4716)

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

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

For fiscal questions:

Rob Huffman (773-4600)

Paul Schreiner (773-7108)

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

[Paul.Schreiner@state.sd.us](mailto:Paul.Schreiner@state.sd.us)

**LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS**

**A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.**

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

| SCHOOL NAME               | NCES ID # | TIER I | TIER II | TIER III | INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY) |         |         |                |
|---------------------------|-----------|--------|---------|----------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|----------------|
|                           |           |        |         |          | turnaround                        | restart | closure | transformation |
| Freeman Davis Elementary  |           |        |         | X        |                                   |         |         |                |
| Mobridge Upper Elementary |           |        |         | X        |                                   |         |         |                |
|                           |           |        |         |          |                                   |         |         |                |
|                           |           |        |         |          |                                   |         |         |                |
|                           |           |        |         |          |                                   |         |         |                |
|                           |           |        |         |          |                                   |         |         |                |
|                           |           |        |         |          |                                   |         |         |                |
|                           |           |        |         |          |                                   |         |         |                |

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

Specific information for each Tier I, II, and III school that the district applies to serve will be addressed in each school level section. Please answer these questions **from a district perspective**, taking into consideration each of the district’s Tier I, II, and III schools.

**(1) (Tier I, II, & III)** The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school. **(Must be at the district level)**

- a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome. *Your answer must include the following: A list of the names of the members of the district committee and the position within the district that each person is representing. The committee must include a broad range of stakeholders including administrators, teachers, program directors, community members, and parents.*

Tim Frederick, Superintendent  
 Chris Bohlander, HS School Principal, School Improvement Coordinator  
 Joe Lenz, MS Principal  
 Jill Olson, Elementary Principal

Brittany Knudson, ESA 5 Education Specialist  
Tonya Hertel, JOM Coordinator  
Jason Rabenberg, Teacher  
Kim Brewer, Teacher  
Mary Jo Anderson, Teacher  
Tanya Ford, Title I Teacher  
Jean Blongien, Counselor  
Colleen Chase, Parent  
Holly Hitland, Parent  
Amber Jungwirth, Parent  
Jessica Jahraus, Teacher  
LuAnne Bosch, Teacher  
Brenda Kettering, Teacher  
Lynn Kuehl, Title I Teacher  
Val Ford, Parent  
Sarah Fulkerson, Parent  
Kristi Eisemann, Parent

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

The Mobridge Pollock School District, with the assistance of the ESA 5 and the Mobridge-Pollock Data Collection Team had a data retreat in August and then reviewed through more data in October with the ESA 5 Data Collection Team. The district has used data within the four lenses of the Data Retreat process:

**Student:** Freeman Davis Elementary and Mobridge Upper Elementary uses both formative and summative assessments to determine student needs. We compiled and discussed data from benchmark assessment for Dibels<sup>x</sup> in Reading and AIMS Web in Math, along with student data from Successmaker. Goals in all areas were established through our school improvement plan. Students in Second Grade also took a perception survey focused on technology, culture, and environment.

**Professional Practices:** Common planning time for grade levels were established this year through our school improvement process. Goals were set by each individual teachers and professional development was designed based on the goals and data

from our data retreat. The Mobridge-Pollock School District will continue to track and monitor teacher absences from the classroom. Focusing time missed due to sick leave, family sick leave, professional development and personal leave.

**Programs & Structures:** Attended a Peer Review of School Improvement Plans. This allowed us to incorporate suggested changes to our SIP. Implemented RtI for reading during the 2010-2011 school year with common intervention time. This was based on information collected during the data retreat in August.

**Family & Community Data:** Information from school counselor and survey's that the District Data Team collected. We have worked with community partners in applying for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Grant in developing an after school and summer program.

- 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.*

During February, classroom teachers analyzed student progress on the benchmark testing from both Dibels and AIMS Web. Staff discussed student progress, strategies to improve student achievement, and timelines. The building leadership team, consisting of the principal, teachers, and a paraprofessional met on April 11<sup>th</sup> to review building needs and discuss priorities for funding through the School Improvement Grant. The information was then shared and more ideas generated from the Title I Parent Advisory group on April 12<sup>th</sup>. Their ideas were further refined as the principal met one-on-one with an Educational Specialist from the ESA.

- d. Broadly describe the results of that review (specifics for each school will be outlined in the school sections). *Summarize the results of the CNA for each school.*

Freeman Davis is a feeder school to Mobridge Upper Elementary and is on level I for school improvement based on how the students in grades 3-5 scored on the Dakota STEP. Mobridge Upper Elementary is on Level 1 improvement for Math. 27% of the all students, 38% of Native American, and 41% of Economically Disadvantage students were not proficient on the 2010 Dakota STEP Reading test. 34% of all students, 40% of Native American, and 47 % of Economically Disadvantage students were not proficient on the 2010 Dakota STEP Math test. Mobridge Upper Elementary did not make AYP in math in 2010. Teachers need further training in best practices in math instruction and strategies for identifying gaps in student understanding of fundamental math concepts.

Mobridge Upper Elementary is on Level 1 improvement for Math. 27% of the all students, 38% of Native American, and 41% of Economically Disadvantage students were not proficient on the 2010 Dakota STEP Reading test. 34% of all students, 40% of Native American, and 47 % of Economically Disadvantage students were not proficient on the 2010 Dakota STEP Math test. Mobridge Upper Elementary did not make AYP in math in 2010. Teachers need further training in best practices in math instruction and strategies for identifying gaps in student understanding of fundamental math concepts.

- 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.*

#### Freeman Davis Elementary

The \* indicates areas that will be addressed with SIG funds.

Strengths identified through the comprehensive needs assessment:

1. Students benchmark scores have improved
2. Common Planning time has provided time to plan together
3. Class Size Reduction\*
4. Building Leadership Team has been formed
5. Data is being collected
6. Training on AIMS Web for Math
7. Week long training with a consultant from Math Solutions

Weaknesses identified through the comprehensive needs assessment:

1. Math performance (did not make AYP in 2010)\*
2. Increase number sense and problem solving skills for students\*
3. Class size fluctuation due to mobility and demographics\*
4. Job-embedded professional development and instructional coaching\*
5. 47% of the Economically Disadvantage were not proficient on the Dakota STEP Test\*

#### Mobridge Upper Elementary

The \* indicates areas that will be addressed with SIG funds.

Strengths identified through the comprehensive needs assessment:

1. Students benchmark scores have improved
2. Common Planning time has provided time to plan together
3. Building Leadership Team has been formed
4. Data is being collected
5. Training on AIMS Web for Math
6. Week long training with a consultant from Math Solutions

Weaknesses identified through the comprehensive needs assessment:

1. Math performance (did not make AYP in 2010)\*
2. Increase number sense and problem solving skills for students\*
3. Class size fluctuation due to mobility and demographics\*
4. Job-embedded professional development and instructional coaching\*
5. 47% of the Economically Disadvantage were not proficient on the Dakota STEP Test\*

- f. Provide the rationale the district used to determine which schools to serve with SIG funds and which schools not to serve. *Must address each Tier I and II school first, and then address each of the district's Tier III schools, if applicable.*

Freeman Davis Elementary is at Level 1 school improvement for Math. Title I funds are not adequate to address this school's needs.

Mobridge Upper Elementary is at Level 1 school improvement for Math. Title I funds are not adequate to address this school's needs.

- (2)** (Tier I & II) The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- a. Describe the LEA's capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application. *What capacity does the district have to execute and support a turnaround or transformational model? Will the district contract with any person or organization to assist with the implementation of the turnaround or transformational model? What resources does the district have in terms of staffing, funding, support, partnerships, etc. that will assist the district in successfully implementing the chosen interventions? Differentiate what has already taken place and detailed plans for the future.*
- b. Describe district administrative oversight. *Your answer must include who from the district will provide oversight of the SIG and how that will be accomplished.*
- (3)** (Tier I) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school. *The LEA must indicate the barriers or reasons why it lacks the capacity to serve all Tier I schools. Examples might be funding, minimum staffing for oversight, inability to close schools, geography or rural nature of district, lack of charter schools in the state, lack of qualified principals applying over the past years, district improvement, school improvement, multiple requirements to address.*
- (4)** (Tier I, II & III) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take.

- a. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. *Districts must describe what has been done to this point to design the interventions described in the school level sections. Plans for future action must be indicated. Broadly address all of the schools the district has committed to serve. School level sections will contain specific actions and timelines the district will meet in implementing the interventions for each school.*

The Mobridge Pollock School District has recently designed curriculum maps to help determine where gaps in the curriculum may exist. The district has utilized emetric in determining specific indicators and standards that are not being addressed within the district. Specifically, Freeman Davis and Mobridge Upper Elementary have implemented RtI (reading), Dibels and AIMS Web to help track the progress of students while addressing the standards and indicators. This has allowed them to focus on the appropriate instructional models based on the needs of the students.

The district will utilize a Math Intervention Instructor to help assist small group and individual instruction to meet the high needs of the student body in the area of mathematics.

In adding two additional teachers this will allow us to have classroom sizes that are much more manageable. The focus will be on teaching to the identified needs of the students through Math Solutions, AIMS Web and the “Do the Math Intervention Program” versus simply trying to manage a class.

By adding an Instructional Coach to the Freeman Davis Elementary and Mobridge Upper Elementary this will allow teachers to be coached in implementing Cognitively Guided Instruction as well as assist in helping teachers collect and analyze data for their classroom. The instructional coach will establish an RtI math program focused on student data and provide job embedded professional development.

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

Based upon our application as a Tier III school we will be having professional development in the area of “Do the Math Interventions” and on-going professional development in the area of Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI).

The process used to determine the direction of the professional development is based off of the data that has been collected and analyzed throughout the school year. Using community members, staff members, past practices along with the student data it has driven the decision to utilize the programs mentioned above.

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

Based upon our application as a Tier III school we will continue to provide resources through the following areas to improve the performance of staff members and students:

**Staffing:** The district will continue to provide a curriculum director, school improvement coordinator, federal program director, data collection manager, technology coordinator, lead teachers within buildings and continue to develop and implement RTI and AIMS Webs through professional development.

**Funding:** As a Title I school, we will continue to direct 10% of the dollars directed at each school towards the area of professional development that is determined through the data collection process. We will also continue to use Title II A dollars to support classroom size reduction in 1<sup>st</sup> Grade.

**Support:** The district will support the interventions by supplying built in professional development days into the schedule to focus on interventions that work best in meeting the needs of the students identified.

**Partnership:** The district will continue to work with local business folks in setting up incentive programs that encourage high achievement. The district has worked in collaboration with community partners in applying for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Grant.

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

Based upon our application as a Tier III school we feel no policies and practices will need to be changed to fully implement the selected interventions.

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

Based upon our application as a Tier III school the district will sustain the reform effort with the following resources:

**Staffing:** The district will continue to provide a curriculum director, school improvement coordinator, federal program director, data collection manager, technology coordinator, lead teachers within buildings and continue to develop and implement RTI and AIMS Webs through professional development. The two additional teachers, Instructional Coach and Math Intervention teacher will only be part of the three year contract. If funds are available at the end of the three years (Title Funding or General Fund) we will continue to offer the classroom size reduction positions.

**Funding:** We will continue to direct Title I, Title II A and General Fund dollars towards the professional development and additional staff. After three years, we will direct money from the Title Programs to cover the cost of “Do the Math”. At this time we will only need to fund the reproducible materials.

**Support:** The district will support the interventions by supplying built in professional development days into the schedule to focus on interventions that work best in meeting the needs of the students identified.

**Partnership:** The district will continue to work with local business folks in setting up incentive programs that encourage high achievement. The district has worked in collaboration with community partners in applying for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Grant.

- (5) (Tier I & II) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to pre-implement and implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application. *Highlight major events and benchmarks for all schools over the first year pre-implementation and the remaining three year implementation time period. The timeline should be from the **district perspective**.*
- (6) (Tier I & II) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds. *List the reading and math annual goals for each of the Tier I and II schools the district commits to serve. The districts must use the Dakota Step (indicator) to define their measurable goals which are based upon the percent of proficient students. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year.) Other goals should be set that are measurable and specify the indicator (district assessments) that will be used during each of the grant years.*
- (7) (Tier III) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. *Briefly describe the activities for all Tier III schools served. Specifics of the activities will be provided in each school section.*

Freeman Davis Elementary will implement the following interventions.

**Provide job-embedded instruction**

Freeman Davis Elementary will hire a .5 FTE Math Instruction Coach to provide job embedded professional development and data analysis. The coach will also provide support in implementing Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) in Math as well as guidance in executing the “Do The Math” Program. This intervention will provide ongoing support and training for all teachers to ensure that all students receive appropriate instruction, which will help more students become proficient in Math. This position will help address fluctuating class sizes throughout the year and support teachers as new student’s transition into the school throughout the year.

**Class size reduction**

Freeman Davis Elementary will hire 2.0 FTE additional classroom teachers to reduce class sizes at the Kindergarten and Second Grade. Current Title I and Title IIA funds reduce class size at the first grade, but Kindergarten will have 24-26 students in each class and Second Grade will have 28-29 in each class. This intervention will continue building solid foundational skills for students so they are at grade level when they start Third Grade.

**Increased learning time for staff**

Teachers will have up to 40 hours of additional paid time each year to collaborate with other teachers and/or participate in professional development.

**Purchase Intervention Materials**

Freeman Davis Elementary will purchase the “Do the Math” program from Scholastic to address intervention needs for struggling math students.

**Purchase Equipment**

Freeman Davis Elementary will purchase six interactive projectors to increase motivation through hands on learning, technology integration, and interactive math lessons.

The Mobridge Upper Elementary will implement the following interventions.

**Implement an instructional model based on student needs**

Mobridge Upper Elementary will hire a 1.0 FTE Math Intervention Teacher to provide small group and one-on-one instruction. This intervention will address the needs of student who are not proficient in Math.

**Provide job-embedded instruction**

Mobridge Upper Elementary will hire a .5 FTE Math Instruction Coach to provide job embedded professional development and data analysis. The coach will also provide support in implementing Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) in Math as well as guidance in

executing the “Do the Math” Program. This intervention will provide ongoing support and training for all teachers to ensure that all students receive appropriate instruction, which will help more students become proficient in Math. This position will help address fluctuating class sizes throughout the year and support teachers as new student’s transition into the school throughout the year.

**Increased learning time for staff**

Teachers will have up to 40 hours of additional paid time each year to collaborate with other teachers and/or participate in professional development.

**Purchase Intervention Materials**

Mobridge Upper Elementary will purchase the “Do the Math” program from Scholastic to address intervention needs for struggling math students.

**Purchase Equipment**

Mobridge Upper Elementary will purchase three interactive projectors to increase motivation through hands on learning, technology integration, and interactive math lessons.

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

**Freeman Davis Elementary**

**NCLB Goal 1:** By 2013-2014 all students will reach high standards, at a minimum we will raise the number of students meeting benchmark (DIBELS) in Reading.

**Objective:** Kindergarten, 1<sup>st</sup> Grade and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade students will individually show a gain of 5% in all assessments:

- Initial Sound Fluency
- Phoneme Segmentation Fluency
- Nonsense Word Fluency
- Oral Reading Fluency
- Letter Naming

**NCLB Goal 2:** By the 2013-2014 all student will reach high standards, at a minimum we will raise the number of students meeting benchmark (AIMS Web) in math

**Objective:** Kindergarten, 1<sup>st</sup> Grade and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade students will individually show a gain of 5% in all assessments:

Oral Counting  
Number Identification  
Quantity Discrimination  
Missing Number  
Mathematic Concepts and Applications  
Math Computations

**Mobridge Upper Elementary**

**NCLB Goal 1:** By 2013-2014 all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in math .

**Objective:** The number of Economically Disadvantage students scoring basic or below basic on the Dakota STEP test will decrease by 10% from the prior year, meeting the safe harbor provisions.

**NCLB Goal 2:** By the 2013-2014 all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading.

**Objective:** The number of students scoring basic or below basic on the Dakota STEP test will decrease by 10%.

**NCLB Goal 3:** By 2013-2014 all students will reach high standards, at a minimum we will raise the number of students meeting benchmark (DIBELS) in Reading.

**Objective:** 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students will individually show a gain of 5% in oral reading fluency:

**NCLB Goal 4:** By the 2013-2014 all student will reach high standards, at a minimum we will raise the number of students meeting benchmark (AIMS Web) in math

**Objective:** 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students will individually show a gain of 5% in the following mathematic concepts and applications:

Number Sense  
Operations

Patterns and Relationships  
Measurement  
Geometry  
Data Probability

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Grant Periods:**

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

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

**Mobridge-Pollock School District Budget Sheet**

**2011-2012 (Project Year 1)**

**Personnel:**

The Mobridge-Pollock School District would use a Math Instructional Coach in the Freeman Davis and Mobridge Upper Elementary. This person would provide professional development and data analysis opportunities. The math coach would provide support in implementing Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI). This position would help support teachers in fluctuating class sizes throughout the year.

The teachers would be used for classroom size reduction in Kindergarten and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade. We presently have classroom size reduction in 1<sup>st</sup> Grade. It is imperative that we keep class sizes down due to the diversity within our district. Classroom sizes will approach 25-30 students without these teachers.

The Math Intervention Teacher would be a full time instructor in Mobridge Upper Elementary. This person would allow us to provide small group and one on one instruction. This will help our students meet proficiency in the elementary and the middle school setting in the future.

|                                  |                |                    |
|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| <b>Instructional Coach</b>       | <b>1.0 FTE</b> | <b>\$43,000.00</b> |
| <b>Teachers</b>                  | <b>2.0 FTE</b> | <b>\$70,000.00</b> |
| <b>Math Intervention Teacher</b> | <b>1.0 FTE</b> | <b>\$35,000.00</b> |

**Employee Benefits:**

This covers the cost of 4 full time employees benefits which includes insurance, retirement, Social Security and Medicare

**4.0 FTE X 30%** = **44,400.00**

**Equipment:**

Interactive projectors to increase motivation through hands on learning, technology intergration and interactive math lessons.

**Interactive Projectors**      **4 interactive projectors @ \$2,000**      =      **\$8,000**

**Supplies:**

The program is intended to help struggling students catch up and keep up with grade-level math skills and standards by helping students develop number sense, computation, and problem solving skills.

**“Do Math Intervention Program” Modules**      =      **\$14,000**

**Reproducible materials for “Do the Math” = \$6,000**

**Professional Development:**

Teachers will be allowed up to 40 hours of additional paid professional development time to collaborate with other teachers and/or to participate in specifically designed instruction to meet the needs of the students and staff members.

**Teachers Hourly (Collaboration and training)**

|  |                              |                     |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>23 Teachers @40 hours X \$22.50</b>           |                              | <b>=\$20,700.00</b> |
| <b>Benefits</b>                                  | <b>\$20,700x 20%</b>         | <b>=\$4,140.00</b>  |
| <b>Substitutes</b>                               | <b>23 days @ \$85.00/day</b> | <b>= \$1,955.00</b> |
| <b>Implementation Training for “Do the Math”</b> |                              |                     |
| <b>Intervention Program</b>                      | <b>2 days</b>                | <b>=\$6,000.00</b>  |

**Indirect Cost:**

**1.84% of \$253,195.00 = \$4512**

**2012-2013 (Project Year 2)**

**Personnel:**

The Mobridge-Pollock School District would use a Math Instructional Coach in the Freeman Davis and Mobridge Upper Elementary. This person would provide professional development and data analysis opportunities. The math coach would provide support in implementing Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI). This position would help support teachers in fluctuating class sizes throughout the year due to high mobility within the district.

The teachers would be used for classroom size reduction in Kindergarten and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade. We presently have classroom size reduction in 1<sup>st</sup> Grade. It is imperative that we keep class sizes down due to the diversity within our district. Classroom sizes will approach 25-30 students without these teachers.

The Math Intervention Teacher would be a full time instructor in Mobridge Upper Elementary. This person would allow us to provide small group and one on one instruction. This will help our students meet proficiency in the elementary and the middle school setting in the future.

|                                  |                |                    |
|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| <b>Instructional Coach</b>       | <b>1.0 FTE</b> | <b>\$44,290.00</b> |
| <b>Teachers</b>                  | <b>2.0 FTE</b> | <b>\$72,100.00</b> |
| <b>Math Intervention Teacher</b> | <b>1.0 FTE</b> | <b>\$36,050.00</b> |

**Employee Benefits:**



This covers the cost of 4 full time employees benefits which includes insurance, retirement, Social Security and Medicare

**4.0 FTE X 30%** **=\$45,732.00**

**Equipment:**

Interactive projectors to increase motivation through hands on learning, technology intergration and interactive math lessons.

**Interactive Projectors**                      **4 interactive projectors @ \$2,000** **= \$8,000**

**Supplies:**

The program is intended to help struggling students catch up and keep up with grade-level math skills and standards by helping students develop number sense, computation, and problem solving skills.

**Reproducible materials**                      **for "Do the Math" Intervention Program** **= \$6,000**

**Professional Development:**

Teachers will be allowed up to 40 hours of additional paid professional development time to collaborate with other teachers and/or to participate in specifically designed instruction to meet the needs of the students and staff members.

**Teachers Hourly (Collaboration and training)**

**23 Teachers @40 hours X \$23.18** **= \$21,325.60**

**Benefits** **\$21,325.60 x 20%** **= \$4,265.12**

**Substitutes** **23 days @ \$85.00/day** **= \$1,955.00**

**Indirect Cost:**

**1.84% of \$239,717.72** **= \$4,264**

**2013-2014 (Project Year 2)**

**Personnel:**

The Mobridge-Pollock School District would use a Math Instructional Coach in the Freeman Davis and Mobridge Upper Elementary. This person would provide professional development and data analysis opportunities. The math coach would provide support in implementing Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI). This position would help support teachers in fluctuating class sizes throughout the year due to high mobility within the district.

The teachers would be used for classroom size reduction in Kindergarten and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade. We presently have classroom size reduction in 1<sup>st</sup> Grade. It is imperative that we keep class sizes down due to the diversity within our district. Classroom sizes will approach 25-30 students without these teachers.

The Math Intervention Teacher would be a full time instructor in Mobridge Upper Elementary. This person would allow us to provide small group and one on one instruction. This will help our students meet proficiency in the elementary and the middle school setting in the future.

|                                  |                |                    |
|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| <b>Instructional Coach</b>       | <b>1.0 FTE</b> | <b>\$45,618.70</b> |
| <b>Teachers</b>                  | <b>2.0 FTE</b> | <b>\$74,263.00</b> |
| <b>Math Intervention Teacher</b> | <b>1.0 FTE</b> | <b>\$37,131.50</b> |

**Employee Benefits:**

This covers the cost of 4 full time employees benefits which includes insurance, retirement, Social Security and Medicare.

**4.0 FTE X 30%** **= \$47,103.97**

**Equipment:**

Interactive projectors to increase movtivation through hands on learning, technology intergration and interactive math lessons.

**Interactive Projectors** **4 interactive projectors @ \$2,000** **= \$8,000**

**Supplies:**

The program is intended to help struggling students catch up and keep up with grade-level math skills and standards by helping students develop number sense, computation, and problem solving skills.

**Reproducible materials** **for “Do the Math” Intervention Program** **= \$6,000**

**Professional Development:**

Teachers will be allowed up to 40 hours of additional paid professional development time to collaborate with other teachers and/or to participate in specifically designed instruction to meet the needs of the students and staff members.

|   |                              |                     |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Teachers Hourly (Collaboration and training)</b> |                              |                     |
| <b>23 Teachers @40 hours X \$23.87</b>              |                              | <b>=\$21,960.40</b> |
| <b>Benefits</b>                                     | <b>\$20,000 x 20%</b>        | <b>=\$4,392.08</b>  |
| <b>Substitutes</b>                                  | <b>23 days @ \$85.00/day</b> | <b>= \$1,955.00</b> |

**Indirect Cost:**

**1.84% of \$246,424.65 = \$4,389**

## Mobridge-Pollock School District

Budget Information  
Title I School Improvement 1003(g)

### Budget Summary

| Schools  | Project Year 1<br>7/01/11 - 6/30/12 (a) |                                 | **Project Year 2<br>7/01/12 - 6/30/13<br>(b) | **Project Year 3<br>7/1/13 - 6/30/14<br>(c) | Three-Year Total |
|--|---|---------------------------------|--|---|------------------|
|  | Pre-implementation                      | Year 1 - Full<br>Implementation |  |   |                  |
| <b>Freeman Davis Elementary,<br/>Tier III</b>  |   | \$153,802                       | \$147,684                                    | \$151,932                                   | \$453,417        |
| <b>Mobridge Upper Elementary,<br/>Tier III</b> |   | \$103,905                       | \$96,298                                     | \$98,997                                    | \$299,200        |
|  |   |                                 |  |   |                  |
|  |   |                                 |  |   |                  |
|  |   |                                 |  |   |                  |
|  |   |                                 |  |   |                  |
|  |   |                                 |  |   |                  |
| <b>District - Level Activities</b>             |   |                                 |  |   |                  |
| <b>Total Costs</b>                             |   |                                 |  |   | \$752,617        |

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

\*\* Contingent upon renewed federal funding

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

By submitting this application, the LEA assures that it will do the following:

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;  
 I agree.
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;  
 I agree.
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and  
 I agree.
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.  
 I agree.

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

The SD DOE has requested and received the waivers below.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

**F. WAIVERS: The SEA has not requested waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant. The LEA may apply for the following waiver.**

The SD DOE has not requested the waiver below.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will apply. If the LEA does not intend to apply for the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver. The waiver must be published for public comment prior to submission.

- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

