



south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Learning. Leadership. Service.

School Improvement Grants LEA Application

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

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202
OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: 06/30/2010

Due Date

May 1, 2010

South Dakota Department of Education

Kneip Office Building, Title I Office
700 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501

Grant Period Ends

June 30, 2013

FY 2009

School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Cover page

Legal Name of Applicant: Shannon County School District #65001	Applicant's Mailing Address: P. O. Box 109 Batesland, SD 57716
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Vickie Grant Position and Office: Director of School Improvement Contact's Mailing Address: P. O. Box 109 Batesland, SD 57716	Telephone: 605-288-1921 Fax: 605-2881814 Email address: vgrant@shannon.ws
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name): Daniel Elwood	Telephone: 605-288-1921
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: 4-09-10
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): Daniel Elwood

Original Signature of Authorized Representative: _____

Date: _____

SD Department of Education use only

Date Received:

Signature of authorized SD DOE staff person

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
Shannon County Alternative		X						X
Batesland				X				
Red Shirt				X				
Rockyford Lower				X				
Rockyford Upper				X				
Wolf Creek Upper				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 all of the district's Tier I, II, and III schools.

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school
 - a. List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome. *(Your answer must include the following: A list of the names of the members of the committee. The position within the district that each person is representing, The committee must include a broad range of stakeholders including administrators, teachers, program directors, community members, and parents).* The Corrective Action Leadership Team for Shannon County School District met on April 6 to conduct the needs assessment and determine the intervention for each school. Members of the team who were present include Dan Elwood, superintendent; Vickie Grant, school improvement coordinator; Maurice Twiss, federal programs director/community member; Robert Two Eagle, Lakota studies director/community member; Darrell Eagle Bull, Dean of Students/community member,

Alternative School; Monica Whirlwind Horse, principal/community member, Rockyford Upper; Connie Rous, teacher, Batesland Elementary; Illa Brings Him Back, paraprofessional/community member, Wolf Creek School; Liz Swallow, paraprofessional/community member, Red Shirt School; Natalie Hand, parent, Wolf Creek School; Mark Donovan, grandparent, Wolf Creek School; Bob Rose, technical adviser; and Sandra Gaspar, consultant.

- 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 each of the four lenses: Student, teacher, program, and community and parent.*

Student: DSTEP data in reading and mathematics (2003 to 2009)

Local CBM data in reading and mathematics (2003 to 2010)

District Audit, 2006 and 2009

Teacher: Current year in-service schedules

Anecdotal and formal teacher feedback regarding professional development

District Audit, 2006 and 2009

Program: Mathematics Program Audit conducted by Linda L. Walker, 2008

District Audit, 2006 and 2009

Community and parent:

Parent Survey, academics component, 2009

District Audit, 2006 and 2009

- c. Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) conducted for the purpose of the SIG application. *(Your answer must include the following: **WHEN** the comprehensive needs assessment was conducted, give date (must be completed between February and application submission); **WHO** was involved with the analysis of the data; and **HOW** the comprehensive needs assessment was accomplished.* The comprehensive needs assessment was conducted by the District Corrective Action Leadership Team in the Board Room in Batesland on April 6, 2010. Ten of the 12 regular members of the Corrective Action Leadership Team participated in the data analysis. In addition one parent, one grandparent, and the Dean of Students at the Alternative School (a Persistently Lowest Achieving School) joined the group for the data review/analysis and subsequent discussion. In keeping with the academic goal of the Shannon County School District Improvement Plan, the primary focus of the data analysis was student performance in reading and mathematics, both on the DSTEP (from 2003 through 2009) and on district-administered Curriculum Based Measures (CBMs) in reading and mathematics (2003 through 2010). The School Improvement coordinator presented student achievement, teacher, program and community/parent data via a slide show presentation and hand-outs. Members of the group discussed patterns/trends and generated a list of planning considerations. In addition, the CATeam reviewed a draft professional development plan (that was based on an earlier analysis of data) and discussed ways in which the district SIG proposal and the professional development plan could be merged. Meeting participants worked in triads to note strengths and weaknesses in the data and in the professional development plan. They provided oral and written feedback to the grant planning committee.
- d. Broadly describe the results of that review (specifics for each school will be outlined in the school sections). *Summarize the results of the CNA for each school.* The team that conducted the Comprehensive Needs Assessment recognized that the mathematics achievement of

Shannon County students overall is considerably lower than achievement in literacy/reading. Although 40% of district's students are proficient in reading, only 28% are proficient in mathematics. Data disaggregated by building showed a similar pattern: mathematics achievement in ALL Shannon County Schools is significantly lower than achievement in reading. Team members were especially interested in a chart that compared reading and mathematics DSTEP performance in each school according to the number of test items answered correctly, on average. Students in the various schools needed to answer from .9 (Batesland) to 8.3 (Shannon County Alternative School) more questions correctly on the reading test to achieve proficiency. In mathematics, these numbers ranged from 5.7 to 15.1 more questions correctly to achieve proficiency. This result is not surprising, since the primary focus of professional development, improvement in instruction, coaching and assessment has been on literacy since 2002. Only within the past three years has the district selected and begun to implement a reformed mathematics program (Investigations) in grades K-5. The district audit revealed that professional development has been inadequate; as a result, implementation of the new mathematics program with fidelity has been compromised. The team agreed, via consensus, that improving mathematics achievement should be the focus during the SIG period, but that efforts to continue support for literacy should not be diminished.

Since Shannon County Alternative School is a Tier I school, the team also considered data for this school separately. Of particular concern were data that showed the following: of the 58 students currently enrolled in the Alternative School, only 18 students have been in the program since the beginning of the school year. This attrition rate of nearly 70% has serious implications when it comes to delivering a coherent and properly sequenced instructional program. Given the alternatives, the team agreed that the Transformation Model was most appropriate for the Shannon County Alternative 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.*

School	Strength(s)	Weakness(s)/Need
Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff/Student Relationships • Student/Staff Ratio • Made AYP in Reading • Parents support SCSD academic program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics achievement and professional development • Enhance existing collaboration opportunities & coaching • Student Mobility
Batesland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Achievement • Parents support SCSD academic program • Reading PD • 8:00-9:00 collaboration via DDN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics achievement and professional development • Enhance existing collaboration opportunities & coaching • Reading Achievement (6-8) • Evaluate effectiveness of 6-8th core reading materials
Wolf Creek Upper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Achievement • Parents support SCSD academic program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics achievement and professional development • Enhance existing collaboration opportunities & coaching

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading PD • 8:00-9:00 collaboration via DDN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate effectiveness of 6-8th core reading materials • Classroom Management
Rockyford Lower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Achievement • Parents support SCSD academic program • Reading PD • 8:00-9:00 collaboration via DDN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics achievement and professional development • Enhance existing collaboration opportunities & coaching • Evaluate effectiveness of 6-8th core reading materials
Rockyford Upper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Achievement • Parents support SCSD academic program • Reading PD • 8:00-9:00 collaboration via DDN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics achievement and professional development • Enhance existing collaboration opportunities & coaching • Evaluate effectiveness of 6-8th core reading materials • Classroom Management
Red Shirt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Achievement • Parents support SCSD academic program • Reading PD • 8:00-9:00 collaboration via DDN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics achievement and professional development • Enhance existing collaboration opportunities & coaching • Evaluate effectiveness of 6-8th core reading materials

- f. Provide the rationale the district used to determine which schools to commit to serve with SIG funds and which schools not to serve: Since the Shannon County Alternative School is a Tier I school, the district is committed to serving this school as its top priority. Students served in the alternative program are students who struggle the most to be successful in school; they are consistently the lowest-achieving students in the district. As such, they are the students who need the most instructional, emotional and social support.

The other eligible schools in Shannon County also have *Must address each Tier I and II school first, and then address each of the district's Tier III schools, if applicable.*

- (2) The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- a. Describe the LEA's capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application. *What capacity does the district have to execute and support a turnaround or transformational model? The district has the personnel, the technical infrastructure, and a history of participation in the South Dakota Incentives+ project to jumpstart its efforts to implement the Transformation Model in the Shannon County Alternative School. As a result of its participation in SDI+, the district has already linked growth in student performance with monetary incentives for paraprofessionals, teachers and principals. In addition, SDI+ has assisted the district in implementing strategies to recruit, place and retain highly-qualified and highly-effective staff.*

Will the district contract with any person or organization to assist with the implementation of the turnaround or transformational model? The district will contract with Technology and Innovation in Education (TIE) to assist with implementation of the Transformation Model in Shannon County Alternative School. TIE is a high-capacity, intermediate service agency that specializes in teacher and school leader development, school innovation, program evaluation, and data-driven school improvement. In particular, TIE will assist the district in creating a sophisticated evaluation system that includes a process for removing staff who are not effective. 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? Shannon County School District has a progressive superintendent and a Board of Education who are willing to abandon the status quo in favor of new ideas that show promise for improving teaching and learning. They are committed to significantly increasing both student instructional time and staff professional development time. The district has one of the lowest teacher/ student ratios in the state of South Dakota and will employ a total of 10 instructional coaches (literacy, mathematics and Response to Intervention--RTI) beginning with the 2010-2011 school year. As a part of the SDI+ project, each school has created a Building Leadership Team that has received more than 50 hours of specialized training in data-driven decision making, effective instructional strategies, effective teaming, and school leadership. In addition, the district has created a sophisticated, web-based system to guide instruction and assessment. The system aligns the district's literacy and mathematics programs with state standards and provides teachers with pacing guides to ensure that students will have a guaranteed and viable curriculum. The district also has a comprehensive formative and summative assessment system, and teachers have immediate access to a wealth of student achievement data to help guide their instruction. Differentiate what has already taken place and detail plans for the future.

The district has already made significant improvements in curriculum (comprehensive literacy and reformed mathematics), instruction and assessment. The district has adopted a philosophy of continuous improvement, however. Curriculum groups in all the content areas meet each summer to further refine the web-based resources, discuss ways to improve teaching and learning.

- 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.)*The district's Leadership Team, chaired by the superintendent, will provide oversight of the School Improvement Grant. The team is a 12-member group that meets monthly and includes central office staff, principals, teachers, paraprofessionals, parents/community members, and a board member. The team will receive monthly progress reports, will annually benchmark goals and objectives, and will make recommendations for continuous improvement.
- (3) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school. *The LEA must indicate the barriers or reasons why it lacks the capacity to serve all Tier I schools. Examples might be funding, minimum staffing for oversight, inability to close schools, geography or rural nature of district, lack of charter schools in the state, lack of qualified principals applying over the past years, district improvement, school improvement, multiple requirements to address.* Shannon County School District has only one Tier I school and is applying to serve that school.
- (4) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take.

Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. *Describe what the district has done to this point to design the interventions described in the school level sections. Broadly address all of the schools the district has committed to serve.*

In reference to the Transformational Model to be applied to SCSD's Alternative School, the district has already been engaged in comprehensive efforts to increase teacher and school leader effectiveness in all schools through its participation in the SDI+ project. Through SDI+, the district has begun to create and implement a performance evaluation system that links teacher pay to student performance in all schools. In addition, the district has created a professional learning community structure in all schools.

A major component of this plan for all schools is the implementation of a comprehensive, job-embedded professional development program to improve teaching and learning in mathematics and to integrate Lakota studies into the teaching of mathematics across the district. This detailed plan, which has been developed over the past several months, is aligned with the district's improvement plan. It includes

- an additional two weeks of professional development in mathematics content and pedagogy for all teachers in principals each August before school starts;
- ongoing training in Cognitively Guided Instruction (a program designed at the University of Wisconsin specifically for Native American children) throughout the project period;
- follow-up classroom observations by professional development providers throughout the project period;
- additional instructional coaching support in all Shannon County Schools throughout the project period and beyond;
- continued training of Building Leadership Teams and Collaborative Work groups throughout the project period and beyond to increase focus on data-driven student achievement and integration of Lakota studies into the regular academic program
- an instructional leadership class (Lenses on Learning) for all building principals, and district instructional coaches in RTI, literacy, mathematics and Lakota studies in Year 1. In this class, participants learn how to support improved instruction in mathematics. Additional instructional leadership programs will be designed for Years 2 and 3.

Year 1: Focus on Number Sense with Lakota integration

Year 2: Focus on Algebra with Lakota integration

Year 3: Focus on Geometry with Lakota integration

TOTAL: 90 hours per year

The pedagogy components of the program will be delivered by TIE. The content components of the program will be delivered by the CAMSE at Black Hills State University.

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?* Contingent on funding, the district will contract with TIE to provide both technical assistance on implementation of School Improvement Grants and for professional development in mathematics

over the three-year grant period. In addition, the district will contract with the Center for the Advancement of Mathematics and Science Education (CAMSE) at Black Hill State University to provide the content portion of the mathematics professional development.

These external service providers were selected because of their long and successful track record in South Dakota and their specialized expertise. TIE has been South Dakota's primary professional development provider for the past 25 years; CAMSE is one of the Centers of Excellence established within South Dakota's university system. This powerful combination of pedagogy and content expertise will help SCSD create a comprehensive, job-embedded professional development program that will be implemented over the three-year duration of this grant and will provide a minimum of 270 hours of professional development (90 hours each year for three years) in number, algebra and geometry.

Shannon County's District Leadership Team and Administrative Team were involved in the selection of the external partners.

- a. Align other resources with the interventions. *Describe other resources available to the district that will be leveraged to assist with interventions under SIG. Include participation in SDI+, RtI, Reading First, etc. Address resources in terms of funding, staffing, partnerships, and support.*
The district participates in SDI+ and RTI. More than half a million dollars each year is paid out in paraprofessional teacher and principal incentives through SDI+. The district is required to partially match these funds this year (25%), will match 50% next year and will match 75% in the following year. The district has hired an RTI coach and has piloted the intervention model in two schools. It is expanding this model in all other schools next year and will train all lower elementary staff.
 - b. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. *Describe policies and practices that will need to be changed in order to fully implement the selected interventions. What barriers exist? Indicate the willingness of the district to modify procedures along the way if needed.*
Since SDI+ has already set a precedent for performance-based pay, this should not be an issue in Shannon County. Evaluation instruments used for teachers and principals are subject to negotiations with the Shannon County Education Association. In addition, the length of contract is negotiated, so plans to extend the Alternative School calendar to accommodate year-round school will need to be discussed as the negotiations table.
 - c. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. *Describe how the district will continue the reform efforts once the SIG funds no longer exist. Address funding, staffing, and other resources that will be needed to sustain the reforms.* The district has considerable resources available through Title I and other federal programs, as well as impact aid. A sustainability plan will be developed in Year 3.
- (5) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application. *Highlight major events and benchmarks for all schools over the three year implementation time period. The timeline should be from the district perspective.*

Timeline for Alternative School Interventions:

Year One Activities	Year Two Activities	Year Three Activities
<p>Spring, 2010—Hire new principal Spring 2010—Hire full time instructional coach Spring, 2010—Contract with external services providers TIE and CAMSE Summer, 2010—Planning for use of new curriculum materials and alternate calendar with staff Fall, 2010—Implementation of professional development program and curriculum modules Fall, 2010--new year-round school calendar begins School Year 1—Staff plan parent training/involvement component School Year 1—External providers work with District Leadership Team to revamp evaluation system May of Year 1—District Leadership Team benchmarks progress toward project implementation and makes recommendations to inform future work.</p>	<p>School Year 2— Implementation of professional development program and new curriculum continue School Year 2—new evaluation/incentives system is implemented School Year 2—new parent involvement/training component is implemented May of Year 2—District Leadership Team benchmarks progress toward project implementation and makes recommendations to inform future work. Summer Year 2—School is extended through the summer</p>	<p>Program as described in the grant proposal is fully implemented Year 3—Sustainability plan is created May of Year 3—District Leadership Team benchmarks progress toward project implementation and makes recommendations to inform future work. Summer Year 3—School is extended through the summer. Transition to year-round school is complete.</p>

Timeline for Implementation of Professional Development Plan in all eligible schools:

Year One: 2010-2011*
District In-service Program

Date/ duration	Schedule/ Format	Who will participate?	What are the outcomes?	Activities	Who is responsible?	How much will it cost? Who will pay for it?	How will success be measured?
July 27-28	SDI+ Summer Institute, Rapid City	BLT members and principals	Improve operation/functioning of Building Leadership Teams and Collaborative Work Groups	To be determined	SDI+ leadership	Cost covered by SDI+ project. Participants receive a \$200 stipend	SDI+ external evaluators will gather evaluation data
Three weeks prior to district in-service (August 3,4,5) Three days	Face to face at Batesland	All new teachers	Orient new teachers to reservation, district, curriculum, instructional expectations, assessment system, policies, procedures, etc.	To be determined	School Improvement Coordinator, Lakota Studies Director, Instructional coaches	\$250/day stipends issued to new teachers for participation. Est. cost to be based on # of vacancies	Perceptions feedback from participating teachers
Three weeks prior to district in-service (August 1-5) plus to follow-up days (to be scheduled) for data analysis	Face to face	Lower elementary teachers	Improve the capacity of lower elementary teachers to deliver RTI instructional strategies	CORE RTI training: Advanced Applications of Reading DIBELS	Coordinator: Lynette Miller w assistance from state RTI trainers	Supplemental contracts issued to teachers for participation.	Evaluation process to be determined by CORE RTI trainers
Two weeks prior to district in-service (August 9-13 and 16-20) Two, one-week courses	Face to face	All teachers of mathematics 5 concurrent sessions (25-30 participants each)	Increase content knowledge in number Improve fidelity of curriculum implementation; build district-wide assessment	Two-credit course in mathematics content knowledge—number	June Apaza, CAMSE	Supplemental contracts issued to teachers for participation. Consulting fees included in total	Perceptions feedback from participating teachers Pre-post content assessments

			system in math	Two-credit course in Reformed Mathematics Implementation and Assessment	Kim Clark, TIE	package	
Week of August 16-20, 1/2 day within Reformed Mathematics Implementation and Assessment course.	Face to Face	All BLT members and principals	To be determined Focus on instructional strategies & leadership development	Plan pre-school in-service BLT/CWG session	SDI+ with input from School Improvement Coordinator, Lakota Studies Director, Instructional coaches	No additional cost	Perceptions feedback from participating teachers, principals
Pre-school in-service (district day) August 23 (Monday)	Face to face at central location	All staff	Strengthen social network among staff Motivate staff to begin a successful new year Distribute information	Keynote speaker District information dissemination (federal programs, business office, etc.) Lunch	Superintendent with input from program directors	Contracted day, no additional staffing cost Keynote speaker: Est. \$500	Perceptions feedback from participating staff
Pre-school in-service (building day) August 24 (Tuesday)	Face to face in buildings	All staff in the building	Content to be determined	Principal distributes information BLT meets ½ day with collaborative work groups	Principal and Building Leadership Teams	Contracted day, no additional cost	Perceptions feedback from staff
Pre-school in-service (teacher day) August 25	Individuals at their work stations	All staff in the building	Prepare classrooms for the beginning of school	Teachers have this time to work on their own	Teachers	Contracted day, no additional cost	N/A--Not a training day
School starts August 26							
During the 2010-2011 school year. Combo of release days and DDN sessions to = 30	Face to face/DDN Sessions to be scheduled by School	All teachers of mathematics in 5 different groups of 25-30 participants each.	Improve classroom practice (pedagogy) of teachers of mathematics.	Understanding Student Thinking in Number and Operations (CGI)	SC teacher leaders supported by Kim Clark, Marcia Torgrude, and June Apaza	Contracted time, no additional cost Consulting fees included in overall package	SD Counts evaluation

contact hours	Improvement Coordinator						
During the 2010-2011 school year Duration to be determined	Face to face in SCSD	Principals and instructional coaches (including Lakota studies and Literacy)	Leadership support for implementation of inquiry-based mathematics	Lenses on Learning course	CAMSE and/or TIE As designed with co-planning by consultants and district leaders to mesh with Ed Porthan training	Consulting fees included in overall package	CAMSE/TIE evaluation
Monthly during the 2010-2011 school year	Face to face	Pre-K-2 Math and RTI teachers	Improve the capacity of pre-K-2 teachers of mathematics to teach skills and provide interventions	Training using Kathy Richardson materials.	TIE Kim Clark	Consulting fees included in overall package	Perceptions feedback from participants Classroom observations to determine effectiveness of implementation
During the 2010-2011 school	Alternating sites/DDN with follow-up coaching	All new teachers (as a condition of signing bonus)	Orientation to literacy, mathematics and RTI programs	Year-long course for new teachers as delivered in 2009-2010 with improvements	Lynette Miller, Joni Sasse, Amy Huether	Instructor stipends est Teacher participation required as a condition of receiving signing bonus	Instructor-designed evaluation; classroom observations to determine effectiveness of implementation
BLT training days October, February, April To be scheduled 8:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m.	Face to face at central location one week prior to each district in-service day	All principals and Building Leadership Team members	Content to be determined Focus on instructional strategies & leadership development	Plan professional development for other staff on in-service days	SDI+ with input from School Improvement Coordinator, Lakota Studies Director, Instructional coaches	Contracted days, no additional cost	Perceptions feedback after each training session
District In-service days (3 full days October, February & April + 1 full day	Face to face in each building Face to face	All instructional staff in each building	Content to be determined. Focus on instructional	Building Leadership teams provide training in	Principal and Building Leadership Teams	Contracted days, no additional cost	Perceptions feedback after each in-service day

embedded in LNI)	one day (or two half-days) at LNI		strategies and leadership development	October, February, April	CAMSE/TIE		Observations of PD to determine team effectiveness
Districtwide grade level collaborative work group sessions 2X/month per grade level	DDN	All instructional staff	Content to be determined. Focus on instructional strategies and leadership development	Discuss instructional strategies using adopted protocol	Instructional coaches	Contracted days, no additional cost	Meeting notes posted on district web site Evaluator observations of meeting effectiveness
Building-level collaborative work group sessions 2X/month per month	Face to face in each building	All instructional staff	Content to be determined. Focus on instructional strategies and leadership development	Discuss instructional strategies using pre-determined protocols	Building Leadership Team members are responsible for convening their groups	Contracted days, no additional cost	Meeting notes turned in to principals Evaluator observations of meeting effectiveness
End of year check-out day	Within each building	All instructional staff	Complete logistics/paperwork to end the school year	Principals indicate expectations	Building principals	Contracted day, no additional cost	N/A—Not a training day

***Years 2, 3 and 4 of the plan are essentially the same in format. In mathematics, content changes as follows: Year 1—focus on number sense; Year 2—focus on algebra; Year 3 focus on geometry and measurement; Year 4—focus on rational numbers and/or data and probability**

- (6) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics

that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds. *List the reading and math annual goals for each of the Tier I and II schools the district commits to serve. The goal must be measurable and specify the indicator (Dakota STEP) that will be used during each of the grant years. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year).*

TIER I: Shannon County Alternative School

- The number of Shannon County Alternative School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in reading will increase from 20 % in 2009 to 25 % in 2010.
- The number of Shannon County Alternative School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in mathematics will increase from 10% in 2009 to 15% in 2010.

NOTE: Targets are adjusted annually to meet safe harbor requirements for AYP. Targets calculated by TIE staff and provided annually to the school.

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.*

Results of the districtwide Comprehensive Needs Assessment indicate that low student achievement in mathematics is of grave concern in all district schools. Therefore, the services that Shannon County Tier III schools will receive relative to this proposal include implementation of a comprehensive, job-embedded professional development program to improve teaching and learning in mathematics and to integrate Lakota studies into the teaching of mathematics across the district. This detailed plan is aligned with the district's improvement plan. It includes

- an additional two weeks of professional development in mathematics content and pedagogy for all teachers in principals each August before school starts;
- ongoing training in Cognitively Guided Instruction (a program designed at the University of Wisconsin specifically for Native American children) throughout the project period;
- follow-up classroom observations by professional development providers throughout the project period;
- additional instructional coaching support in all Shannon County Schools throughout the project period and beyond;
- continued training of Building Leadership Teams and Collaborative Work groups throughout the project period and beyond to increase focus on data-driven student achievement and integration of Lakota studies into the regular academic program
- an instructional leadership class (Lenses on Learning) for all building principals, and district instructional coaches in RTI, literacy, mathematics and Lakota studies in Year 1. In this class, participants learn how to support improved instruction in mathematics. Additional instructional leadership programs will be designed for Years 2 and 3.

Year 1: Focus on Number Sense with Lakota integration

Year 2: Focus on Algebra with Lakota integration

Year 3: Focus on Geometry with Lakota integration

TOTAL: 90 hours per year

The pedagogy components of the program will be delivered by TIE. The content components of the program will be delivered by the CAMSE at Black Hills State University.

(7)

1) A Comprehensive professional development program to improve teaching and learning in mathematics that extends through the three-year grant period and will extend one year beyond the grant funding period if funds are available. This program will include 90 hours annually of professional development in both mathematics pedagogy (for inquiry-based programs) and mathematics content (Year 1 number sense; Year 2 algebra; Year 3 geometry; and Year 4 statistics and probability). In addition to coursework, the program will include extensive teacher observations, coaching and technical support. Professional development will be provided by Technology and Innovation

(8) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds. *List the reading and math annual goals for each of the Tier I and II schools the district commits to serve. The goal must be measurable and specify the indicator (Dakota STEP) that will be used during each of the grant years. A goal that indicates safe harbor requirements may be appropriate (decreasing the non-proficient by 10% from the prior year). TIER: III*

Batesland Elementary School:

- The number of Batesland Elementary School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in reading will increase from 45 % in 2009 to 46 % in 2010.
- The number of Batesland Elementary School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in mathematics will increase from 31% in 2009 to 34% in 2010.

NOTE: Targets are adjusted annually to meet safe harbor requirements for AYP. Targets calculated by TIE staff and provided annually to the school.

Wolf Creek Upper Elementary School:

- The number of Wolf Creek Upper Elementary School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in reading will increase from 42 % in 2009 to 45 % in 2010.
- The number of Wolf Creek Upper Elementary School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in mathematics will increase from 26% in 2009 to 30% in 2010.

NOTE: Targets are adjusted annually to meet safe harbor requirements for AYP. Targets calculated by TIE staff and provided annually to the school.

Red Shirt Elementary School:

- The number of Red Shirt Elementary School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in reading will increase from 39 % in 2009 to 39 % in 2010.
- The number of Red Shirt Elementary School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in mathematics will increase from 29% in 2009 to 29% in 2010.

NOTE: Targets are adjusted annually to meet safe harbor requirements for AYP. Targets calculated by TIE staff and provided annually to the school.

Rockyford Lower Elementary School:

- The number of Rockyford Lower Elementary School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in reading will increase from 36 % in 2009 to 39 % in 2010.
- The number of Rockyford Lower Elementary School scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in mathematics will increase from 29% in 2009 to 31% in 2010.

NOTE: Targets are adjusted annually to meet safe harbor requirements for AYP. Targets calculated by TIE staff and provided annually to the school.

Rockyford Upper Elementary School:

- The number of Rockyford Upper Elementary School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in reading will increase from 30 % in 2009 to 34 % in 2010.
- The number of Rockyford Upper Elementary School students scoring proficient or advanced on the DSTEP in mathematics will increase from 24% in 2009 to 29% in 2010.

NOTE: Targets are adjusted annually to meet safe harbor requirements for AYP. Targets calculated by TIE staff and provided annually to the school.

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

Shannon County Alternative School:

Superintendent Elwood visited with the current alternative school principal/district director of school improvement, Vickie Grant and building manager, Darrell (Brownie) Eagle Bull regarding the prospective 1003g grant opportunity on February 22, 2010. The district director of school improvement/alternative school principal, Vickie Grant and building manager, Brownie Eagle Bull discussed options later that same day as well as via phone and in person as the grant writing process evolved. Superintendent Elwood kept the school board up-to-date via board reports—February 22nd, March 12th, and March 22nd. The Shannon County Alternative School Improvement Team of Brownie Eagle Bull, Building Manager; Chris Benson, Parent/Community; Robert Lockhart, Title I Teacher; Lowell Phillips, Special Education Teacher; Terry Porter, Classroom Teacher; Velma Kills Back, Classroom Teacher; and Wilbert Buckman, Classroom Teacher met from 8:00-9:00 each Wednesday in March to review the application and implementation of the Transformation School Improvement Model. Finally, on April 6, 2010, principals (including Brownie Eagle Bull, Shannon County Alternative Building Manager; Amy Huether, District Literacy Specialist; Joni Sasse, District Math Specialist; and Candi Foltz-Hall, District Early Childhood Coordinator) from across the district met with district leadership (Dan Elwood, Superintendent; Maurice Twiss, Director of Federal Programs; Vickie Grant, Director of School Improvement; Sandy Gaspar, SDDOE Corrective Action Consultant, and Robert Rose, SDDOE Technical Advisor; to review the application. Later, the Corrective Action Team—Those district level people previously mentioned, joined by Todd O'Bryan, School Board Member; Illa Brings Him Back, paraprofessional; Elizabeth Swallow, paraprofessional; Connie Rous, teacher; Monica Whirlwind Horse, Rockyford Upper Elementary Principal; Robert Two Crow, District Lakota Studies Director met to review and finalize the needs assessment. This group was joined by Brownie Eagle Bull, Alternative School Building Manager and parent/community representatives Mark Donovan and Natalie Hand.

Others:

Superintendent Dan Elwood and Vickie Grant, District Director of School Improvement met with principals/building managers from all schools along with other district administrators

regarding the prospective 1003g grant opportunity on February 22, 2010. The district director of school improvement, Vickie Grant continued discussions via phone and in person as the grant writing process evolved. [Building level involvement—see below] Superintendent Elwood kept the school board up-to-date via board reports—February 22nd, March 12th, and March 22nd. On April 6, 2010, principals (including Brownie Eagle Bull, Shannon County Alternative Building Manager; Amy Huether, District Literacy Specialist; Joni Sasse, District Math Specialist; and Candi Foltz-Hall, District Early Childhood Coordinator) from across the district met with district leadership (Dan Elwood, Superintendent; Maurice Twiss, Director of Federal Programs; Vickie Grant, Director of School Improvement; Sandy Gaspar, SDDOE Corrective Action Consultant, and Robert Rose, SDDOE Technical Advisor; to review the application. Later, the Corrective Action Team—including those district level people previously mentioned, joined by Todd O’Bryan, School Board Member; Illa Brings Him Back, paraprofessional; Elizabeth Swallow, paraprofessional; Connie Rous, teacher; Monica Whirlwind Horse, Rockyford Upper Elementary Principal; Robert Two Crow, District Lakota Studies Director met to review and finalize the needs assessment. This group was joined by Brownie Eagle Bull, Alternative School Building Manager and parent/community representatives [].

In addition to planning team involvement prior to this meeting (see below), principals will take this information back to their building team.

Batesland:

Building based people involved in the 1003a and SIG development process included: Mary Goodart, Kindergarten teacher; Amanda Lefler, Kindergarten teacher and School Improvement Team Member; Cindy Buresh, 1st grade teacher, School Improvement Team Member and BLT; Peggy Link, 2nd grade Teacher, School Improvement Team Member; Connie Rous, Third Grade Teacher, School Improvement Team Member, District Corrective Action Member; Deb Black Crow, 4th Grade Teacher/Community Member; Mia Whirlwind Horse, 5th Grade Teacher, Denise Schulz, Sixth Grade Teacher; Regina Whipple, 7th and 8th Grade Math and Science Teacher, School Improvement Team Member, and BLT; Tracy Fortin, 7th and 8th Grade Language Arts and Social Studies Teacher; Janell Youel, Special Education and School Improvement Team Member; Amie Kuxhaus, Preschool Teacher and School Improvement Team Member; Eileen Grinnell, In School Suspension Teacher and School Improvement Team Member; and Melody Bohlender, Counselor and School Improvement Team Member. Additional building level planning team members include Vickie Lefthand, Ginger Goodlance, Bridgette Yankton, Parent/Community; Ginny Mueller, Charlotte Cummings, Paraprofessionals; Dee Anderson, RtI Coach. Mrs. Kaltenbach, Batesland Principal, School Improvement Team Member, BLT, and District Corrective Action Team member chaired all meetings.

Red Shirt:

Building based people involved in the 1003a and SIG development process included Barbara Ice, Principal, Monica Knuppe, Teacher of Grades 6-8, Kathy Furbish, SpecialEd, Jean Heier, RtI, Lee Monnens, Teacher of Grade 2, Helene Circle Eagle, Lakota Studies Coach, and Rebecca Kaiser, Librarian. Additional building level planning team members include Jennifer Her Many Horses and Darwin Two Bulls, parent/community.

Wolf Creek Upper:

Building based people involved in the 1003a and SIG development process included, after a meeting with all of the upper grade level teaching staff, Wolf Creek’s Upper team, consisting of Amy Huether, Literacy Coach; Joni Sasse, Math Coach; Lynn Stein, Upper Math; Nona Jackson, 6th Grade classroom teacher; and Beverly Bertram, Upper Language Arts on March 18 & 19. Additional building level planning team members include Natalie Hand, parent/community/parent advisory council and Asa Wilson, special education.

Rockyford Upper:

Building based people involved in the 1003a and SIG development process included the Rockyford Upper Elementary Building Leadership team of Monica Whirlwind Horse, principal; Sonia Pille, classroom teacher; Marcia Stein, special education; Janet Kelly, parent/community and Amy Huether, district literacy coach, with meetings held on March 8,9,10, 12 and 17.

Rockyford Lower:

Building based people involved in the 1003a and SIG development process included the Rockyford Lower BLT team consisting of Robert J. Hall, Principal; Terri White and Sandra Blacksmith fourth grade teachers, Gayle Ludens, third grade teacher, Nicole Twiss, second grade teacher; Lynnette Miller, RtI Coach and Candi Foltz-Hall, Early Childhood Literacy Coordinator. Additional building level team members include Carolyn Tail, Stacy Two Lance, parent/community; and Marcia Stein, special education teacher. The work of the team was shared. Discussion and recommendations were encouraged from the entire staff on March 17th with the goals of the School Improvement Plan leading and guiding the discussion. The team met March 10, 12, 15, 17 and 19.

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

	<p>to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	---	--

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

Grant Periods:

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

ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL

<u>Personnel:</u>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Instructional Coach:	48,000.00	48,000.00	48,000.00
5 teachers, 10 PD Days:	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00
Extended Contracts: 18 days, 5 teachers, 10 paraprofessionals	47,700.00	47,700.00	47,700.00

Employee Benefits:

Benefits (25% of salaries):	25,521.00	25,521.00	25,521.00
-----------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Travel:

Equipment:

Computers and Furniture for Modular Laboratories	29,720.00
---	-----------

Supplies:

Modules, module supplies, Information system	63,150.00
---	-----------

Contractual:

Services rendered by external PD providers	5,320.00	5,320.00	5,320.00
<u>Professional Development:</u>			
<u>Indirect Costs: .0252%</u>			
	5,690.00	3,350.00	3,350.00

BATESLAND ELEMENTARY

<u>Personnel:</u>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Teacher Intern:	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00
Teacher Salaries 10 PD Days:	32,319.00	32,319.00	32,319.00
13.5% of district total			
Based on student enrollment			
<u>Employee Benefits:</u>			
Benefits (25% of salaries):	16,830.00	16,830.00	16,830.00
<u>Travel:</u>			
<u>Equipment:</u>			
<u>Supplies:</u>			
<u>Contractual:</u>			
Services rendered by			
external PD providers	26,933.00	26,933.00	26,933.00
13.5% of district total			
Based on student enrollment			
<u>Professional Development:</u>			
<u>Indirect Costs</u>	2,799.00	2,799.00	2,799.00

WOLF CREEK UPPER ELEMENTARY

<u>Personnel:</u>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Teacher Intern:	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00
Teacher Salaries 10 PD Days:	33,317.00	33,317.00	33,317.00
13.9% of district total			
Based on student enrollment			
<u>Employee Benefits:</u>			
Benefits (25% of salaries):	17,079.00	17,079.00	17,079.00
<u>Travel:</u>			
<u>Equipment:</u>			
<u>Supplies:</u>			
<u>Contractual:</u>			
Services rendered by			
external PD providers	27,764.00	27,764.00	27,764.00
13.9% of district total			
Based on student enrollment			
<u>Professional Development:</u>			
<u>Indirect Costs</u>	2,852.00	2,852.00	2,852.00

ROCKYFORD LOWER ELEMENTARY

<u>Personnel:</u>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Teacher Intern:	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00
Teacher Salaries 10 PD Days:	51,870.00	51,870.00	51,870.00
21.6% of district total Based on student enrollment			
<u>Employee Benefits:</u>			
Benefits (25% of salaries):	21,718.00	21,718.00	21,718.00
<u>Travel:</u>			
<u>Equipment:</u>			
<u>Supplies:</u>			
<u>Contractual:</u>			
Services rendered by external PD providers	43,225.00	43,225.00	43,225.00
21.6% of district total Based on student enrollment			
<u>Professional Development:</u>			
<u>Indirect Costs</u>	3,826.00	3,826.00	3,826.00

ROCKYFORD UPPER ELEMENTARY

<u>Personnel:</u>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Teacher Intern:	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00
Teacher Salaries 10 PD Days:	29,327.00	29,327.00	29,327.00
12.2% of district total			
Based on student enrollment			
<u>Employee Benefits:</u>			
Benefits (25% of salaries):	16,082.00	16,082.00	16,082.00
<u>Travel:</u>			
<u>Equipment:</u>			
<u>Supplies:</u>			
<u>Contractual:</u>			
Services rendered by			
external PD providers	24,439.00	24,439.00	24,439.00
12.2% of district total			
Based on student enrollment			
<u>Professional Development:</u>			
<u>Indirect Costs</u>	2,642.00	2,642.00	2,642.00

RED SHIRT ELEMENTARY

<u>Personnel:</u>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Teacher Intern:	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00
Teacher Salaries 10 PD Days:	11,970.00	11,970.00	11,970.00
5% of district total Based on student enrollment			
<u>Employee Benefits:</u>			
Benefits (25% of salaries):	11,742.00	11,742.00	11,742.00
<u>Travel:</u>			
<u>Equipment:</u>			
<u>Supplies:</u>			
<u>Contractual:</u>			
Services rendered by external PD providers	9975.00	9975.00	9975.00
5% of district total Based on student enrollment			
<u>Professional Development:</u>			
<u>Indirect Costs</u>	1,731.00	1,731.00	1,731.00

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

Name of School: Shannon County Alternative School

Budget Summary

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)	Project Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$102084.00	\$102084.00	\$102084.00	\$306,252.00
2. Employee Benefits	\$25,521.00	\$25,521.00	\$25,521.00	\$75,563.00
3. Travel	00			
4. Equipment	\$29,720.00			\$29,720.00
5. Supplies	\$63,150.00			\$63,150.00
6. Contractual	\$5320.00	\$5320.00	\$5320.00	\$15960.00
7. Professional Development				
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	\$225,795.00	\$132,925.00	\$132,925.00	\$491,645.00
9. Indirect Costs*	\$5690.00	\$3350.00	\$3350.00	\$12,390.00
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	\$231,485.00	\$136,275.00	\$136,275.00	\$504,035

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

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

Name of School: Batesland Elementary School

Budget Summary

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)	Project Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$67,319.00	\$67,319.00	\$67,319.00	\$201,957.00
2. Employee Benefits	\$16,830.00	\$16,830.00	\$16,830.00	\$50,490.00
3. Travel				
4. Equipment				
5. Supplies				
6. Contractual	\$26,933.00	\$26,933.00	\$26,933.00	\$80,799.00
7. Professional Development				
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	\$111,082.00	\$111,082.00	\$111,082.00	\$333,246.00
9. Indirect Costs*	\$2,799.00	\$2,799.00	\$2,799.00	\$8397.00
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	\$113,881.00	\$113,881.00	\$113,881.00	\$341,643

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

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

Name of School: Wolf Creek Upper Elementary School

Budget Summary

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)	Project Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$68,317.00	\$68,317.00	\$68,317.00	\$204,951.00
2. Employee Benefits	\$17,079.00	\$17,079.00	\$17,079.00	\$51,237.00
3. Travel				
4. Equipment				
5. Supplies				
6. Contractual	\$27,764.00	\$27,764.00	\$27,764.00	\$83,292.00
7. Professional Development				
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	\$113,160.00	\$113,160.00	\$113,160.00	\$339,480.00
9. Indirect Costs*	\$2,852.00	\$2,852.00	\$2,852.00	\$8556.00
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	\$116,012.00	\$116,012.00	\$116,012.00	\$348,306.00

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

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

Name of School: Rockyford Lower Elementary School

Budget Summary

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)	Project Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$86,870.00	\$86,870.00	\$86,870.00	\$260,610.00
2. Employee Benefits	\$21,718.00	\$21,718.00	\$21,718.00	\$65,154.00
3. Travel				
4. Equipment				
5. Supplies				
6. Contractual	\$43,225.00	\$43,225.00	\$43,225.00	\$129,675.00
7. Professional Development				
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	\$151,813.00	\$151,813.00	\$151,813.00	\$455,439.00
9. Indirect Costs*	\$3,826.00	\$3,826.00	\$3,826.00	\$11,478.00
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	\$155,639.00	\$155,639.00	\$155,639.00	\$466,917.00

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

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

Name of School: Rockyford Upper Elementary School

Budget Summary

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)	Project Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$64,327.00	\$64,327.00	\$64,327.00	\$192,981.00
2. Employee Benefits	\$16,082.00	\$16,082.00	\$16,082.00	\$48,246.00
3. Travel				
4. Equipment				
5. Supplies				
6. Contractual	\$24,439.00	\$24,439.00	\$24,439.00	\$73,317.00
7. Professional Development				
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	\$104,848.00	\$104,848.00	\$104,848.00	\$314,544.00
9. Indirect Costs*	\$2,642.00	\$2,642.00	\$2,642.00	\$7,926.00
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	\$107,490.00	\$107,490.00	\$107,490.00	\$322,470.00

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

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

Name of School: Red Shirt Elementary School

Budget Summary

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2 7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3 7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)	Project Total (f)
1. Personnel	\$46,970.00	\$46,970.00	\$46,970.00	\$140,910.00
2. Employee Benefits	\$11,742.00	\$11,742.00	\$11,742.00	\$35,226.00
3. Travel				
4. Equipment				
5. Supplies				
6. Contractual	\$9,975.00	\$9,975.00	\$9,975.00	\$29,925.00
7. Professional Development				
8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	\$68,688.00	\$68,688.00	\$68,688.00	\$206.064
9. Indirect Costs*	\$1,731.00	\$1,731.00	\$1,731.00	\$5193.00
10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	\$70,419.00	\$70,419.00	\$70,419.00	\$211,257.00

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

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

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

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

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

The 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.

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.
- "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.