

**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

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

**FY 2009
School Improvement Grant (SIG)
Cover page**

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): Mike Butts

Original Signature of Authorized Representative:

Date: 4/9/10

SD Department of Education use only

Date Received:

Signature of authorized SD DOE staff person

Guidelines

Purpose of Grant

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

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010, which was signed into law by President Obama on December 16, 2009, included two critical changes to the SIG program. First, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 allows SEAs and LEAs to use SIG funds to serve certain “newly eligible” schools (i.e., certain low-achieving schools that are not Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring). Second, the law increases the amount that an SEA may award for each school participating in the SIG program from \$500,000 annually to \$2 million annually.

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

Clarification of Available School Improvement Funds

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

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

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

Eligible Applicants

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

Allocations

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

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

Based on Need and Commitment

In addition to the objective measures used to determine need for the 1003(a) funds (poverty, enrollment, and level of need), each DISTRICT with eligible schools applying for funds under section SIG 1003(g) must demonstrate the need for the additional school improvement funds and commitment to carry out the requirements. Greatest need. An LEA with the greatest need for a School Improvement Grant must have one or more schools in Tier I, II, or III. Strongest Commitment. An LEA with the strongest commitment is an LEA that agrees to implement, and demonstrates the capacity to implement fully and effectively, one of the following rigorous interventions in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve: Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, or Transformational Models.

Conditions of Eligibility

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

Budget and Accounting

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

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

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

Duration

Grant Periods:

Project Year 1: July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011

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

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

The SEA must renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to each Tier I or Tier II school that meets the annual student achievement goals established by the LEA and makes progress on the leading indicators. The SEA may renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to a school that does not meet its annual goals as it has discretion to examine factors such as the school's progress on the leading indicators or the fidelity with which it is implementing the model in deciding whether to renew the LEA's SIG grant. For a grant to be renewed with respect to a Tier III school, the school must meet the goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA, or make progress toward meeting those goals. See section II.C(a)(i)-(ii) of the final requirements. If a the SEA

determines that one or more of an LEA's schools do not warrant renewed funding, the SEA may continue to award the LEA SIG funds for other eligible schools. The SEA would reduce the LEA's grant, however, by the amount allocated for the schools for which funding is not being renewed.

The Application Process

Review and Approval Process: EA applications will undergo review by a panel with facilitation. The panel will consist of members of the Committee of Practitioners and the School Support Team. Additional panel members will be recruited with expertise in curriculum, administration, and teacher evaluation. A rubric will be used to determine if LEA applications meet the requirements of the grant and warrant approval. Each element will be scored based on the following scoring rubric:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Technical Assistance

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

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

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.

The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school

List the members and positions of the committee that conducted the needs assessment and determined the outcome.

Aimee Zachrison- Alt Ed teacher
Kris O'Brien- Language Arts Teacher
Susan Fairchild- Math Teacher
Sharon Thyen- Health/PE Teacher
Rhonda Kruger- Spanish Teacher
Carrie Overby- SPED Teacher
Shelley Gauer- Counselor
Katie Pedersen- Parent
Susan Jones- Parent/ School Board member
Sandie Jungers- Director of Special Services
Mike Butts-HS Principal
Josh Seesz- Student Assistance Provider
Todd Larson-Student Assistance Provider
Gertrude Makgabenyana-Larsen- Student Assistance Provider
Lyn Korbelt- Alt Ed teacher
Caryl Bunkowske- Alt Ed teacher
Anna Smith-Transition teacher
Jami Grangaard- Transition teacher
Jean Moulton- After School Study Hall Teacher
Bill Gripenrog-After School Study Hall Teacher

Indicate the data sources that were analyzed as part of the district's comprehensive needs assessment designed for the purpose of the SIG application.

Attendance data-chronic absenteeism and 3yr trend attendance data
Truancy petitions
Failing grades data
Off-grade level data
Dropout data
OSS/ISS/CRS data

Describe the process used to complete the district's comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) conducted for the purpose of the SIG application.

When: The comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) was conducted on April 7, 2010.

Who: The CNA team listed above conducted the comprehensive needs assessment.

How: Data and research were collected from current programs, school improvement plans,

comprehensive SIP audit, and the student information system. The persons collecting and compiling the data contributed significantly to the CNA. Other persons reviewed and discussed the data at length. Recommendations for strategies and interventions that contribute to student success were gathered and discussed by the whole committee.

Broadly describe the results of that review (specifics for each school will be outlined in the school sections).

The data collected, compiled and reviewed indicated that there is a population of students that are not successful in high school. While current programs benefit many students there appears to be a sufficient lacking in specialized programs to meet the needs of these unsuccessful students. Students that are at-risk of dropping out, those with attendance issues, those with other issues that interfere with success at school (drug/alcohol/family situations/poverty/legal issues/etc) and those off-grade level, need the support of additional programs and personnel to be successful in school.

The CNA committee brainstormed a list of barriers to student success in high school. The list includes but is not limited to the following: truancy, absenteeism, poverty, hunger, apathy, lack of transportation, legal issues, drug/alcohol use, home life situations, mental health issues, and teenage parenting. Using the Cycle of Disengagement Model from the National Dropout Prevention Center, the committee determined where the current programs at WHS disrupt the Cycle of Disengagement. The high school has introduced programs and activities to affect truancy/absenteeism, academic failure and dropout retention. These programs activities have seen some success, but not affected all at-risk students. In further discussion it was determined that more specialized programs/activities were needed to increase student success in earning credits, staying on grade-level, and increasing performance on standardized tests.

List the strengths and weaknesses for each school based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment.

Watertown High School has been successful in reducing the dropout rate, decreasing the number of students off-grade level, and increasing the opportunities for students to earn credit toward a diploma. Watertown High School lacks the ability to reach all students that need additional support to be successful in high school. Watertown High School has been unsuccessful in engaging all students in relevant learning activities thus reducing the number of student absences. WHS has also been unsuccessful in increasing student performance on standardized tests, reducing the number failing grades, and addressing bullying, violent/delinquent behaviors, or substance abuse problems.

Provide the rationale the district used to determine which schools to serve with SIG funds and which schools not to serve.

Watertown High School is the only Tier III school in the district.
No other district schools are Tier I or II.

The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

Describe the LEA's capacity to adequately serve the schools identified in the application.

Watertown School District 14-4 will support the implementation of this grant. The district will provide salary and benefits for all personnel (not identified in this grant), facilities, professional development

time (5 half-day, 2 full day in-services), and contracted services with ESA 1. The district will provide for the administration and oversight of this grant. These resources will successfully support the implementation of the interventions described within this grant application.

Describe district administrative oversight.

The grant implementation will be directly supervised by Mike Butts-HS Principal, Rick Hohn-Business Manager, and Dr. Lesli Hanson-Superintendent.

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.

Not Applicable

The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take.

Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

Section I.A.2(a) **Turnaround Model**

WHS will use certain aspects of the Turnaround model to improve student achievement at Watertown High School.

Turnaround Model item #6-Promoting the continuous use of data, will be implemented at Watertown High school. The school will use data to determine the students most at risk for failure and dropout.

Watertown High School will use the Benchmark assessment, a formative assessment currently used in our district to adequately gauge student learning, to provide an accurate picture of student progress in all core subject areas. Further, the district will use Dakota STEP test results to monitor student achievement in the areas of Reading and Mathematics. It is the intention of the Watertown School District to have all students become proficient and advanced by 2013-2014 as mandated by NCLB. The student results will be utilized to drive programs whose main strategies include differentiated instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

Turnaround Model #7-Increased Learning Time, has been used at Watertown High School. WHS has increased learning time for students through an afterschool study hall, an extended school day (5th Block), and night school. The school intends to continue using the extended learning times for instruction in core academic subjects for students that are in need of credit recovery or additional assistance.

Turnaround Model #8-Appropriate Social Emotional and Community Oriented Services have been used infrequently by Watertown High School. On a very limited basis, the school has worked with a community agency for drug and alcohol screenings. It is the intent to expand the use of these services for students that need further assistance with drug and alcohol issues and follow-up counseling. The school will determine the need for any further services to assist students. These services may include, but are not limited to mental health counseling, housing assistance, child care services, or family counseling.

4a Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

As part of the School Improvement Plan, Watertown High School has held many data retreats in an effort to determine the interventions needed to boost student progress. WHS is currently involved in the following programs for school improvement:

1. Night School

Night School is an addition to the school day, offered in two-hour sessions twice each week. Night School offers full courses for high school students who are off grade level or for high school students who have dropped out and wish to return to school to complete requirements for a diploma. The Night School offers a wide array of courses through APEX Online Learning. Students work independently with the assistance of an instructional coach or certified teacher. In addition, APEX is supplemented with hands-on activities and small group instruction to maximize the opportunities to master content standards. Night school has assisted 11 students in earning their high school diploma.

2. After School Study Hall

After School Study Hall provides an academic setting for students to receive additional help from certified teachers. The After School Study Hall program provides remediation and enrichment in math and reading, and continually strives to use new and unique ways to enrich the students practice in math and reading. Hands-on activities that address everyday applications in mathematics are used to help students explore more complex uses of math in real life. Reading and Literacy strategies support activities in the Language Arts classrooms through use of I-pods. The I-pods deliver a supplemented reading program to students who need help.

These measures have helped students to succeed at Watertown High School. However, in review of information in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, it was determined that Watertown High School needed to add to these existing programs. Watertown High School intends to add truancy/absenteeism interventions, an Arrow Academy, Parent and community outreach program, and professional development in understanding poverty, youth at-risk and dropout prevention.

Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

Not applicable

Align other resources with the interventions.

Watertown school district strongly supports the efforts in literacy and math. The district has a literacy support program with literacy coaches at all school levels. Math Counts programming has been implemented in the elementary and middle school levels in 2009-10 and begins at the high school level in 2010-11. The district provides programming for Migrant, Title I, SPED and general education supported by funds to the eligible schools.

Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

The interventions included in this grant application may be offered at times outside the normal school day, thus requiring the flexibility of the district in regards to the employees contract day. A modification may be made in the attendance policy for students in order to accommodate student participants in some of the interventions outlined in this grant.

Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

Watertown School District 14-4 will continue the reform efforts after the SIG funds no longer exist. The salaries, benefits, professional development, travel, supplies and purchased services will be covered under Title I, SPED and general funds.

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.

Not applicable. Watertown HS is a Tier III school.

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.

Not applicable. Watertown HS is a Tier III 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.

Tier III- Watertown High School

Project Year 1: July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011

1. Absenteeism:

June/July 2010 – Contract for transportation services

June/July 2010 – New Hires Lifeguards and Social Worker

August 2010 – Discipline Training for new hires

December 2010 – Reflection/Data/Discussion/Program Revision

May 2011 – Reflection/Data/Discussion/Program Revision

June 2011 – Plan for Year 2

2. Arrow Academy:

June/July 2010 – New Hires

August 2010 – Discipline Training for new hires

August/September 2010 – Professional Development.

September 2010 – Other program Visits

September-October 2010 – Data collection and review

October 2010 – Identification of Students/Student Invitation to Program

Jan 2011 – Students begin Arrow Academy

May 2011- Reflection/Data/Discussion/Program Revision

June 2011- Plan for Year 2

3. Parent/Community Involvement

August/September 2010 – Professional Development. Training in the Parent Teacher Home Visit Project. Staff involvement.

September – December 2010 – Home visits by staff.

January/February 2011 – Professional Development. Training in capacity building and sharing information by the PTHV Project trainers.

February – May 2011 – Home visits by staff with regard to capacity building and sharing of information.

June 2011 – Evaluation of Year 1/ Plan for Year 2

4. Professional Development

Fall 2010-National Dropout Prevention Conference

Spring 2011-National Youth At-Risk Conference

Summer 2010- Understanding Poverty workshop

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

1. Absenteeism:

June/July 2011 – Contract for transportation services

August 2011 – Discipline Training for new hires

December 2011 – Reflection/Data/Discussion/Program Revision

May 2012 – Reflection/Data/Discussion/Program Revision
June 2012 – Plan for Year 3

2. Arrow Academy:

August 2011 – Discipline Training for new hires
August/September 2011 – Professional Development.
August/September 2011 – Identification of Students/Student Invitation to Program
September 2011 – Other program Visits
September-October 2011 – Data collection and review
May 2012- Reflection/Data/Discussion/Program Revision
June 2012 – Plan for Year 3

3. Parent/Community Involvement

August/September 2011 – Professional Development. Creating systems change.
September – December 2011 – Home visits by staff.
January/February 2012 – Professional Development. Train the trainer sessions.
February – May 2012 – Home visits.
June 2012 – Evaluation of Year 2/ Plan for Year 3

4. Professional Development

Fall 2011-National Dropout Prevention Conference
Spring 2012-National Youth At-Risk Conference
Summer 2012- Understanding Poverty workshop

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

1. Absenteeism:

June/July 2012 – Contract for transportation services
August 2012 – Discipline Training for new hires
December 2012 – Reflection/Data/Discussion/Program Revision
May 2013 – Reflection/Data/Discussion/Program Revision
June 2013 – End of program wrap-up and planning for the future

2. Arrow Academy:

August 2012 – Discipline Training for new hires
August/September 2012 – Professional Development.
August/September 2012 – Identification of Students/Student Invitation to Program
September 2012 – Other program Visits
September-October 2012 – Data collection and review
May 2013- Reflection/Data/Discussion/Program Revision
June 2013 – End of program wrap-up and planning for the future

3. Parent/Community Involvement

August/September 2012 – Professional Development. Program adoption school-wide.
September – December 2012 – Home visits by staff.
January/February 2013 – Professional Development. Train the trainer sessions.
February – May 2013 – Home visits.
June 2013 – End of program wrap-up and planning for the future

4. Professional Development

Fall 2012-National Dropout Prevention Conference

7. For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.

1. Truancy/Absenteeism Measures

The CNA revealed that truancy was a factor in meeting goals as a school. In an effort to curb truancy, WHS will implement a Truancy Ride program. A truancy specialist will receive a list of truant students from the attendance personnel daily. The specialist will then transport the truant students to school, walking them to the attendance counter to check in for the day, and then escorting the students to class. The truancy specialist will then also do a sweep for students in the afternoon, if needed.

2. Arrow Academy

The Arrow Academy will exist for the purpose of working with youth who exhibit chronic absenteeism. Chronic absenteeism will be identified as students absent over 100 times per school year. Those at risk of becoming chronic absentees are identified as those students who have between 30 and 100 absences per school year. According to the CNA, 12% of the population of WHS exhibits chronic absenteeism and can be affected by this program. In this self-contained environment, students who are identified by staff as candidates will complete required courses through APEX Online Learning program as well as instruction by certified instructors. To enter the program, students must exhibit high absenteeism, be off-grade level, show a significant drop in grades, or are significant dropout risk. In addition, since truancy is a symptom of a larger problem with most of the students identified for this program, there will be a counseling aspect to the academy. This will be administered through the Reconnecting Youth program. Reconnecting Youth (RY) is a school-based program for youth in grades 9 through 12 who are at risk for school dropout and who exhibit multiple behavior problems. The program brings together peers, school personnel, and parents to deliver interventions to reduce drug involvement, increase school performance, and decrease emotional distress.

Reconnecting Youth is a school-based indicated prevention program that targets young people in grades 9 through 12 who show signs of poor school achievement and potential for dropping out of high school. They also may show signs of multiple problem behaviors (such as substance abuse, depression, and suicidal ideation). The program teaches skills to build resiliency with respect to risk factors and to moderate the early signs of substance abuse.

The program incorporates social support and life skills training with the following components:

Personal Growth Class □ a semester-long, daily class designed to enhance self-esteem, decision making, personal control, and interpersonal communication;

Social Activities and School Bonding □ to establish drug-free social activities and friendships, as well as improving a teenager's relationship to school.

1. Parent/Community Outreach

Teachers in the Watertown High School will begin to do home visits as part of the outreach to the community of Watertown. Home visits will assist in boosting community involvement in the education system. Rather than blaming one another, teachers and parents will come together, in a unique setting, as

equal partners, to build trust and form a relationship where they can take the time to share dreams, expectations, experiences, and tools regarding the child's academic success. Once a relationship is formed, the partners are empowered, finding accountability with each other to make the necessary changes to insure that students experience academic and social success.

The Parent Teacher Home Visit Project will be utilized to train and implement a successful home visit model at Watertown High School. In other school districts, the PTHV Project has been successful in part by raising the test scores of students from Socio-Economically Disadvantaged families. The test scores were raised by a considerable amount in these school districts. It has also been instrumental in raising attendance rates in these schools.

2. Professional Development

A deliberate and consistent professional development plan is necessary to the success of the implementation of these programs. The students served by these new programs are students who have absenteeism issues, are off grade level, and have not been successful in the regular classroom setting. Thus, professional development is at the heart of providing a good program. Teachers will attend the National Youth At Risk Conference and the National Dropout Prevention Conference to further understand the issues surrounding the students and specialized teaching techniques. Teachers will further be trained by professionals in Parent Teacher Home Visit Project, Reconnecting Youth, and Understanding Poverty.

The success of the programs outlined above will be dependent upon the underlying structure of the Alternative Education program at WHS.

The Alt Ed Program consists of several tiers.

The alternative department will be divided into a three-tiered system in order to intervene in the Cycle of Disengagement as identified by the National Dropout Prevention Center.

Tier 1 consists of lifeguards and a social worker assisting regular classroom teachers to support students before a failure happens. Lifeguards will be equipped with a list of students who have been identified as potential dropouts. These students will have been nominated to participate in a summer bridge academy. Students will be on the case load of a Lifeguard. The Lifeguards, students, and teachers will work together in order for the students to be successful in the first attempt in an academic course. If students are not successful in the first attempt, the students will be given the option of credit recovery. Credit recovery will be delivered through APEX online learning with a certified classroom teacher. This credit recovery program already exists in the Watertown School District.

Tier 2 consist of the Arrow Academy. The lowest achieving students will be identified by several criteria to include chronic absenteeism, course failure, off-grade level or at risk of dropping out. The Arrow Academy will be an alternative education classroom. The school day will consist of the four core subjects delivered by APEX online learning, project-based learning, small group learning, and one-on-one teacher to student learning. The students in the academy will take elective courses both in the academy and outside of the academy. The inside-academy electives will be a school-based indicated prevention program made especially for the students in the academy. This program will teach skills to build resiliency with respect to risk factors and to moderate the early signs of student disengagement.

Tier 3 consists of the system to re-engage students who have already dropped out of school or have indicated their desire to drop out of high school. Watertown High School will continue to operate the Night School founded two years ago. The purpose of the night school will be to offer full courses for high school students who are off grade-level or for students wishing to return to school.

Through all of these interventions, Watertown High School will strive to improve its parent and community outreach through the Parent Teacher Home Visit Project (PTHV Project). Teachers will be trained in home visits in order for parents and teachers to come together in a spirit of cooperation for the good of the student. In addition, professional development will be used to pull together ideas and information necessary for the teachers involved to provide a quality program.

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.

Goals and Objectives for 2009-2010

- 1) In 2010, the total student population at Watertown High School in grade 11 will meet AYP as measured by the South Dakota STEP in the subject area of reading. The goal will be met when 62% (AMO) or 70% (Safe Harbor) or 66% (Confidence interval) is reached.
- 2) In 2010, the total student population at Watertown High School in grade 11 will meet AYP as measured by the South Dakota STEP in the subject area of math. The goal will be met when 63% (AMO) or 65% (Safe Harbor) or 56% (Confidence interval) is reached.
- 3) In 2010, the subgroup of students in grade 11, with disabilities, will meet AYP as measured by the South Dakota STEP in the subject of reading. The goal will be met when 62% (AMO) or 20% (Safe Harbor) or 50% (Confidence interval) is reached.
- 4) In 2010, the subgroup of students in grade 11, with disabilities, will meet AYP as measured by the South Dakota STEP in the subject of math. The goal will be met when 63% (AMO) or 23% (Safe Harbor) or 41% (Confidence interval) reached.

Subsequent goals for the school years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 will reflect the appropriate % of students advanced or proficient needed to reach AYP by any measure (Safer Harbor, Confidence Interval, 2 yr Averaging) for the All Student Group, Students with Disabilities group and any other subgroup necessary.

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.
Not applicable.

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

model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

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

□

District Budget categories for consideration in required budget narrative.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grant Periods:

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

Project Year 1 2010-2011

Personnel:

Lifeguards:	\$42000 @ 4.0 FTE =	\$168,000	
Arrow Academy:	\$42000 @ 2.0 FTE =	\$84,000	Yr 1 \$275,037
After School Study Hall:	360hr @ \$26/hr (2 people) =	\$9,360	
Night School:	480hr @ \$26/hr (2 people) =	\$12,480	
Summer Curriculum Revision/Dev	63 hr @ \$19/hr (3 people) =	\$1197	

Benefits

Lifeguards:	\$168,000 x 13.65% + ins =	\$44,292	
Arrow Academy:	\$84000 x 13.65% + ins =	\$22,046	Yr 1 \$69483
After School Study Hall:	\$9360 x 13.65% =	\$1278	
Night School:	\$12480 x 13.65% =	\$1704	
Summer Curriculum Revision/Dev	\$1197 x 13.65% =	\$163	

Travel

Program visitation Madison WI	Mileage	\$300	Yr 1 \$1000
	Meals	\$288	
	Lodging	\$350	
	Misc	\$62	

Professional Development

Parent Teacher Home Visit Project Strategic Planning in Washington, DC			
2 staff	Airfare	\$2000	
	Registration	\$600	Yr 1 \$3788
	Meals	\$288	
	Lodging	\$700	
	Misc	\$200	

National Youth at Risk Conference in Savannah, GA			
6 staff	Airfare	\$5000	
	Registration	\$1800	Yr 1 \$9295
	Meals	\$720	
	Lodging	\$1575	
	Misc	\$200	

National Dropout Prevention Conference			
6 staff	Airfare	\$5000	

Registration	\$1800	Yr 1	\$9295
Meals	\$720		
Lodging	\$1575		
Misc	\$200		

Equipment

8 desktop computers	8 @ \$900 =	\$7200	Yr 1	\$14,000
1 printer	1 @ \$1000 =	\$1000		
Printer cartridges		\$800		
GED Server		\$5000		

Supplies

GED supplies	\$5000	Yr 1	\$10,000
Teaching materials	\$2000		
Student Incentives	\$3000		

Purchased Services

Parent teacher Home Visit Training	Yr 1	\$17200
Professional Development Workshops (3)		
Reconnecting Youth Program Training		
Professional Development Workshops	Yr 1	\$14000
Understanding Poverty Workshops (3)	Yr 1	\$12000
Transportation (student transportation-truancy diversion)	Yr 1	\$8000
Drug/Alcohol screening and counseling	Yr 1	\$6000

Indirect costs \$443,098 x 1.82% = \$8,064

Total Yr 1 \$451,162

Project Year 2 2011-2012

Personnel:

Lifeguards:	\$42000 @ 4.0 FTE =	\$168,000		
Arrow Academy:	\$42000 @ 2.0 FTE =	\$84,000	Yr 2	\$275,940
After School Study Hall:	360hr @ \$27/hr (2 people) =	\$9,720		
Night School:	480hr @ \$27/hr (2 people) =	\$12,960		
Summer Curriculum Revision/Dev:	63 hr @ \$20/hr (3 people) =	\$1260		

Benefits

Lifeguards:	\$168,000 x 13.65% + ins =	\$44,292		
Arrow Academy:	\$84,000 x 13.65% + ins =	\$22,046	Yr 2	\$69,606
After School Study Hall:	\$9720 x 13.65% =	\$1327		
Night School:	\$12960 x 13.65% =	\$1769		
Summer Curriculum Revision/Dev:	\$1260 x 13.65% =	\$172		

Travel

Program visitation	Mileage	\$300	Yr 2	\$1000
	Meals	\$288		
	Lodging	\$350		
	Misc	\$62		

Professional Development

Parent Teacher Home Visit Project Strategic Planning in Washington, DC

2 staff	Airfare	\$2000		
	Registration	\$600	Yr 2	\$3788
	Meals	\$288		
	Lodging	\$700		
	Misc	\$200		

National Youth at Risk Conference in Savannah, GA

6 staff	Airfare	\$5000		
	Registration	\$1800	Yr 2	\$9295
	Meals	\$720		
	Lodging	\$1575		
	Misc	\$200		

National Dropout Prevention Conference

6 staff	Airfare	\$5000		
	Registration	\$1800	Yr 2	\$9295
	Meals	\$720		
	Lodging	\$1575		
	Misc	\$200		

Equipment

Printer cartridges	\$800	Yr 2	\$800
--------------------	-------	------	-------

Supplies

GED supplies	\$2000	Yr 2	\$7000
Teaching materials	\$2000		
Student Incentives	\$3000		

Purchased Services

Parent teacher Home Visit Training	Yr 2	\$15000
Professional Development Workshops (3)		
Reconnecting Youth Program Training		
Professional Development Workshops	Yr 2	\$5000
Understanding Poverty Workshops (3)	Yr 2	\$12000
Transportation (student transportation-truancy diversion)	Yr 2	\$8000
Drug/Alcohol screening and counseling	Yr 2	\$6000

Indirect costs \$416,724 x 1.82% = \$7584

Total Yr 2 \$424,308

Project Year 3 2012-2013

Personnel:

Lifeguards:	\$42000 @ 4.0 FTE =	\$168,000	
Arrow Academy:	\$42000 @ 2.0 FTE =	\$84,000	Yr 3 \$276,843
After School Study Hall:	360hr @ \$28/hr (2 people) =	\$10,080	
Night School:	480hr @ \$28/hr (2 people) =	\$13,440	
Summer Curriculum Revision/Dev	63 hr @ \$21/hr (3 people) =	\$1323	

Benefits

Lifeguards:	\$168,000 x 13.65% + ins =	\$44,292	
Second Chance Program:	\$84,000 x 13.65% + ins =	\$22,046	Yr 3 \$69,730
After School Study Hall:	\$10,080 x 13.65% =	\$1376	
Night School:	\$13,440 x 13.65% =	\$1835	
Summer Curriculum Revision/Dev	\$1323 x 13.65% =	\$181	

Travel

Program visitation	Mileage	\$300	Yr 3 \$1000
	Meals	\$288	
	Lodging	\$350	
	Misc	\$62	

Professional Development

Parent Teacher Home Visit Project Strategic Planning in Washington, DC			
2 staff	Airfare	\$2000	
	Registration	\$600	Yr 3 \$3788
	Meals	\$288	
	Lodging	\$700	
	Misc	\$200	

National Youth at Risk Conference in Savannah, GA			
6 staff	Airfare	\$5000	
	Registration	\$1800	Yr 3 \$9295
	Meals	\$720	
	Lodging	\$1575	
	Misc	\$200	

National Dropout Prevention Conference			
6 staff	Airfare	\$5000	
	Registration	\$1800	Yr 3 \$9295
	Meals	\$720	
	Lodging	\$1575	
	Misc	\$200	

Equipment

Printer cartridges	\$800	Yr 3 \$800
--------------------	-------	------------

Supplies

GED supplies	\$2000	Yr 3 \$7000
--------------	--------	-------------

Teaching materials	\$2000
Student Incentives	\$3000

Purchased Services

Parent teacher Home Visit Training	Yr 3 \$10000
Professional Development Workshops (3)	
Reconnecting Youth Program Training	
Professional Development Workshops	Yr 3 \$5000
Understanding Poverty Workshops (3)	Yr 3 \$12000
Transportation (student transportation-truancy diversion)	Yr 3 \$8000
Drug/Alcohol screening and counseling	Yr 2 \$6000

Indirect costs \$412,751 x 1.82% = \$7512

Total Yr 3 \$420,263

South Dakota Department of Education Budget Information American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) Title I School Improvement 1003(g)		
Name of School: Watertown High School		
Budget Summary		
	Budget Categories	Project Year 1
	7/01/10-6/30/11 (a)	Project Year 2
	7/01/11-6/30/12 (b)	Project Year 3
7/1/12-6/30-13 (c)	Project Total (f)	
	1. Personnel	
	2. Employee Benefits	
	3. Travel	
	4. Equipment	
	5. Supplies	
	6. Contractual	
	7. Professional Development	
	8. Total Direct Costs (line 1-7)	
	9. Indirect Costs*	
	10. Total Costs (lines 8-9)	
*Use restricted indirect cost rate (same rate as regular Title I program)		

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

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.

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.

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.

Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

I agree.

The SD DOE has requested and received the waivers below.

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

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

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