

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (ARRA SIG)

| | |
|--|--|
| Legal Name of Applicant: San Juan School District | Applicant's Mailing Address: 200 North Main Street Blanding, UT. 83411 |
| LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Lynnette Johnson Position and Office: Student Services Director Contact's Mailing Address: San Juan School District 200 North Main Street Blanding, Utah 84511 Telephone: (435) 678-1227 Fax: (435) 678-1280 Email address: ljohnson1@sanjuanschools.org | |
| LEA Superintendent or Charter School Director (Printed Name): Douglas E. Wright | Telephone: (435) 678-1211 |
| Signature of the LEA Superintendent or Charter School Director X_____ | Date: May 06, 2010 |
| 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 LEA receives through this application. | |

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 |
| Bluff Elementary | 108 | X | | | | | | X |

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

PART 1

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

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.

The state of Utah requires that any LEA making application for the ARRA School Improvement Grants 1003g must analyze the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school for which it applies that appears on the state’s identified Tier I and Tier II list. Included in the analysis of each school, the LEA should consider the following:

- **The percent of students scoring proficient for Language Arts and Mathematics** (LEAs are to consider overall school and subgroup achievement);
- **Trend data** for both Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs are to consider overall school and subgroup achievement);
- **Demographic information** relevant to the school’s achievement in Language Arts and Mathematics;
- **Contextual data** of the school (attendance, graduation and dropout rates, discipline reports, parent and community surveys);
- **Teacher information** (teacher attendance, turnover rates, teaching assignments aligned with highly qualified teacher status, teacher education, experience, and performance evaluations);
- **Administrator information** (how long the administrator has been at the building, or the replacement of the principal as required in the Turnaround or Transformation models, administrator education, experience, and performance evaluation); and
- **Effectiveness of prior school reform efforts.**

Based on a thorough analysis of the data sources listed above, the LEA must:

- Identify the **intervention model** chosen for each school; and
- Provide the **rationale for the model** chosen for each school.

(1) Needs Assessment and Intervention Model

Bluff Elementary School:

Student achievement for Bluff has improved in the recent years, due to intense professional development and increased instructional expectations. Bluff has been a Reading First school and as such has received significant support from the District Literacy Specialist and District Reading Coach. The principal has completed two years of Principals' Academy focused on Professional Learning Communities.

Student achievement has been a result of professional development efforts, administrative supervision and district support. The below chart shows the 5 year trend. (see attachment #1).

| Subject | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|--------------------------|------|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Reading/Language/English | 38% | appeal | 39% | 50% | 56% | NA |
| Mathematics | 34% | appeal | 46% | 41% | 48% | NA |
| Science | 23% | appeal | 6% | 7% | 33% | NA |

The Native American subgroup is similar to the whole school scores as 84% are Native American. Many of these students are designated as ELL and that subgroup lags behind other Native American and the total school scores indicating a need to more directly address language development. The District is in the process of adopting an ELL curriculum and it will be implemented in all schools in the 2010-11 school year.

Subgroup achievement levels for 2008-09 as measured by the CRT

| Subject | White, | Black, | Hispanic | Asian, | Native | English | Special |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|----------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| Reading/Language/English | N<10 | | | | 55% | 44% | N<10 |
| Mathematics | N<10 | | | | 45% | 33% | N<10 |

Under the direction of the current principal, Monique McDermott, Bluff Elementary has been making promising academic progress in recent years. In November 2009, USOE Title 1 office recognized the school with the Utah Closing the Achievement Gap Title I School Recognition. The criteria for this recognition follows:

1. Achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in both Language Arts and Mathematics for the previous two years;
2. Reduce by at least 50% the achievement gap between certain disaggregated student groups and the whole school in Language Arts and Mathematics. The comparison looks specifically at achievement of the following student groups: economically disadvantaged (ED), limited English proficient (LEP), and students with disabilities (SWD); and
3. Be nominated by their Superintendent for state recognition as a Closing the Achievement Gap Title I School.

| School | AYP 2007 | AYP 2008 | Disaggregated | Disaggregated |
|--------|----------|----------|---------------|---------------|
| | | | | |

Recipient Schools: Sixth grade students choose to either enter Montezuma Creek Elementary or Albert R. Lyman Middle School in Blanding.

Current Principal Information:

| Position | Background & Core Competencies | Years in Position | Years in School | Years in LEA |
|------------------------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Monique McDermott, Principal | 4 years teaching at Mexican Hat Elementary 3 years Staff Developer 2 years Reading Coach Completed Principals' Academy ESL endorsed, Reading endorsement | 5 | 5 | 14 |

Bluff Elementary:

| Grade Level or Subject Level | Total FTE | FTE Highly Qualified in all Subjects Taught | FTE 5 yrs or less in school | FTE 6-15 yrs in school | FTE 16 or more yrs in school |
|---|-----------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Preschool/Special Ed | 1 | Yes | No | No | No |
| Kindergarten <i>(retiring teacher)</i> | 1 | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| 1 st grade | 1 | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| 2 nd grade <i>(teacher non-renewed)</i> | 1 | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| 3 rd grade <i>(teacher non-renewed)</i> | 1 | No | Yes | No | No |
| 4-5 grades <i>(full time teacher returning; part-time teacher leaving)</i> | 1 .5 | Yes Yes | Yes Yes | No No | No No |
| Heritage Language | .5 | Yes | Yes | No | No |

The above chart shows that out of 7 FTE teaching positions, only 3 FTE will be returning. This significant turnover in staff coupled with the loss of principal, shows a great need for increased support for Bluff Elementary. For Highly Qualified information, (see attachment #2).

Decisions about future grade level assignments will not be finalized until a new principal and teachers are hired. However, developing multi-grade classrooms or a no grade/standards based school is a possibility.

The March 2010 issue of the "American School Board Journal" features the journey and success of no grades/standards based curriculum at Adams District 50. Adams District 50 in Colorado has worked with Robert Marzano to very successfully implement this model. *"Metz Elementary, the pilot school, put the reform in place in 2008-09. Of the school's 430 students, 80 percent were eligible for free or reduced price lunch and 60 percent are English language learners. Students are*

placed in their level groups in literacy and math and spend one-third of the day in heterogeneous classrooms.” (see attachment #3).

The new principal and staff will work with the District support team and community to determine what classroom configuration holds the most promise for the school. SIG funds are designated for potential site visits to Adams and/or highly functioning multi-grade schools.

Teacher absenteeism:

Teacher absence is not a problem, most likely due to a program the District instituted several years ago that pays teachers a bonus for not using sick leave. **However, recruiting and retaining quality teachers is a serious problem.** The ARRA SIG performance pay will help the District in recruitment efforts.

Previous and current reform and improvement efforts within the last 5 years:

Beyond the obvious challenges of replacing staff is the serious loss of investment of professional development, instructional coaching, and school-wide planning. The principal had just completed a two year Principal’s Academy training that was focused on developing **Professional Learning Communities**. This past year the staff had completed the first year of training and had begun to implement a **Utah Behavior Initiative (UBI)** model. The school has been a very committed part of the District’s **Reading First** grant. All of these very substantial research based efforts that were contributing to the school’s progress, stand to be lost without immediate intervention.

Process of principal evaluation:

Current Evaluation Process:

In accordance with the “Educator Evaluation Act” (Utah Code § 53A-10), the principal’s professional excellence program provides for a “systematic, fair, and competent evaluation and remediation of those whose performance is inadequate.” The San Juan School District’s Professional Excellence Program (SJPEP) contains an evaluation program that provides a “reliable and valid evaluation consistent with generally accepted professional standards for personnel evaluation systems.” The program also meets the requirements of the dismissal procedures found in the “Utah Orderly School Termination Procedures Act” (Utah Code § 53A-8-104).

Program Responsibilities.

The Director of Schools and Curriculum along with Human Resources Director is responsible to administer this program. It consists of three parts:

1. Administrator’s Goals and Reflection Form.
2. Principal Performance Questionnaire.
3. Administrator Evaluation Form.

The principal is responsible for completing the goals form and turning it into his or her supervisor by September 1st of each year. By May 1st of each year, the principal will complete the reflection form and turn it into his or her supervisor to be used as a line of evidence for the end-of-year Administrator Evaluation. This form will be completed annually.

The Human Resources Director administers the Principal Performance Questionnaire. This

questionnaire is completed by faculty, staff, directors, and supervisors. Parents are selected randomly and asked to complete this form. If necessary, students are selected randomly and asked to complete this form. This questionnaire is completed each year while the principal is a provisional or probationary employee. Once the principal reaches career status, this questionnaire is be completed on an every-other-year basis unless deemed necessary by the principal's supervisor, the Human Resources Director, or the Superintendent of Schools. The Human Resources Director averages all scores from the Principal Performance Questionnaire as evidence for part 2 of the Administrator's Evaluation.

The evaluation scale is:

- 4 = Excellent
- 3 = Meets Standard
- 2 = Needs Improvement
- 1 = Unsatisfactory

During May of each year, the principal's supervisor uses the Administrator's Goals and Reflection form, the results of the Principal Performance Questionnaire, and any other appropriate lines of 20 evidence to complete the Administrator's Evaluation. Other lines of evidence may be used if necessary to document a principal's performance. An unsatisfactory rating is based on the Administrator's Evaluation and requires that a plan of assistance be generated to assist the principal in making improvements in the necessary competencies.

Teacher Evaluation Process:

Current Evaluation Process:

Teachers are evaluated through a process defined in the District's Professional Excellence Program whose primary focus is to:

- (1) to assure that all employees meet the minimum acceptable competency and performance standards;
- (2) to assist employees who are struggling to meet the competency and performance standards;
- (3) to assist in identifying and recognizing outstanding teachers; and
- (4) to meet the requirements of the "Educator Evaluation Act" (Utah Code § 53A-10) and the "Utah Orderly School Termination Procedures Act" (Utah Code § 53A-8).

The teacher's professional excellence program includes two levels. The first level is for provisional and probationary teachers while second level is for career teachers. The only difference between a Level 1 and a Level 2 program is that a Level 1 educator must have two formal observations and two lines of evidence while it is optional for a Level 2 educator unless required by the principal. The component forms of the educator's program are:

- 1. Goals and Reflection Form.
- 2. Pre-observation Conference Form.
- 3. Formal Observation Form.
- 4. Lines of Evidence (various forms exist for this program).
- 5. Principal's Report Form.

Proposed Evaluation Process for ARRA SIG Schools:

Earlier this year, San Juan School District signed off on the State of Utah’s “Race to the Top’ application, which unfortunately was not selected. A part of the “Race to the Top” framework was to strengthen teacher evaluation and tie at least part of the process to student achievement. The District is still very open to that premise, should the new State application be successful and if any of our schools are selected as ARRA SIG, the District will work to embed that level of accountability into the process. In reference to the above list: #4. Lines of Evidence and #5. Principal’s Report Form, are already in place and could very easily be used for this level of accountability. Whether the entire teacher evaluation process for all San Juan teachers needs to be reformed, or whether appropriate levels of accountability can be attained for ARRA SIG teachers with the present system will be under the direction of the Human Resources Director and the District Evaluation Committee.

Proposed Teacher Performance Pay:

San Juan School District successfully piloted incentive pay under the State’s 4-6 grade Math Initiative. This program allowed the District to pay teachers for CRT gain scores for improvement of their students.

The District is proposing to expand this successful initiative for all teachers in ARRA SIG schools for both Language Arts and Math using the same system of compensation--\$250 per each point per student/subject. These teacher bonus/stipends would be paid under the following formula:

Proficiency Level Bonus Scores: (for each student)

| | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 1 to 1 = -1/2 point | 2 to 1 = -1 point | 3 to 1 = -3 points | 4 to 1 = -4 points |
| 1 to 2 = 1 point | 2 to 2 = -1/2 point | 3 to 2 = -2 points | 4 to 2 = -3 points |
| 1 to 3 = 3 points | 2 to 3 = 2 points | 3 to 3 = 0 points | 4 to 3 = -1 points |
| 1 to 4 = 4 points | 2 to 4 = 3 points | 3 to 4 = 1 point | 4 to 4 = 1/2 points |

Sample of Teacher Performance Pay Chart for Language Arts & Math:

| Student Name/Subject | 2009-10 CRT Proficiency Score | 2010-11 CRT Proficiency Score | Total + Points | Total – Points | + Points - Minus Points |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| John Doe Language Arts | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| John Doe Math | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sally Smith Language Arts | 4 | 3 | 0 | -1 | -1 |
| Sally Smith Math | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| David Jones Language Arts | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| David Jones Math | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Total Performance Pay | | | | | 6 points X \$250 each = |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|----------------|
| (for 3 students listed) | | | | | \$1,500 |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|----------------|

Other Performance Pay Incentives:

As literacy and mathematics are the priorities for student achievement, teachers with primary responsibility should benefit directly from improved performance. Because it takes a whole school to be successful, this proposal also rewards the administrator and all teachers for improvements by:

1. For achieving AYP through Safe Harbor = \$500.
2. For achieving AYP through Status = \$1,000.
3. For making progress toward the SJSD/ABC Framework as measured by the SJSD/ABC Rubric. The three areas of school improvement are: academics, behavior and coaching. Teachers will be rewarded for movement in both the academic and behavior strands. (see attachment#4)
 - a. Four descriptors measure each indicator—Pre-Initial, Initial, Development and Sustaining. PLC teams will receive a \$500 bonus for each stage of improvement across a strand. For example: **academics**—a PLC team moves 6 indicators from a Pre-initial to a Development stage and 2 into a Development stage. Each team member would receive a \$500 bonus. If the PLC team moved 5 indicators from a Pre-Initial stage to Developing and 3 into a Sustaining, they would receive \$1,000 bonus (for movement across 2 stages).
 - b. Principals will be rewarded \$500 for movement across all three strands: academic, behavior, and coaching. Academics and Behavior are student centered strands. Coaching is supervision of teacher development and is the primary responsibility of the principal.

INTERVENTION MODEL(S) CHOSEN

Transformation:

Bluff Elementary is applying to undergo Transformation. The following conditions qualify the schools for this model.

- Bluff Elementary will have a new principal as the current principal is leaving.
- Bluff Elementary will need to re-hire 60% of their staff. It makes no sense to adopt a turnaround model for this school as the replacement of ineffective teachers already occurred this spring.
- The District will advertise widely and use an objective rating system to select A new ARRA SIG principal. While a hiring committee will allow for input from parents and staff, the Superintendent and Board of Education have the final decision for the hire. The LEA will be evaluating successful experience, training and leadership abilities of all applicants.

The District will continue to invest in professional development for principals. The new principal at Bluff will be enrolled in Principals' Academy, 2 years of monthly training. The K12 Supervisor will be directly responsible for principal support and supervision. The LEA Support Team will assist the principal in making and sustaining reforms.

With the success of Reading First and the adoption of the San Juan School District ABC framework, the District is poised to support and sustain the transformation of ARRA SIG schools. The District does not see a conflict with the requirements of ARRA SIG strategies and the direction the District is headed. The District commits to support Research Based changes in operational practice, especially improvement in instruction through measures of both accountability and performance pay.

INITIATIVES THAT WILL SUPPORT TRANSFORMATION OF BLUFF ELEMENTARY:

The District has adopted research based initiatives to support the transformation:

San Juan School District ABC (SJSJ/ABC) Framework (see attachment #4 & #5)

This ABC model addresses three key elements of school improvement:

Academics, Behavior and Coaching.

Each element of the framework includes a 3 Tiered model for instruction and interventions. Academics and Behavior are focused on student supports. Coaching is directed toward teacher growth and interventions.

The District is firmly committed to successful implementation and on-going support of the ABC Framework. Each dimension of the model is defined by a convincing body of research that meets Federal expectations. As the research behind the model is solid and the District is already committed to supporting the model, Bluff Elementary Transformation Model is compatible with the SJSJ/ABC Framework.

Following is information about each of the three elements of the SJSJ/ABC Framework.

Academic Achievement

For the past three years, San Juan School District has systematically invested in professional development to help schools implement **Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)** throughout the district. The Superintendent, K12 Supervisor, Student Services Director and all principals have attended a two year (in two cohort groups) Principals' Academy sponsored by the **Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling (CITES)** a division of Brigham Young University's Education Department.

The PLCs are the framework for the Academic improvement. Properly implemented, PLCs can dramatically increase student achievement by empowering teachers to collaboratively focus on essential standards, common assessments and provide targeted, timely tiered interventions. The

well-known Response to Interventions (RTI) model is definitely a part of the PLC process; however, the RTI 3-Tiered Intervention process is strengthened with the addition of PLCs as a structured way for teachers to improve instruction and provide tiered interventions. **An expectation of ARRA SIG schools is that teachers and school leaders are given increased governance. The PLC process allows for a “tight/loose” system of decision-making where within explicit parameters, teachers and principals have much more autonomy for their students.** The District administration is trained and committed to this process.

Tier 1 for academics guarantees all students access to the Core Curriculum. Every student is expected to be taught Tier 1 by a Highly Qualified and Highly Effective teacher. Tier 1 instruction is focused on guaranteeing students master “Essential Standards”. These standards are derived from the State Core and are determined by teacher PLC teams to have endurance, leverage and prepare students for the next level. Teachers develop and give “Common Assessments” in order to determine student mastery of these Essential standards.

Tier 2—students who do not master standards are given timely, targeted, directed interventions, rather than remediation. This is a flexible group for instruction that is determined on an on-going basis by PLC teachers reviewing Common Assessment data in order to make instructional and intervention decisions.

Tier 3 is for a small group of students who do not respond to Tier 2 interventions. Tier 3 is more intense and can be longer term such as Special Education or ELL support.

Behavior (Positive Behavior Supports) Utah Behavior Initiative

Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) is a Research Based approach to improving student behavior, which in turn improves student achievement. The **Utah Behavior Initiative (UBI)** (see attachment #6), is a State sponsored project that incorporates PBS. The Behavior element of the SJSD/ABC Framework is grounded in the PBS tenets. Bluff Elementary began their first UBI year this past year. UBI implementation is a three year process; with Bluff’s large turnover in staff, it will be especially critical to support new staff in this process. Without addressing student discipline and motivation, the school will be handicapped in making substantial progress. A system of Positive Behavior Supports is an expectation for all schools in the district, especially for school in need of improvement.

Tier 1 for behavior is a support system and prevention instruction for all students. All students are taught the expectations for school behavior and given on-going instruction and support.

Tier 2 is a system of behavior interventions for a lower percentage of students (up to 15%) who need additional support in order to be successful in school.

Tier 3 is for a small percentage of students (3-5%) who need intense support and interventions. This may include Special Education services, ELL instruction, therapeutic counseling, interagency family support etc).

Coaching

Coaching for teachers is designed with a 3 Tier approach as well. Professional Development, reflective coaching, inservice as well as progressive discipline are all part of the Coaching model.

Tier 1 is a system of training and support for all teachers. Reflective coaching and PLC teams offer each teacher a peer system of support. Support in the form of professional development opportunities as well as administrative feedback and evaluation are provided for all teachers. Professional Development for all teachers will include: 1) **Solution Tree**, onsite consulting and annual summits; **Utah Behavior Initiative**, state training and UBI District Coordinator on-site; 3) **Children's Media Workshop**, onsite mentoring.

Tier 2 is an increased level of support for teachers who are identified as in need of improvement. This support usually involves District or consultant specialists who implement demonstration/team teaching, structured observation and goal setting. Teachers are given notice at this level that improvement is needed in order to not progress to Tier 3.

Tier 3 involves teachers who are not responding positively to Tier 2 intervention. These teachers are involved in Progressive Discipline and if significant improvement is not documented they are recommended to the Board of Education for non-renewal or dismissal.

Internal Supports for Coaching include:

The ARRA SIG funds will pay for a full-time Instructional Coach at Bluff Elementary. The coach will assist teachers in developing effectiveness in the areas of literacy and overall classroom instruction. They will provide ongoing classroom based professional development and feedback to classroom teachers as well as assist in coordinating and reporting assessment data. The Instructional Coach will provide assistance with implementation of the comprehensive core reading/math and supplementary intervention programs. 8% of the Instructional Coach's salary will be paid from another fund to allow 3 weeks to work with the District team in elementary schools throughout the district for assessment purposes. The Coach will work under the direction of the building administrator and District support personnel.

Language Arts and Mathematics instructional expectations are direct, explicit instruction, progress monitoring, and targeted interventions. All curriculum and methods will meet scientifically based research standards and programs will be implemented systematically with fidelity. Ron Nielson, **K12 Supervisor and Curriculum Director** will have ultimate supervisory responsibility for effective instruction.

Language Arts/Reading

The **Elementary Literacy Specialist, Marla Atkinson**, will have direct responsibility to provide professional development, coaching and supervision for a continued "Reading First" program at Bluff Elementary. 6 Trait writing is supported by MY ACCESS software.

Mathematics

The **District Mathematics Specialist**, to be hired, will have direct responsibility for professional development, coaching and supervision of the math program at both schools.

External Partners for Coaching include:

1) Solution Tree

Solution Tree is the Lead External Partner for the Transformation project. This organization is the premier provider of Professional Learning Community supports. Richard and Becky Dufour, Richard Stiggins, and Robert Marzano are among Solution Tree's consultants. These nationally renowned educator/researchers provide training at annual PLC Summits. Solution Tree "associate consultants" have had extensive training by national experts, as well as have a track record of successful school experience implementing the PLC model. Bluff Elementary staff will be supported by regular attendance at Summits, onsite consulting and video conferencing. (see attachment #6).

2) Utah Behavior Initiative

Bluff Elementary is in their second year of UBI training. They will continue the state level of training support. The **District UBI Coordinator**, Vernon Hatch, provides onsite training, coaching and monitoring of UBI methods. The school will put in place basic UBI elements the first year of transformation.

3) Children's Media Workshop (CMW)

The ABC approach is the foundation for the transformation of both schools. However, we believe this transformation will be greatly enhanced if we also address issues of student isolation, motivation and background knowledge, areas of great concern for our Native American ELL students.

While students may become proficient on essential standards through our systematic ABC approach, many still have difficulty understanding how mastery of content affects their lives. Learning is too often passive and repetitive. The District will contract with the **Children's Media Workshop (CMW)** to provide inquiry based media/technology teacher training and student mentoring. Vehicles for achieving this active learning, directly connected to essential standards, include: hooking students up with other classrooms throughout the nation or even the world; helping students use technology to discover cultural and school connections; and learning to impact decision-makers for causes the students truly care about. This project will allow teachers and students to deepen and enrich their understanding of the essential standards. CMW will give purpose to learning and help students actually see connections between their world, their school work and the global community.

The average student spends 7 hours a day engrossed in some type of media experience. The CMW project will capture this interest and directing it toward learning identified essential standards results and helping students see relevance to their learning as well as engage in higher level thinking, rather than passive watching.

Too many teachers suffer from “technophobia” and do not have the skills or time to use technology well to enhance and deepen student learning. CMW will provide onsite teacher training and coaching within the classroom, as well as in extended hours, to help teachers become proficient in both the use of technology and developing critical thinking skills through inquiry learning. **The CMW project will not interfere or compete with Core language arts and mathematics time each day.** Rather the CMW consultants will use the identified standards to enrich curriculum and make connections to the Core learning during other periods of the day and after school.

A Community of Learners does not stop at the school walls. CMW will empower the school to use media as a tool for seamless community involvement by helping students and teachers tap into their local communities and the larger world. Media products produced will be an important tool for authentic assessment in addition to the quantitative data collection the transformation will require.

Collaboration and teamwork are hallmarks of CMW. **They are committed to working with other external and internal partners to ensure a concerted effort to support student achievement.** CMW is very familiar with the Native American experience. Their approach to teacher training was first developed in the early 1980’s in San Juan School District and has resulted in a track record of the largest teacher training initiative in US history with over 600,000 K12 educators participating in workshops cited by Columbia Teachers College as “the very best in the large universe of teacher in-service training.” (see attachment #8)

While the enrollment numbers are small for our schools, the San Juan Project has the possibility of being a model for rural multicultural, and distance education. Its value could far exceed the Bluff student numbers.

(2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

The LEA has identified how it will provide leadership and support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application. The description must include the following information on how the LEA will successfully implement the school intervention model:

- Identify the **LEA staff assigned to support** implementation of the school intervention model;
- Identify the **qualifications and relevant experience** of the assigned LEA staff related to prior successful school improvement efforts;
- Describe how the LEA will provide **ongoing technical assistance** to make sure each school is successful;
- Identify the **fiscal resources** (state and federal) that the LEA will commit to implementation;
- Identify the process through which the LEA will **involve the school/community**;
- Describe how the **local school board will be engaged** to ensure successful implementation (including the prioritization or revision of appropriate board policies and allocation of resources);
- Describe how the LEA will **evaluate the effectiveness** of the reform strategies;
- Describe how the **LEA will monitor student achievement** by individual teacher/classrooms; and
- If student achievement results do not meet expected goals, describe how the LEA will assist in **necessary plan revisions**.

(2) LEA Demonstrated Capacity to Support Tier I and II Schools

District Administration uses the SJS/ABC Rubric to monitor school implementation of the Framework. Members of the SJS/ABC team include the K12 Supervisor/Curriculum Director, Student Services Director, Special Education/Assessment Director, Human Resources Director and District Specialists as need.

Schools are expected to make consistent progress in implementation and are given specific detailed feedback on their progress.

Qualifications and Experience

The K12 Supervisor/Curriculum Director and the Student Services Director have been accepted by the State Office of Education as qualified School Support Team (SST) members for schools who have been identified as in need of improvement and have participated in the SST training. Both have been approved by Utah State University as ESL instructors on a graduate level. The K12 Supervisor is ESL endorsed. He and the District Reading Specialist have had substantial Reading First training. The Student Services Director was the former District Reading Specialist, and is reading and ESL endorsed.

Ongoing Technical Assistance

The District will rely on both the State Office of Education specialists and identified External Providers for additional ongoing technical assistance.

School/Community Involvement

Each school has an active School Community Council as well as an Indian Education Committee. These two advisory committees will be actively involved in developing and promoting the schools’

goals and reforms. Schools will find ways to involve parents in more significant and meaningful ways in school planning and decision making.

School Board Engagement

The Student Services Director met with the School Board on Wednesday April 21st, 2010 in the Board work meeting to discuss the grant application. The Board is supportive of the application and has agreed to engage in discussion of policies or procedures that might interfere with reform efforts. The Board is supportive of the PLC philosophies which allows for increased teacher governance within specifically identified parameters. The Board has been supportive of past performance pay efforts and is committed to increased teacher accountability.

San Juan Education Association

The Student Services Director met with Mr. Jeffery Hunt, San Juan Education Association President, on Thursday, April 24th to discuss the grant application. Mr. Hunt was given information about the criteria for application, Bluff Elementary school, the transformation model and implications for teachers, including teacher evaluation based on student achievement as well as teacher performance pay. Mr. Hunt indicated he would be contacting other association officers and UEA technical assistance to ensure he will have the information he needs to advocate for teachers and participate in the reform efforts. The District enjoys a positive, constructive partnership with the Association and commits to working through the reform process in the same manner.

Evaluation of Effectiveness of Reform Efforts

The LEA Support Team, with technical assistance from the USOE, will monitor implementation of the transformation process. A variety of data will be collected to determine the effectiveness of the reform.

- CRT test data showing marked improvement in student gain score achievement.
- Progress monitoring assessments, such as DIBELS, Voyager reports and common assessments.
- SJS/ABC rubric to monitor implementation of the framework.
- ARRA SIG application—charts of activities, goals, and assurances.

Monitoring Student Achievement

The school will use a variety of assessments to gauge student performance, both formative and summative. Progress monitoring, common assessments, CRT, DWA as well as indicators such as office referrals, attendance, safe school violations, and graduation rates will be used to conduct an annual needs assessment.

DIBELS is used conscientiously at Bluff Elementary. Regular data meetings determine student interventions and instructional improvements. PLC teams will develop and utilize common assessments to determine mastery of essential standards and to provide timely, targeted interventions for students who need extra help.

Bluff will use the UBI Tracker software to track student behaviors, both infractions and positives. This will allow the staff to reinforce good behavior and to intervene and teach when poor behavior

happens. The District is modifying the SIS system to reflect more precisely student discipline infractions as well as positive behaviors.

The LEA Support Team will review school data throughout the year and provide any needed assistance to help schools stay on track.

Necessary Plan Revisions

A system of ongoing evaluation of the reform and necessary plan revisions will become part of the culture at both the school and district level. PLC teacher teams as well as schools as a whole will set and adjust SMART goals and make any necessary plan revisions. The District Support Team and External Consultants will monitor and ensure schools maintain a rigorous system of self-evaluation and a commitment to plan implementation.

(3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

The LEA budget included in the SIG application demonstrates that the LEA has allocated a reasonable amount for LEA support and school intervention model strategies. Quality budgets include the following:

- The LEA provides a **budget for each of the three years** of the grant;
- For each school included in the SIG application, the budget provides **reasonable costs** associated with the successful implementation of the intervention model selected (e.g. extended learning time, professional development, teacher recruitment and retention);
- If the LEA plans to apply for SIG funds to support LEA efforts, the budget includes adequate and reasonable costs associated with **LEA leadership and support** of the school intervention models;
- The LEA budget includes reasonable costs for **purchased professional services** to ensure quality consultants to facilitate research-based reform;
- The budget detail provides **sufficient information** to support budget requests; and
- The LEA has considered any costs associated with **program evaluation**.

Please see budget spreadsheet and budget narrative Part C, page 34.

- 3 Year Budget
- Reasonable Costs
- LEA Leadership and Support
- Purchased Professional Services
- Sufficient Information
- Program Evaluation

PART 2

The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant but, most likely, will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. In reviewing the LEA applications, the SEA will use a detailed checklist based on the information requested in Part 2 of the application to determine LEA commitment to implementing SIG requirements.

(1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

The LEA must include in its SIG application information that describes how it will implement with fidelity each of the requirements associated with the intervention model(s) selected for its eligible schools. This information includes the following:

- **Identification of the school(s)** for which the LEA is making application;
- Identification of the **intervention model** for each participating school;
- Sufficient information describing how the LEA will successfully implement each requirement;
- Any **steps already taken by the LEA** to initiate school improvement efforts that align with SIG intervention models; and
- The LEA includes a **timeline for implementation** of the school intervention model to ensure implementation begins in the fall of the 2010-2011 school year.

(1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

Information for (1) can be found throughout the application. In summary:

- Identification of applicant schools: Bluff Elementary.
- Intervention model for both schools: Transformation
- Implementation will be strengthened through the SJSJ/ABC Framework
- The District has undertaken the following improvement efforts
 - Reading First
 - Principals Academy training and the adoption of the SJSJ/ABC Framework
 - Performance pay pilot for 4-6 grade math teachers
 - Professional Development for ELL: all elementary, reading, Special Education and Secondary Language Arts teachers are required to be ESL endorsed; all staff participates in REACH training; and SIOP for all content teachers.

Chart for implementation in fall of 2010-11 school year:

| Month | Strategy | Responsible |
|-----------|--|---|
| May 2010 | Hire new principal and teachers at Bluff Elementary Apply for Principals' Academy for Bluff principal | Board of Education K12 Supervisor LEA Support Team |
| June 2010 | Conduct ARRA SIG Principal orientation Register principals and teachers for PLC Summit Advertise RFP for program evaluator Begin process of revising teacher evaluations to reflect student achievement | LEA Support Team Student Services Director Student Services Director Human Resource Director |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| <p>July 2010</p> | <p>Share ARRA SIG requirements with Stakeholders (including School Community Councils, Indian Education Committees, and the San Juan Association). School planning retreats PLC Summit Student Data Profile Reports</p> | <p>LEA Support Team/principals LEA Support Team/principals LEA Support Team/principals Student Services Director</p> |
| <p>August 2010</p> | <p>Parent/Community information activities Onsite coaching with Internal and External supports begins.</p> | <p>Principals/teachers LEA Support Team</p> |

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

The LEA must include in its SIG application sufficient information describing how it will select and contract with proven external providers to support the LEA and the school(s) in the implementation of the intervention model(s). This includes the following:

- The LEA will declare whether it intends to contract with an external provider.

x **Chooses to contract with external providers:**

- A description of **how the LEA will contract** with an external provider, including a description of how the LEA will recruit, screen, and select external providers;
- If the LEA has already selected an external provider, the LEA must **provide evidence that the external provider has a demonstrated record of success**; and
- A **narrative description and budget to support external provider contracts**, if applicable.

Detailed and relevant criteria for determining need for external provider contract and selecting external providers that take into account the specific needs of the Tier I and/or Tier II schools to be served by external providers.

These criteria must include, but are not limited to:

- o Analysis of the LEA's capacity and operational needs.
 - o Researching and prioritizing the external providers available to serve the school:
 - Available providers have been **thoroughly** researched.
 - Contact other LEAs currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding their experience and effectiveness.
 - The provider identified has a proven track record of success in working with **similar schools and/or student populations**. For example, success in working with high schools or English Language Learners.
 - o Alignment between external provider services and existing LEA services:
 - The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are **clearly defined** and aligned.
 - o The LEA has **specifically** planned how it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards.
 - o The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has been **clearly demonstrated**.
- LEA provides a description of the reasonable and timely steps it will take to recruit and screen providers to be in place by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.

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

| Recommended Intervention Model and External Partners/Providers | |
|--|--|
| Intervention Model | Rationale for Selecting Model |
| Transformation | Bluff principal is leaving. 60% of Bluff staff is leaving. The school needs considerable professional development support. The SJS/ABC Framework is compatible with the Transformation Model. |
| Lead Partner/Provider | Rationale for Selecting Lead Partner/Provider |
| Solution Tree http://www.solution-tree.com/Public/Main.aspx | Solution Tree is a provider of educational strategies and tools that improve staff and student performance. For more than 20 years they have provided researched based essential school-improvement summits, conferences, institutes and consultants. They are national recognized for Professional Learning Communities support and training. (see attachment #6) |
| Internal Partner | Rationale for Selecting Internal Partner/Provider |

| | |
|--|---|
| (District Staff) | Staff has responsibility, training and experience with each role assigned. Each has a commitment to support Bluff in developing Professional Learning Communities. |
| Supporting Partner/Provider | Rationale for Selecting Supporting Partner/Provider |
| Children’s Media Workshop http://www.mediadivide.org/ | Bluff Elementary has a need to help students become engaged, active learners who can see a connection between the essential standards and application in their world. The PLC model requires students be given enrichment opportunities tied to the essential standards, as well as interventions. CMW transforms schools into efficient 21 st Century learning environments through media technology and best teaching practices gathered throughout the world to develop authentic, self-motivated learners across the school culture. (see attachment #8) |
| Supporting Partner/Provider | Rationale for Selecting Supporting Partner/Provider |
| Program Evaluator | An external evaluator will be able to objectively look at implementation of the reform and gauge its effectiveness. The annual reports will allow the schools and LEA Support Team to make necessary adjustments and revisions in an informed and timely way. The RFP will specify qualifications of the evaluator that include the education and experience to render an informed report. |
| Supporting Partner/Provider | Rationale for Selecting Supporting Partner/Provider |
| Utah Behavior Initiative http://www.updc.org/abc | Positive Behavior Supports are an expectation of the SJSD/ABC Framework. Bluff Elementary will be in their second year of UBI training and implementation. With the considerable staff turnover, the UBI support will be necessary to regain momentum. (see attachment #7). |
| Supporting Partner/Provider | Rationale for Selecting Supporting Partner/Provider |
| Stakeholders: Parents, Communities San Juan Education Association | Stakeholders must be engaged as partners in the reform effort. Their input and support will be an ongoing goal of the school and LEA. |

| Group/Partner/Provider | Role with this School in Implementation of Intervention Model |
|------------------------------|--|
| State Education Agency (SEA) | Utah State Office of Education Ann White, Title 1 School Improvement Specialist Becky Donaldson, Title 1 School Improvement Specialist Rita Brock, Title III/Alternative Language Specialist |
| Local Education Agency (LEA) | San Juan School District Board of Education Superintendent Douglas E. Wright |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Internal Partner/Provider (LEA Staff)</p> | <p><u>LEA Support Staff</u></p> <p>Ron Nielson, K12 Supervisor/Director of Curriculum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision of instruction • Principal supervision • Supervision of teacher evaluation • School Support Team member for: Title I SPI; ARRA grant and San Juan School District ABC Framework. <p>Lynnette Johnson, Student Services Director</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitors implementation of ARRA SPI plan • Submits ARRA reports and accounts for expenditures • School Support Team member for: Title I SPI; ARRA grant and San Juan School District ABC Framework. <p>Anthony Done, Special Education/Assessment Director</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision of required assessments. • School Support Team member for: ARRA grant and San Juan School District ABC Framework. • Facilitates UBI training and implementation <p>Clayton Long, Bilingual and Title III Director</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides support for Bilingual and ELL instruction • School Support Team member for: ARRA grant and San Juan School District ABC Framework. • Facilitates Indian Education Parent Committees <p>Kit Mantz, Human Resource Director</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairs the District Evaluation Committee • Supervises all job actions • School Support Team member for: ARRA grant and San Juan School District ABC Framework. <p>Vernon Hatch, District Ed. Psychologist/UBI Coordinator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trainer for Utah Behavior Initiative • Provides weekly on-site support and coaching for UBI <p>Marla Atkinson, Reading Specialist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for all literacy instruction/programs • Gives classroom teacher support • Oversees literacy professional development • School Support Team member for: ARRA grant and San Juan School District ABC Framework. <p>District Mathematics Specialist (To Be Hired)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for all mathematics instruction/programs • Gives classroom teacher support • Oversees literacy professional development • School Support Team member for: ARRA grant and San Juan School District ABC Framework. |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Lead Partner/Provider: Solution Tree | Academics: Professional Learning Communities: Provide Professional Development, monitoring of implementation, technical support, on-site coaching of PLC teams/principal. |
| Support Partner/Provider: Utah Behavior Initiative | Provide training and support for positive behavior system. |
| Principal | Instructional Leader Primary Teacher Evaluation/Supervision School-wide Planning, Leader and monitor for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Learning Communities Provide School-wide Tiered Interventions Monitor student progress in weekly data meetings • Positive Behavior Supports • Lead out in required Professional Development activities • Teacher evaluation and supervision |
| School Teams | Daily quality instruction Provide effective interventions for students Provide a positive and safe learning environment for students Attend required professional development activities Members of Professional Learning Communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop group norms • Determine essential standards to be mastered (8-9 per semester/per subject). • Develop common assessments • Develop and Provide Tiered Interventions • Monitor student learning weekly in PLC meetings Implement ARRA SPI expectations |
| Parents & Community Parents as a whole School Community Councils Indian Education Committees | Attend school parent meetings meetings—ARRA SPI information meetings; Back to School nights, Student Education Plan (SEP) conferences, School Governance Committee meetings. Give regular input for school plans—ARRA SPI and Title 1 School-wide Support students at home with Parent/School Compact agreements |

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

The LEA SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has committed appropriate other state and federal resources to support successful implementation of the intervention model. A competitive LEA SIG application must include the following information:

- A description of how LEA **program personnel will collaborate** to support student achievement and school reform;
- A **list of the financial resources that will support** the intervention model (e.g. local, state, federal funds, and other private grants, as appropriate); and
- A **description** of how each of the financial resources listed above will support the goals of the school reform

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

LEA Program Personnel have already formed a school support team. Members and role descriptions are found in the above chart. The LEA support team was formed this year to support schools as they implement Professional Learning Communities. As Bluff Elementary has been identified as a Tier 1 school, the LEA team is committed to monitoring and supporting the schools' reform efforts. Support will include: principal and teacher supervision, monitoring the reform plan, providing data and information, finding needed resources, assisting with professional development plans and onsite coaching,

Budgets are aligned in the District's Consolidated Plan (UCA) for these priorities. District financial resources are focused on the SJSD/ABC model in the form of:

- professional development for both teachers and administrators (Title I and Title IIA)
- 3 Tier Interventions for academics (Title I, Title I ARRA, Title III, Student Success Block, IDEA, State Gifted and Talented, Youth Connections grant through Workforce Services)
- 3 Tier Interventions for behavior (Title I, Title IV, IDEA)
- 3 Tier Interventions for instructional coaching (Title I ARRA, Title I)
- quality research based curriculum resources, such as: MY ACCESS, ELL, literacy and mathematics materials (Title I, Title III, IDEA).

(4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

The LEA SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has identified potential practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation of intervention strategies. Competitive applications must include the following:

- A list of practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation;
- Proposed steps to modify identified practices and/or policies to minimize barriers;
- A procedure in place to identify and resolve future issues related to practices and/or policies; and
- Description of how the LEA will collaborate with key stakeholders to implement necessary changes (e.g. associations, administrators, local board of education).

Approvable applications must address the following:

- The barriers to successful implementation of interventions are **clearly defined**.
- The plan to address the identified barriers is **clearly defined**.
- The LEA description **demonstrates** sufficient commitment to work with **key stakeholder groups** to modify practices and policies, as necessary.
- A procedure is in place to identify and resolve future issues related to practices and/or policies.

(4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

The District believes existing barriers to school reform can and will be overcome. Potential barriers include:

- 1. Policies and procedures related to teacher evaluations.** As the teacher evaluation process will be tied to student achievement, these policies and procedures will need to be reviewed and possibly revised. The Board of Education has agreed to discuss these policies in order to achieve desired reform. The existing teacher evaluation process allows for a “Principal’s Report” and “Other Lines of Evidence”. These elements likely will be the mechanism for linking student achievement to the evaluation process. The Association has worked well with the District in the past. They have been notified about the grant and invited to participate in the change process.
- 2. Increased school/teacher governance.** The District has invested heavily in forming the SJSJ/ABC Framework which sets in motion Professional Learning Communities. These collaborative teams give teachers a voice and a structure to make significant decisions about the instruction and support for students. Schools will need to determine schedules that will allow for student interventions. Bluff Elementary has considerable latitude to determine the school schedule. Bluff Elementary has an afterschool program which will be enhanced with the Transformation effort.

3. Policies and procedures related to performance pay. The District has successfully used performance pay as part of a 4-6 Math Initiative. The Board is supportive of this concept. The LEA Support team will work to ensure the bonuses are fair and are administered in a way that improves teacher moral and brings staffs together toward a common goal, rather than dividing teachers. This will be accomplished through performance pay for— a) language arts and math teachers; b) whole staff based on total school CRT gain score achievement and c) movement toward implementation of the SJS/ABC Framework.

4. Implementation Fidelity. The LEA Support Team will be actively involved in monitoring and supporting the schools as they undergo transformation. The USOE will be called on for technical support and monitoring as well. The External Evaluator will give an outside, objective view of the process and make any recommendations for improvement. The Lead External Partner, Solution Tree Consultant, will give regular onsite and distance communication training and feedback.

(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The LEA SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has a reasonable plan to sustain the improvements achieved through the SIG process when the funding period ends. Competitive applications include the following:

- A list of the ongoing supports needed to sustain school improvement after the funding period ends;
- A description of the anticipated resources that will be committed to meet the needs identified above; and
- The written assurance that it will provide continued support.

(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends

Much of the ARRA SIG funds are designated for Professional Development and planning. This infusion of foundation training and planning will jump start the improvement process. The District has been very committed to a high level of training for a number of years and will continue to leverage needed funding to sustain the resulting transformation of schools.

If teacher performance pay proves to be successful, the District and schools will analyze funding sources, in particular Title 1, to continue that incentive.

The District has committed to sustaining the SJS/ABC Framework and has formed the LEA support team to ensure schools have both the support and oversight to continue to implement and refine the model. Increased school/teacher governance is part of both the SIG transformation and the PLC model and the District is committed to collaborative PLC team structures in all schools including transformation schools.

(6) 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 by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.

(6) Timeline Delineating Implementation steps

See chart page 22.

(7) Annual SMART Goals

The District's Consolidated plan (UCA) contains District-wide goals for academics, behavior and coaching. The expert consultants for Professional Learning Community training have advised our District that SMART student achievement goals should be set by the school PLC teams at that school level, not District level. The rationale is that teachers need increased governance, (within set parameters) to ensure ownership and also because they have responsibility to analyze the data, the instruction, the interventions to achieve results. SMART goals should be **specific** to the teachers' students, **measurable** with the common assessments PLC's develop or choose, **attainable**, **results oriented**, and **time-based**. As PLC's have responsibility for the majority of these variables, they need to be the ones to set the SMART goals. However, the District needs to maintain "tight" control of parameters of the process.

The following are found in the District Consolidated plan (UCA):

District and School educators will form Professional Learning Communities (PLC) as a means to collaborate and plan for student learning. The members of the PLC will define the mission, goals, values, and vision for the school and district. The focus of the PLC is the learning of each student. Members will clarify exactly what each student must learn, monitor each student's learning on a timely basis, provide systematic interventions that ensure students receive additional time and support for learning when they struggle, and extend learning when students have already masters the intended outcomes

1. Schools will determine professional development needs and ensure that all teachers receive needed PLC training to be successful.
2. Schools will set SMART goals (Strategic and specific, Measureable, Attainable, Results-Oriented & Time-bound).
3. A) Principals will assign each educator to a PLC team within their school. B) Schools will designate a set, regular time for PLC teams to meet. This time is a priority in the school. C) PLC teams will decide and publish meeting norms.
4. PLC teams will identify 8-10 essential standards per semester for each subject. These are standards that teachers guarantee every student will master.
5. PLC teams will develop common assessments in order to determine student mastery of each essential standard.
6. PLC teams will design and implement a system of 3 Tier Interventions for students who do not master the essential standards.

ACADEMICS: All schools will ensure that each student successfully completes every course and every grade level and demonstrates proficiency on local, state, and national assessments. Schools will eliminate the gaps in student achievement that are connected to ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, and disabilities. Each student will be challenged and supported in their journey to reach their potential.

Although the school PLC teams will set SMART goals, the District will use the following indicators to gauge whether gains in student achievement are acceptable:

| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|---|---|--|---|
| Language Arts/Reading <u>Progress monitoring:</u> <i>Bluff Elementary-DIBELS & Common Assessment</i> | Bluff-10% gain student proficiency on CRT | Bluff-10% gain student proficiency on CRT. | Bluff-10% gain student proficiency on CRT |
| Mathematics <u>Progress monitoring:</u> <i>The District will adopt a new progress monitoring instrument, under the direction of the new Mathematics Specialist</i> | Bluff-10% gain student proficiency on CRT | Bluff-10% gain student proficiency on CRT. | Bluff-10% gain student proficiency on CRT |

The District is involved in a Consortium that is pursuing an I3 grant. Part of the grant includes use of adaptive assessments. The District will work closely with USOE as both the District and State may change assessment expectations to ensure project schools have valid and acceptable goals and measures.

(8) 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 beginning with the 2010-2011 school year.

NA. The District is not applying for any Tier III schools.

(9) 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.

NA. The District is not applying for any Tier III schools.

(10) 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 beginning in the fall of the 2010-2011 school year.

(10) Consultation with Stakeholders

Bluff Elementary will hold an annual fall ARRA SIG information evening. Funds are budgeted to have dinner served. School Community Councils will serve as an advisory committee. Principals will work with both staff and parents to problem-solve on an on-going basis. Schools will inform the community about the school progress through regular publications—i.e. news articles, newsletters, flyers etc. Schools will be transparent about school achievement levels and communicate what steps are being taken to accelerate student learning.

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 three year budget that demonstrates the LEA has allocated a reasonable amount for LEA support and school intervention model strategies. Quality budgets include the following:

- **Adequate resources** to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Adequate and reasonable costs associated with **LEA leadership and support** of the school intervention models for the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools;
- **School improvement activities**, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application;
- Reasonable costs associated with the **successful implementation of the intervention model** selected at each school (e.g. extended learning time, professional development, teacher recruitment and retention);
- Reasonable costs for **purchased professional services** to ensure quality consultants to facilitate research- based reform;
- **Budget details** provide sufficient information to support budget requests; and
The LEA has considered any costs associated with **program evaluation**.

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

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

BUDGET NARRATIVE

SALARIES

BLUFF ELEMENTARY:

Performance pay for teachers.

1. Gain score improvement for students. \$125 per point improvement. 6.5 FTE teachers will have an average of 12 students each. $12 \times \$125 = \$1,500$ for language arts; $12 \times \$125 = \$1,500$ for math. Goal of 1 point improvement per student per subject is \$3,000 per teacher. The .5 FTE Heritage Language teacher qualifies for the \$1,500 language arts bonus. **\$21,000 is the total Gain Score bonus for all teachers (total of 7 FTE).**
2. CRT Goal of 10% Overall Improvement per Year = \$1,000 per teacher x 7 teachers = **\$7,000**
3. Progress on ABC rubric (6 teachers)

| | | |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|
| Academics | \$250 for improvement 1 indicator | (7 teachers x \$250 = \$1,750) |
| | \$500 for improvement 2 indicators | (7 teachers x \$500= \$3,500) |
| Behavior | \$250 for improvement 1 indicator | (7 teachers x \$250= \$1,750) |
| | \$500 for improvement 2 indicators | (7 teachers x \$500 = \$3,500) |

Total teacher performance pay for Bluff Elementary is \$36,500 or potentially \$5,615 per teacher.

Performance Pay for Principal & Instructional Coach

1. Gain score improvement for students. 75 students x \$20 per student = \$1,500 x 2 subjects (language arts and math) = \$3,000 each or **\$6,000 total for both principal and coach.**
2. CRT Goal of 10% Overall Improvement per Year = \$1,000 per teacher x 7 teachers = **\$7,000**
3. Progress on ABC rubric

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Academics | \$250 for improvement 1 indicator; \$500 improvement 2 indicators |
| Behavior | \$250 for improvement 1 indicator; \$500 improvement 2 indicators |
| Coaching | \$500 for improvement 1 indicator; \$1,000 improvement 2 indicators |

Total Principal and Instructional Coach performance pay for is \$12,000 or \$6,000 each.

| TEACHERS PERFORMANCE PAY | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Gain Scores</u> | | | | |
| | Gain scores LA | Gain scores math | Total possible per teacher | Total * 6 teachers |
| (125* 12 students) | \$1,500 | \$1,500 | \$3,000 | \$21,000 |
| | | | | |
| HL Teacher | Gain scores LA | | | + HL teacher |
| (\$24 x 75 students) | \$1,500 | | | \$1,500 |
| | | | | |
| <u>AYP Bonus</u> | | | 10% CRT Improvement | Total Status |
| (7 teachers) | | | \$1,000 | \$7,000 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | |
| ABC Rubric progress | | | | |
| | 1 indicator | Total-1 indicator | 2 indicators | Total-2 indicators |
| Academics | \$250 | \$1,750 | \$500 | \$3,500 |
| Behavior | \$250 | \$1,750 | \$500 | \$3,500 |
| | | | Total for Teachers | \$36,500 |
| | | | Total per Teacher | \$5,615 |

PRINCIPAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL COACH PERFORMANCE PAY

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Gain Scores | Gain Scores LA | Gain Scores math | Total possible per person | Total *2 |
| (\$20 per student - 75 students) | \$1,500 | \$1,500 | \$3,000 | \$6,000 |
| AYP Bonus | | | 10% CRT Improvement | Total *2 |
| | | | \$1,000 | \$2,000 |
| Progress on ABC Rubric | | | | |
| | 1 indicator | Total- 1 indicator | 2 indicators | Total- 2 Indicators |
| Academics | \$250 | \$500 | \$500 | \$1,000 |
| Behavior | \$250 | \$500 | \$500 | \$1,000 |
| Coaching | \$500 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$2,000 |
| | | | TOTAL | \$12,000 |
| | | | Total per person | \$6,000 |
| | | | GRAND TOTAL | \$48,500 |

Teacher training stipends:

PLC Summit-Solution Tree-Phoenix Arizona is \$200 per day stipend x 3 days = \$600 x 7 teachers = **\$4,200**
 Summer Planning retreat = \$200 per day x 3 days = \$600 x 7 teachers = **\$4,200**

Instructional Coach Salary:

Master's Degree with up to 15 years experience-base salary of \$58,194 + 10% (instructional coach salary schedule) = \$64,013 (less 8% paid by other fund for 3 weeks district-wide assessment) = **\$58,892**

Total Salary Request for Bluff Elementary (1st Year) = \$121,900

BENEFITS: @ .25% = \$30,228

Insurance for Instructional Coach = \$9,600

CONTRACT SERVICES:

Lead External Partner-Solution Tree

\$6,500 per day on site consulting services x 4 visits (every other month) = \$26,000

\$1,700 for 90 minutes video conference x 4 meetings (every other month) = \$6,800

Total for each school \$32,800

Solution Tree-Total for both schools \$65,600

Support External Partner-Children's Media Workshop

1st year Bluff Elementary = \$81,900

Services include: travel, services, use of CMW camera s and software. It is anticipated that the CMW component will be working in conjunction with other school efforts on a daily basis. The budget reflects a CMW presence of 60 school days throughout the first year of the award and are available for phone conferencing at any time.

CMW-Total for first year = \$81,900

TOTAL CONTRACT SERVICES FIRST YEAR = \$114,700 for first year

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—PLC SUMMIT-SOLUTION TREE LAS VEGAS, NV (TRAVEL)

Registration Fee \$689 x 8 (7 teachers and 1 coach) = \$5,512

Total registration fees = \$5,512

Motel for 2 nights @ \$125 per night x 8 = \$1,000 * 3 nights = **\$3,000**

Per Diem \$36 per day x 8 = \$288 * 3 days = **\$864**

Mileage @ .44 per mile 4 vehicles – 1,062 miles (round trip) = **\$1,869**

Additional Travel—Bluff Elementary to Adams District Colorado

3 people—principal and 2 teachers

Motel for 2 nights @ \$85 per night = \$85 x 3 people x 2 nights = \$510

Per Diem \$36 per day @ 3 days = \$108 x 3 people = \$324

Mileage @ .44 per mile, 1 vehicle-858 miles round trip = \$377

TOTAL TRAVEL:

Motel = \$3,510

PerDiem = \$1,188

Mileage = \$1,311

PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT:

Annual ARRA Fall Event

Bluff 200 people; = **\$1,400**

SUPPLIES:

PLC professional books; refreshments for inservice--**\$2,000**

TOTAL BUDGET REQUESTED-FIRST YEAR:

| | |
|----------------|------------------|
| Direct Costs | \$272,112 |
| Indirect Costs | \$ 6,666 |
| Total Costs | \$278,770 |

BLUFF ELEMENTARY

| | <u>Year 1</u> | <u>Year 2</u> | <u>Year 3</u> | <u>Grand Total</u> |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Salaries | | | | |
| Performance Pay (7 teachers) | \$36,500 | \$36,500 | \$36,500 | \$109,500 |
| Performance Pay-Principal/Instruction.Coach | \$12,000 | \$12,000 | \$12,000 | \$36,000 |
| Teacher Stipends/PLC Summit | \$4,200 | \$4,200 | \$4,200 | \$12,600 |
| Instructional Coach | \$58,892 | \$58,892 | \$58,892 | \$176,676 |
| School Planning Retreat | | | | \$0 |
| Teacher Stipends (3 days, 7 teachers @ \$200 per day) | \$4,200 | \$4,200 | \$4,200 | \$12,600 |
| SUBTOTAL | \$115,792 | \$115,792 | \$115,792 | \$347,376 |
| | | | | \$0 |
| Benefits- @ 25% | \$28,948 | \$28,948 | \$28,948 | \$86,844 |
| Insurance for Instructional Coach | \$9,600 | \$9,600 | \$9,600 | \$28,800 |
| | | | | \$0 |
| Contract Services-External Partners | | | | \$0 |
| Lead Partner Solution Tree | \$32,800 | \$32,800 | \$32,800 | \$98,400 |
| Support Partner CMW | \$81,900 | \$23,400 | \$11,700 | \$117,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | \$114,700 | \$56,200 | \$44,500 | \$215,400 |
| | | | | \$0 |
| Professional Development | | | | \$0 |
| PLC Summit-Solution Tree | | | | \$0 |
| Registration Fee (\$689 x 9) | \$6,201 | \$6,201 | \$6,201 | \$18,603 |
| Travel -Las Vegas & Denver | | | | \$0 |
| Motel | \$3,885 | \$3,885 | \$3,885 | \$11,655 |
| PerDiem | \$1,296 | \$1,296 | \$1,296 | \$3,888 |
| Mileage \$.44 per mile- 1,062 miles | \$1,311 | \$1,311 | \$1,311 | \$3,933 |
| SUBTOTAL | \$7,872 | \$7,872 | \$7,872 | \$38,079 |
| | | | | \$0 |
| Parent/Community Involvement | | | | \$0 |
| Annual ARRA Event (200 people) | \$1,400 | \$1,400 | \$1,400 | \$4,200 |
| Parent Supplies-mailings | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$3,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | \$2,400 | \$2,400 | \$2,400 | \$7,200 |
| | | | | \$0 |
| Supplies | | | | \$0 |
| PLC support | \$2,400 | \$2,400 | \$2,400 | \$7,200 |
| | | | | \$0 |
| Total Direct Costs | \$272,112 | \$213,612 | \$201,912 | \$730,899 |
| Indirect Costs @ 2.45% | \$6,666.74 | \$5,639.36 | \$5,330.48 | \$19,295.73 |
| TOTAL ALL COSTS | \$278,779 | \$219,251 | \$207,242 | \$750,195 |

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

USOE has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in the State.

