

• ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

District Name: MINATARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS County/District Number: 79-0002	District Mailing Address: Minatare Public Schools P.O. Box 425 Minatare, NE 69356
District Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Charles J. Bunner Position and Office: Superintendent Contact's Mailing Address: Minatare Public Schools P.O. Box 425 Minatare, NE 69356 Telephone: 308.783.1232 Fax: 308.783.2982 Email address: cbunner@panesu.org	
President of the School Board (Printed Name): Gary Koke	Telephone: 308.641.6965
Signature of the President of the School Board X _____	Date:
Authorized Representative of the District (Printed Name): Charles J. Bunner	Telephone: 308.783.1232
Signature of the Authorized Representative: X _____	Date:

The district, 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 district receives through this application.

SECTION 1. DISTRICT INFORMATION

PART A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

A. 1. Complete the information in the table for each school in the district included in this application. From the eligibility letter, identify whether each school is in Tier I, II or III. **When Section 2 of this application is completed, indicate the intervention model to be implemented for each Tier I and Tier II school. Add rows as needed.**

School Name	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Intervention Model (Tier I and Tier II Only)			
				Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation
Minatare Elementary	X						X

A.2. Not applicable.

PART B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION DISTRICT LEVEL

District Analysis of Need and Capacity

Minatare does not need to submit district level information since the size of the population results on only one elementary building. All activities will take place at the building level.

Located along the historic western wagon train trails, Minatare’s name was derived from a branch of the Native American tribe of Lakota Sioux called “Minnataree” who lived in this area. Even in 1887, residents showed pluck and hardiness—they dug a canal for irrigation by themselves with little or no money involved. Minatare is surrounded by bigger towns --Scottsbluff, Gering, Bayard. Traditionally, housing and land values are less, making it a feasible choice for low-income families. While agriculture is the mainstay of the community, in the last several years, local job opportunities have been diminished with the closing of cattle feed yards, local restaurants and gas station. The district is also constrained in size without a land base to provide tax-base resources. Minatare district is a mere 12.5 square miles. This results in just over 31 million dollars of valuation. This is the lowest valuation per pupil in the state other than the reservation schools. Following the pioneer spirit, the district and town continue to work together to find ways to support their mutual needs.

At the district level, the following short description is based upon 2008-2009 data. Since the SIG process utilizes 2008-2009 as baseline data, this was determined to be the most consistent approach. In 2008-2009, Minatare Public Schools reported a total student enrollment of 209 students, housed in two separate facilities. Grades K-6 attend the elementary building located at 805 Seventh Street, Minatare, Nebraska. The 2008-2009 enrollments at this building were 103 students. Grades 7-12 attend the secondary school building located at 1107 Seventh Street, Minatare, Nebraska. The enrollment at the secondary building was 106 students. In the total district, around twenty-three certificated staff members and fourteen support staff members, with the elementary building employing eighteen and the secondary building employing fifteen total staff members. A part-time

nurse is employed by the district. Three staff members were shared by both buildings. There are no bus routes in the district. The school owns two buses and three vans to transport students and faculty to various activities. Two faculty members are used as district bus drivers.

At the district level, in 2008-2009, the poverty rate was 71.90%--greatly over the state average of 38.35%. Likewise, the districts ELL population rates of 17.70% were much greater than the state average of 6.31%. Again, Minatare reported a higher mobility rate of 17.22% than the state average of 12.02%. However, Minatare was below the state average in several areas. The special education percentage was at 11.96% which is lower than the state percentage of 15.21%. Graduation at 83.33% was close to the state average of 89.74% and the attendance percentage of 94.51% was very close to the state at 94.84%.

Since much of the data used in the designation of AYP and PLAS status is based upon the former STARS testing system, Minatare is proud of the rating of “exemplary” for assessment quality in both reading and math at all levels (elementary, middle and high school.) However, performance on these assessments has not been exemplary. In fact, the performance is very uneven with highs and lows that spike across the grades and vary from year to year. Some of this variance is attributed to the very small class size in which a small number of students can impact the total averages. Small size also impacts disaggregation of information for subgroups. On the state report, very few groups had enough numbers to be revealed, providing only glimpses into possible issues. For example, males (when data is available) were not as successful as females.

However, research would also indicate that the high poverty and language related challenges have an impact on the learning in this district. This is reinforced by the state AYP decisions. The chart below indicates Minatare rated NOTMET for reading for “all students”, for “white, not Hispanic” and for “free and reduced lunch students”. Other categories did not have enough students represented to be shown.

Student Performance Decision used for AYP				
AYP	Elementary	Middle	High	
Reading				
All students	NOT MET	MET	~	
American Indian/Alaska Native	*	*	*	
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	*	*	
White, Not Hispanic	NOT MET	~	~	
Black, Not Hispanic	*	*	*	
Hispanic	~	~	*	
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	NOT MET	NOT MET	~	
Special Education Students	~	~	*	
English Language Learners	~	*	*	
Math				
All students	MET	MET	~	
American Indian/Alaska Native	*	*	*	
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	*	*	
White, Not Hispanic	MET	~	~	
Black, Not Hispanic	*	*	*	
Hispanic	~	~	*	
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	MET	MET	~	
Special Education Students	~	~	*	
English Language Learners	~	*	*	
No Child Left Behind Qualified Teachers	N / A			

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Reading							
	03	04	05	06	07	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	60.00%	100.00%	*	48.15%	52.38%	50.00%	75.00%
Special Education Students	*	*	▲	*	*	*	*
English Language Learners	*	▲	*	*	*	*	*
Gender							
Male	*	*	*	33.33%	58.33%	*	54.55%
Female	*	*	*	66.67%	*	57.14%	92.31%
Race / Ethnicity							
American Indian / Alaska Native	*	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
White, Not Hispanic	*	100.00%	*	44.44%	58.33%	58.33%	88.24%
Black, Not Hispanic	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	*	*	*	50.00%	57.14%	43.75%	75.00%
Migrants	*	*	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

Reading and math scores both average far below the state proficiency levels. In 2008-2009, reading achievement was a greater concern than for mathematics.

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Mathematics							
	03	04	05	06	07	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	76.92%	100.00%	*	74.07%	70.00%	80.00%	72.00%
Special Education Students	*	*	▲	*	*	*	*
English Language Learners	*	▲	*	*	*	*	*
Gender							
Male	*	*	*	60.00%	63.64%	*	54.55%
Female	*	*	*	91.67%	*	78.57%	85.71%
Race / Ethnicity							
American Indian / Alaska Native	*	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
White, Not Hispanic	*	100.00%	*	77.78%	83.33%	75.00%	77.78%
Black, Not Hispanic	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	90.91%	*	*	70.00%	76.92%	75.00%	58.33%
Migrants	*	*	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

The fact that math achievement is stronger than reading is reinforced by an examination of the results on the nationally norm referenced assessment. (Minatare uses NWEA MAPS.) While some grades were not revealed for reading, the math score that is shown is higher than that for reading in 2008-2009.

Percentage of Students Above U.S. Average on National Tests			
	04	08	11
Standardized Reading Test	*	*	41.67%
Standardized Mathematics Test	76.92%	65.00%	62.50%
ACT			20.00

- * Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:
- 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
 - 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

In writing, Minatare students appear to grow in skills between elementary and secondary school. Interestingly, our students scored higher on the state writing assessment than they did on reading. Knowing that writing is often a way to see reading skills in a more difficult, expressive form, these higher scores are surprising. The district attributes some of this apparent success to the level at which the state determined “mastery levels.” That level on a rubric is somewhat low, in district opinion. So, while the achievement on this test comparing our students to others in Nebraska on a common assessment is reassuring, Minatare is not complacent that the writing scores of students are “good enough”. The relationship between reading and writing can be enhanced for greater achievement.

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Writing			
	04	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	75.00%	100.00%	95.83%
Special Education Students	*	*	*
English Language Learners	*	*	*
Gender			
Male	*	*	90.00%
Female	*	100.00%	100.00%
Race / Ethnicity			
American Indian / Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian or Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A
White, Not Hispanic	69.23%	100.00%	94.12%
Black, Not Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	72.73%	100.00%	91.67%
Migrants	*	N/A	N/A

- B.1. District’s contribution to assist schools in their analysis of need and selection of an intervention model.

No funds will be requested at the district level as part of this application. Since the district is so small, the analysis of need focuses on the school level. (See the school level section of the application for additional data.) The district’s relatively small size (currently two administrators, part-time bookkeeper) intertwines much of the district’s actions with those of the school. In analysis of the need and selection of an intervention model, both current administrators (superintendent/elementary principal and the secondary principal) studied the models available, consulted specialists at the state department and ESU 13, met with

WestEd Consultants who were offering services in the region, and conferred with Minatare's leadership team before selecting the Transformation Model.

Traditional district contributions to the school will be maintained and kept separated from the school's efforts as part of the SIG projects. The superintendent will monitor the project to ensure that supplanting of any basic service does not occur. For example, the SIG application does not replace district funding for grade level staffing, any building projects, or resources beyond those specifically outlined as related to the reform project.

B.2. Factors that indicate capacity

Minatare Public School District has the capacity to use the school improvement funds to support the only building that has been identified for Tier I intervention, the Minatare Elementary building. SIG funds will provide the needed funds to engage in the researched based curriculum, professional development and staff support needed for successful implementation and resulting student achievement.

Personnel in Minatare Schools have the **expertise to manage this project**. The current superintendent, Mr. Chuck Bunner, received his Bachelor of Science degree from Chadron State College in 1968. He has a Master of Arts degree in 1986 from Kearney State College and his Specialist in Education in 1991 from the University of Nebraska-Kearney. Mr. Bunner has served as superintendent of schools in Ovid, Colorado and Sidney, Nebraska, in addition to serving Minatare for six years. While he is retiring from the superintendent position, Mr. Bunner will be able to lend his experience and relationships with the community in the position of IPM. The incoming superintendent, Mr. Timothy J. Cody, is also experienced, having served as Superintendent at Wolf Point School District in the Billings, Montana area. In this role he has worked with diversity and poverty issues and is committed to helping Minatare find solutions to student achievement issues. Traditionally, in the Minatare Public School District, the superintendent has served in the dual capacity of superintendent and elementary principal. McREL's Balanced Leadership work has uncovered the vital role of the principal in school leadership and reform. SIG funds would allow Minatare Public School District the opportunity to hire a full-time principal, therefore increasing the districts' capacity to raise student achievement. Likewise, professional development made possible through SIG funds would increase the capacity of the staff to raise student achievement. While the average teacher does not have advanced degrees, they are committed to lifelong learning and the value of achievement to our students. They are willing to earn more credentials in the process of this project.

Minatare has a **past history of successful reform initiatives**. Supported by the district, Minatare Elementary saw gains in teaching skills through their participation in Reading First, which has ended and is no longer available as a support system for our school. The elementary staff underwent extensive training in the form of on-site coaching from the Nebraska Reading First Director and in various reading institutes. This suggests that Minatare Elementary staff have the capacity to apply professional development in their classroom practice and employ data driven decision making for instruction. The Reading First work also resulted in an increased sense of collective efficacy. The collective decision of Minatare Elementary teachers, reading coach and administration earlier this spring to implement a vertically designed reading program that is more aligned with the needs of the students

beginning in fall 2010 is evidence of staff collective efficacy. Staff realized the need to refine grouping practices so that students will be working at their instructional level to acquire reading skills. A vertically designed reading program uses data to place and group and refines instruction for students on a weekly basis. The vertically designed reading program accommodates a wider range of student instructional levels, therefore providing the likelihood of increased achievement. The increased use of data and the increase in collective efficacy among Minatare Elementary staff indicate the capacity growth that occurred through past reform efforts and the capacity to apply that commitment to the next level of reform.

Minatare Public Schools' 21st Century Community Learning Center Program is another example of successful reform initiatives. The program began in 2006. Today, over fifty percent of elementary children in Minatare attend either the after school portion or the summer portion of this program. Data is kept on student progress both socially and academically. The 21st CCLC staff meets on a regular basis with the classroom teachers to discuss progress made.

Minatare has begun to develop increased and formalized support of parent and community. Minatare Public School District has increased their capacity to work with parents and the community in several ways. The PIRC (Parent Involvement Resource Center) Council, which meets periodically, provides a vehicle for engaging parents and community in school-related discussions. Some highlights of parent and community involvement in Minatare include a community garden and parent/student involvement nights. Since its inception, Minatare's PIRC Program has an increased participation of 38 percent. Those individuals participating in the PIRC Program are actively encouraging others to participate in the program, and, more importantly, in other parent activities such as open house night, parent /teacher conferences, and parent literacy nights. This increased parental activity has carried over into the community resulting in more volunteers such as classroom grandparents and community helpers. Minatare's PIRC work demonstrates an emerging capacity and willingness to engage parents and community. Although the PIRC project is coming to an end, Minatare plans to continue the PIRC council work utilizing the provided meeting agendas and support materials.

Minatare Public School District is supported by the teachers' union. One hundred percent of the teachers' union members have signed the Title I School Improvement Compact. Additionally, the local union is open to implementing such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff. They are also open to time efficiency studies in the classroom which aid in maximizing instructional time.

In regard to recruitment, Minatare Public Schools enjoys an advantage over other small schools in that geographically, we are close to the population centers of the region. This allows us to attract employees that prefer small communities but want to enjoy advantage of large populations and it allows us to attract employees whose spouses are employed in the area. By concentrating our efforts on these areas we are able to attract quality candidates. In addition to these areas of concentration, the district has networked with all area universities' and colleges' career centers to advertise vacancies. The district also utilizes a newspaper network that covers a five state area. Last year the district researched teacher induction programs and plans for implementation of the induction program "Ready For Anything" are underway. While recruiting a principal this late in the season is a challenge, current economic

challenges in other states may serve as an advantage to potentially provide additional quality candidates this year.

In total, Minatare has the desire and growing expertise to make needed changes. The SIG application addresses the need for additional leadership, professional growth, action plans and extended learning time. With funding and employment of these plans, Minatare's capacity to change can be realized.

B.3. If the district is not applying to serve each Tier I school in the district

This question is not applicable to Minatare Public School District. We have just one elementary building and we are applying to serve it.

B.4. External Provider

Minatare policy is silent regarding procurement. Minatare does not have a required procurement method for staff development services. Since the Board of Education has unanimously approved the SIG application (June 14, 2010), they have given their approval for the administration to enact the programs and encumber funds as directed in the application following all requirements. Minatare has taken action to do adequate research into programs and presenters and partners to ensure quality. We also ask the Educational Service Unit to support us in finding quality trainers.

Direct Instruction Consulting Services, Inc. will be contracted to coach the implementation of Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading. **Deborah Loschiavo** is the head consultant. After watching other districts across the state implement the direct instruction curriculum, it was apparent that successful implementation requires intensive teacher training and support. Beyond the initial training in delivering the instruction, the staff needs on-going assistance in student placement, interpretation of weekly assessments, frequent fidelity checks, and supportive problem-solving. Selecting implementation support also ensures that the reading coach can turn to someone with extensive experience with the program and with reading issues to better support Minatare students. Loschiavo has agreed to provide some on-site support as well as committing to weekly conference calls to review faxed student progress data to ensure that every student is correctly placed and has any needed individualization. Deborah Loschiavo was selected after recommendation from respected personnel from the National Institute for Direct instruction (NIFDI.). Loschiavo holds a B.S. in Psychology and a Master's in Special Education from the University of Oregon. She has extensive experience teaching Direct Instruction (DI) in the classroom as well as in the capacity of a DI trainer and coach. From 1978-1980 she worked as the Program Coordinator training practicum students to teach mentally handicapped adults vocational training skills for placement in food service positions at the University of Illinois. From 1983-1994 she was an early intervention teacher using the principals of Direct Instruction to develop and implement a pre-school curriculum. From 1988-1992 she trained special education preschool teachers in Monterey, California how to apply the principles of direct instruction and applied behavior analysis to curriculum design and implementation. From 1992-1996 she worked as a special education teacher in eastern Oregon where she taught Direct Instruction programs to special education

students in kindergarten through 12th grade and coordinated a school-wide implementation of Corrective Reading at a middle school. From 1997-1999 she coordinated a 127-school implementation of the Corrective Reading program in Fort Worth, Texas. She provided training for district teachers and staff, building coordinators and district level supervisors. She also designed and implemented a system of accountability for all 127 schools as well as provided direct on-site support to 30 schools. Since 1999, Deborah has been a trainer and implementation manager for NIFDI. As part of her duties with NIFDI, she has provided initial and ongoing teacher training, weekly student performance data monitoring and monthly on-site consultation to schools in Detroit, MI; Chester, PA; Baltimore, MD; Los Angeles, CA; Honolulu, HI and the island of Guam. She has also worked with schools as a consultant independently of NIFDI in Washington DC, Honolulu, Bellingham Washington, Saipan and elsewhere.

Educational Service Unit #13 is the intermediate agency funded by Nebraska to serve our school district. The reason we have chosen to work with ESU#13 is that they are already provided to our district and have the expertise (i.e. experienced staff developers who have led school improvement external team reviews, provide trainings including endorsement by McREL) to support us at an increased level for needed change. No procurement method is needed. The regular service ESU#13 will provide to our district (no cost to the grant) will relate to the reform project in two ways. First, a staff developer is assigned to directly serve on the Minatare leadership team to assist with any needed aspect of research, project planning, follow-up on implementation suggested by any outside trainers, data analysis and integrity. **Sarah Richter** has a Master's degree in Curriculum and Instruction and endorsements in ESL and Assessment. She has previously served as a reading coach in Arizona and leads the Coaching the Coaches Cadre for the region. The second aspect of ESU support is to include Minatare in any ESU sponsored trainings for the region. Minatare will serve on advisory committees for the selection of regional training and then will be very selective to only attend sessions that directly relate to our specific reform efforts. The cost to Minatare will be the regular fee. These trainings include such events as the Coaching the Coaches Cadre, Reading Mastery Summer Institute, Saxon Math Strategies for English language Learners, DIBELS, Principals and Instructional Coaches Partnering for Success, and Ready for Anything teacher induction systems. Finally, the ESU has agreed to support our new reform efforts as an additional service. In this role, the ESU will facilitate the organizing, development, preparation, set-up, and initial evaluation of specific professional development sessions for which the trainers and related expenses and materials are supported by the grant. This is an additional service, beyond our current services. In lieu of a payment to the ESU for this additional service, we have elected to include ESU staff developers in our training efforts so that they will be better prepared to support our district in the future and build capacity for the region.

A summary of expertise for consultants hired by ESU#13 for some sample programs:

Reading Mastery Summer Institute: with NIFDI trained facilitators: All trainers used by ESU#13 for the summer institutes were trained and certified by NIFDI and are currently working as reading coaches/trainers in Gering and Alliance, Nebraska. All these trainers have presented at other state training institutes and have multiple years experience implementing the reading programs. (NIFDI is

uniquely qualified for these tasks as its founding members include the creators of DI. NIFDI's implementation support consultants are experienced teachers with advanced degrees and five to 25 years teaching experience in DI. Many of the senior consultants are co-authors of the DI programs. NIFDI's leaders have more than 30 years experience with school and district implementations of DI in all types of environments. NIFDI has extensive experience providing support for implementing DI in a wide variety of settings. NIFDI has its roots in the University of Oregon Direct Instruction Follow Through model, which was conceived at the University of Illinois in the late 1960's and implemented in schools around the country from 1967 to 1995. NIFDI began as the Accelerated Student Achievement Project (ASAP) in 1993. The positive acceleration of student achievement as a result of the ASAP implementations led to its adoption in Baltimore and elsewhere. Since its formal creation in 1997, NIFDI has supported DI implementations in 17 states (California, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin) and the territory of Guam.)

DIBELS—The DIBELS Data System will be used by Minatare for universal screening and progress monitoring. Best practice says that assessors should be trained before each testing period. ESU#13 will offer refresher training with a national consultant. Minatare will attend that training, and then conduct its own refresher training for the mid-year assessment time. The national trainer, **Dr. Dawn Miller**, currently serves as the Innovative Projects Facilitator for the Shawnee Mission Public Schools. In this role, Dr. Miller serves as a district team member leading planning, staff development, implementation, and evaluation for response to intervention efforts around academic and behavior supports. Prior to joining Shawnee Mission, Dr. Miller served as a project director for statewide implementation of the problem-solving process and developing a tiered system of support for literacy. Dr. Miller has applied her skills to work as a special education teacher, a school psychologist, adjunct faculty member for administrative programs in Kansas, and district and building consultant/trainer. She has authored or coauthored published work regarding the problem-solving process, assessing written language, and family communication and involvement.

Principals and Instructional Coaches Partnering for Success—The trainers for this session are associates of the Kansas Coaching Project, part of the Kansas University Center for Research on Learning. Through this project, **Dr. Jim Knight and his associates** present the best practices on instructional coaching and how to overcome obstacles to success. Knight is a nationally recognized expert in the field. He is the author of *Instructional Coaching: A Partnership Approach to Improving Instruction* (march 2007) and co-author of *Coaching Classroom Management* (January 2007).

Saxon Math: While we have determined that the primary focus of year one of the grant is to implement a new reading program, we will also use year one to increase our fidelity and quality implementation of the current Saxon math curriculum. We have a high percentage of at-risk students who need support with language development either due to poverty or being second language learners, we selected the training Saxon Math Strategies for English Language Learners to begin this work on quality implementation. No procurement system was needed. The facilitator for this first training will be **Jose Bribiesca**. Bribiesca has taught elementary grades in Texas and became a curriculum specialist in the math department at Fort Worth ISD. He is endorsed in ESL and is working on his master's degree in curriculum and instruction. He has worked on the latest revision of the Saxon Primary program and now trains for Saxon. During year one, we will also conduct a math program review and develop training for our instructional coach so that she can better support the math implementation to enhance quality, fidelity, intensity and consistency. This training will be also provided by a qualified Saxon Math trainer. The coach and principal will work with Saxon to determine any additional support/interventions that can be provided within the program such as pacing, additional time, repetition

National Literacy Project: Recognizing that students really begin to be challenged as they approach intermediate grades, the Minatare reform project will also include a component on adolescent literacy. We will focus this effort on grades 5 and 6 and preparing for transitions to junior high. **Judith I. Irvin** will provide this training in two sessions spaced several months apart to allow us to work on action steps between sessions. She was selected based on a review of several of the books she has written outlining the research and correlated actions that successful schools take. No procurement method is needed. Irvin is a Professor at Florida State University and the Executive Director of the National Literacy Project, a non-profit organization dedicated to improving literacy in adolescents. She has chaired research committees and served on the Commission on Adolescent Literacy of the International Reading Association. Dr. Irvin recently completed two books as a result of a project funded by Carnegie Corporation of New York: *Taking Action on Adolescent Literacy: An Implementation Guide for School Leaders* (with Meltzer & Dukes, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2007) and *Meeting the Challenge of Adolescent Literacy: Practical Ideas for Literacy Leaders* (with Meltzer, Mickler, Phillips, & Dean, International Reading Association, 2009).

Nebraska Response to Intervention (RtI) Consortium has agreed to support Minatare Elementary in its RtI efforts. There is no fee from the RTI Consortium for this service, so they are not an official external provider. Staff expenses for attending are included in the grant proposal. They were selected because they are the strongest voice for quality the RTI reform system in the state of Nebraska. No procurement system is needed to use their services. We applied for inclusion in their project because Minatare is ready to systematize our work, to make it more structured and to build the efficiency of strong decision rules and researched methods of planning for tiered instructional support to increase the success of all students. **Andrea Boden, Ed.S., NCSP**, is Project Manager, of the Nebraska Response to Intervention Consortium for Training and Evaluation. She works within the NDE RTI team to oversee the daily tasks of the Nebraska RTI Consortium and is responsible for coordinating the state training and support activities. Andrea was also a finalist for the National School Psychologist of the Year Award in 2006. Along with consultant, Lynette Block, (MA) Boden will provide training customized to match Minatare Elementary's knowledge and implementation level. Support will focus on Nebraska's RtI Implementation Plan, the RtI Essential Elements, data collection and analysis, and specific next steps for the district. Block's expertise includes having been the state's former Reading First Director with background in universal screening, progress monitoring, program implementation, classroom walkthroughs for fidelity as well as the RTI skills in systems design and problem solving. Boden was Gering Public Schools' former curriculum director who was instrumental in that district's RtI work and in implementation of the reading program now selected by Minatare.. In conjunction with ESU 13, the state RTI consortium will provide four days of training over the 2010-11 school year. Personalized RTI support will be continued the following years.

Corrective Math: By year two, Minatare will begin planning to implement this selected additional intervention for struggling math students. Corrective Math has been initially selected as a strong intervention program to support our core program after second grade. It was selected based upon the similarity to our chosen reading program with the same researched-based methodology. The program has placement tests, various entry points, precise modules for specific skills, and even a "skipping schedule" to allow more precise diagnosis and delivery to accelerate closing the discrepancy gap when possible based on student learning rates. No specific procurement method was needed. We will work with the company provided trainer for this intervention system. **Georgene Haire** has a Master's degree in special education and has extensive experience using the program. Using her Ed.S. (School Psychology,) Haire has also previously been in charge of providing on-going support to staff using the program at the district level for nine years. Her role will be to provide 5 days of

training/on-site support to ensure quality implementation and support for our teachers and instructional coach in learning the new skills for coaching in mathematics. We have designed a timeline to allow the days to fall over two school years to best meet our needs and the ability of the teachers to learn and implement new skills.

Association for Direct Instruction: This organization works with NIFDI to sponsor the annual National Direct Instruction Conference. This conference was selected because through participation, our district can create a nationally certified trainer to build local capacity. Their conference has sessions for several roles and direct instruction programs. We will focus on the literacy coach and staff development leaders' roles. Another reason for selecting this venue is it can serve as way of recognizing those teachers who are most exact in their use of the programs and get the most student achievement. All conference trainers are certified to train others in the respective programs. No procurement system is needed to pay for conference fees.

Community Action Partnership of Western Nebraska-Head Start—Minatare school staff has met with the Head Start director, Sarah Ocella and Jan Fitts , Executive Director CAPWN about the possibilities of combining Head Start program with a public preschool in Minatare. In recent weeks, Head Start has suffered a tremendous setback when a storm destroyed their Minatare facilities, materials and equipment. This is an ideal time to work for all children in the community so more children can be served. The directors were agreeable to the merge to create a new program for the community. The process has begun to develop such a community partnership. Formal agreements can be reached at the next board meetings of both groups. The capacity to accomplish this project is shown in a two ways. First, a similar merge has already been accomplished in a nearby town; their expertise will make organization faster. Second, a church across from the elementary building responded to the storm damage crisis and offered to rent space for the first year while the partnership developed more permanent building plans for the future. The advantage in this move is that the larger church space will accommodate the additional public preschool numbers and allow service to a greater number of children.

Any additional providers of professional growth will be scrutinized for quality and use of research. Minatare will take the added responsibility to use leadership team discussions to ensure that such providers are integrated into the comprehensive plan that used a results-based staff development model. In this way, any session must be part of the continuum from awareness, knowledge, demonstration, practice, on-the job practice, follow-up and extension.

B.5. Alignment to the intervention model

The Analysis of Need did involve all elementary staff representing all our services in planning. In addition, the leaders of the Head Start program were also involved.

The district will ensure that all programs and resources are aligned to support the school in implementing the reform plan. The steps we will take include (1) designating the principal and IPM with responsibility to review programs and projects to ensure communication and connections across activities, (2) reviewing all requests for purchase to require connection to the SIG activities, and (3) utilization of staff/grade level meetings to problem solve and trouble shoot activities to ensure that duplication is prevented and best practices for all program requirements are met.

Other specific programs and the source of funding are listed below:

Program	Source of funds	Alignment to Reform Project
Title I	NDE/Fed	All efforts are aimed at increasing literacy and math ability in the school-wide model. Currently a staff member is funded to serve reading support and some additional reading and math. This would continue with even greater data available for supporting the planning and instruction needed.
Title IIa	NDE/Fed	Most federal funds are transferred to title I needs in this district. The funds that remain in this category for teacher training would be used to tie to grant activities since our primary focus will be reading and math.
Title III	NDE/Fed	Any additional resources and personnel funded by this consortium grant will be aligned with the reading/math program to increase knowledge of English and content as required by law. The focus is on pre-teaching so help these students be more successful in their classrooms work. Some use of a para/teacher in the afterschool program to support these learners in extended time will be considered with these funds to align to the district reform.
21 st Century Community Learning center	Fed	This provides before and after school care during the school year and summer school for 30 days. Currently staff do some intervention work with students using the same reading/math programs as experienced during the school day. The focus is on reinforcing and reviewing the material from that school day to increase repetitions and retention. Good communication between after school and teaching staff is required to make this successful. This would continue with the newest programs and can be refined even more. The summer school is also a partnership with the ELL program to provide both tutorial and mentorship experiences for the youth.

B.6. Governance Policies and Practices

Existing practices and policies will need to be modified to enable Minatare Elementary to implement strategies such as (1) the use of financial incentives and (2) increasing learning time through extending the contracted days and minutes in the school year. The Superintendent will work with the Board of Education to accomplish those needed changes once grant notification is received. The Board of Education has agreed in formal motion to support the SIG application activities (June 2010 board meeting minutes available upon request.) The Minatare Education Association has been contacted regarding the implications of extending the school day and/or year. Teachers and the Board of Education have agreed to negotiate payments for any extra time increase in school day or extended days.

Less formally, but perhaps even more significantly, Minatare recognizes that implementation of the proposed SIG activities will require significant changes in practices such as (1) leadership, (2) instructional techniques, (3) data processes, management and record keeping, (4) teacher and principal evaluation, and (5) parent involvement. This will require constant monitoring and support to stay on-task and meet deadlines. Changing the practices and culture of the school and community will be challenging. In larger districts, boards may need to be more flexible in their regulations to allow such changes. Our small school has tended to be very flexible in the past. Minatare welcomes the added structure and direction provided by the SIG.

B.7. Sustain intervention model when funds not available

The most important aspects of this application (i.e. student engagement, effective programs, strong teaching techniques, data usage, parent involvement, intervention system) are systems that change the culture and can be maintained when SIG funds are not longer available. Minatare Public School District plans to sustain much of the intervention model though that institutionalized change. When ESEA Section 1003(g) funds are no longer available, district general funds will used for the expense of principal salary. Title I funds will cover the expense of instructional coach and part-time reading teacher salaries. The preschool/Head Start program will be supported by federal Head Start programs and state funds for the preschool. The position of intervention progress manager will be eliminated and duties will be assumed by the principal. Curricular expenses will be become part of the general fund budget. Title IIa funds will be used for professional development expenses. Additionally, because Minatare is proposing to train its own staff in trainer of trainer models for reading, math, and intervention curricula, capacity will have been built internally and professional development expenses will decrease. Support through the Nebraska Rtl Consortium will still be available. "Ready for Anything," Minatare's proposed model of new teacher induction and mentoring will provide an institutional framework for improved teacher retention with on-site leadership. Effective data processes will become institutionalized through the implementation of a vertically designed reading program, the implementation of benchmarking and progress monitoring for math, and through continued movement toward an Rtl model. The district also plans to maintain its close association with ESU 13 and rely on the ESU's ability to provide necessary training in future years.

B.8. Establish annual goals

Minatare is committed that all students become proficient. Since we are already below the state average for “gains” we know we must exceed that state gain in order to close the gap we are experiencing. We are also committed that every child show individual growth from where they start, and make greater than one year’s growth if they are behind their peers. Through our work with the RTI Consortium, we will closely monitor students, especially in the area of reading, to find the needed core support and intervention to meet this goal.

Minatare’s overall goal is to increase the percentage of students who are proficient or higher on state assessments each year.

Area	State Goal	District Goal																									
Reading	The gains for “all students” group and for each subgroup must meet or exceed the statewide average gain (unless the statewide average is zero then the gain must be greater than zero). Progress is MET if a majority of the groups demonstrate an increase.	<p>To be established by October 2010 as per state instructions.</p> <p>Minatare’s goal is for all students to be proficient in reading. We will meet the state goal and plan to exceed the state average growth for all students and each subgroup.</p>																									
Math	The gains for “all students” group and for each subgroup must meet or exceed the statewide average gain (unless the statewide average is zero then the gain must be greater than zero). Progress is MET if a majority of the groups demonstrate an increase.	<p>See goals for each group on table below.</p> <p>Minatare’s goal is for all students to be proficient in math. We will meet the state goal and plan to exceed the state average growth for all students and each subgroup.</p>																									
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="470 1285 742 1388">Group</th> <th data-bbox="748 1285 906 1388">2008-2009 State Average Gain Math</th> <th data-bbox="906 1285 1438 1388">Minatare Math goals</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="470 1388 742 1467">All Students</td> <td data-bbox="748 1388 906 1467">1.37 State average</td> <td data-bbox="906 1388 1438 1467">1.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="470 1467 742 1547">American Indian/Alaska Native</td> <td data-bbox="748 1467 906 1547">1.80</td> <td data-bbox="906 1467 1438 1547">1.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="470 1547 742 1608">Asian or Pacific Islander</td> <td data-bbox="748 1547 906 1608">-.01</td> <td data-bbox="906 1547 1438 1608">+.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="470 1608 742 1669">White, Not Hispanic</td> <td data-bbox="748 1608 906 1669">1.26</td> <td data-bbox="906 1608 1438 1669">1.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="470 1669 742 1730">Black, Not Hispanic</td> <td data-bbox="748 1669 906 1730">3.39</td> <td data-bbox="906 1669 1438 1730">3.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="470 1730 742 1791">Hispanic</td> <td data-bbox="748 1730 906 1791">1.49</td> <td data-bbox="906 1730 1438 1791">1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="470 1791 742 1877">Students eligible for free and reduced lunch</td> <td data-bbox="748 1791 906 1877">2.03</td> <td data-bbox="906 1791 1438 1877">2.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Group	2008-2009 State Average Gain Math	Minatare Math goals	All Students	1.37 State average	1.4	American Indian/Alaska Native	1.80	1.9	Asian or Pacific Islander	-.01	+.1	White, Not Hispanic	1.26	1.3	Black, Not Hispanic	3.39	3.4	Hispanic	1.49	1.5	Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	2.03	2.1	2008-2009 State Average Gain Math	Minatare Math goals
	Group	2008-2009 State Average Gain Math	Minatare Math goals																								
	All Students	1.37 State average	1.4																								
	American Indian/Alaska Native	1.80	1.9																								
	Asian or Pacific Islander	-.01	+.1																								
	White, Not Hispanic	1.26	1.3																								
	Black, Not Hispanic	3.39	3.4																								
	Hispanic	1.49	1.5																								
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	2.03	2.1																									
All Students	1.37 State average	1.4																									
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.80	1.9																									
Asian or Pacific Islander	-.01	+.1																									
White, Not Hispanic	1.26	1.3																									
Black, Not Hispanic	3.39	3.4																									
Hispanic	1.49	1.5																									
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	2.03	2.1																									

	Special Education Students	3.12	3.2
	English Language Learners	2.33	2.4
AYP Status (includes both Reading and Math)	Fewer NOT MET AYP decisions	<p>Total NOT MET DESIGNATIONS for 2008-2009 were 3 in reading and 0 in math plus the total AYP decision of NOT MET for a total of 4 such decisions. Due to small numbers, some of the subgroups were not shown, indicating that even more areas could have been NOT MET.</p> <p>For the future, NDE has indicated a plan to combine all grades when the <i>n</i> is less than 30 for high school. This planned change in disclosure procedure for small schools could increase the number of NOT MET designations next year in spite of our efforts, and reflect including high school as well as our elementary school. In spite of the data change, Minatare will aim for <u>fewer than 4</u> such designations and will especially monitor progress on those areas those which were shown on the 2008-2009 report.</p> <p>(This is also a challenge since the 2009-2010 data report will reflect work done before the grant activities even begin. We are confident that Minatare has been concerned about data and aimed for improvement even before this application.)</p>	
Graduation rate (high schools only)	Measurable increase from the previous year	Not applicable	
College enrollment rate (high schools only)	Measurable increase from the previous year	Not applicable	
English proficiency	Increase in percentage of English Language Learners that reach Levels 4 or 5 on ELDA (if applicable)	76%	
Leading Indicators	Measurable improvement from previous year (or baseline for	We will work for improvement from these	

(student attendance, discipline incidents, truancy are areas for elem.)	initial year of grant)	baseline levels from 2008-2009. District Student attendance=94.51% (based on District State of the Schools data 2008-2009) Discipline Incidents- 0 expulsions or suspensions Truancy-Data not available at this time. (See attendance)
Teacher attendance and teacher performance	Measurable improvement from previous year (or baseline data for initial year of grant)	Baseline data from 2008-2009 We will work for improvement from these baseline levels. The major improvement by the end of the project will be development of a new evaluation system statewide that we will implement. Teacher attendance : 94.6% (district wide) Teacher performance: 100% were evaluated in 2008-2009 100% were rated “recommended for employment”

B.9. Process to develop application, staff involved and who will support implementation.

Staff at all levels have been involved in developing this application. Because of AYP status, the Nebraska Department of education had offered a “resource specialist”, Rachel La Bounty, to assist Minatare in focusing on school improvement needs. Therefore, the district had already begun to examine data and current practices and had developed a leadership team for improvement. Meetings began by February and were held at least weekly while the team formed and began to understand the issues. Superintendent/Elementary Principal, Charles Bunner, called on the support of the leadership team consisting of Kyle Metzger, High School Principal; Sherry Land, elementary reading coach; Sue Herdt, counselor; as well as the ESU staff developer , Sarah Richter. Participation did vary depending upon the topics. For example, at the March 24th meeting additional persons in attendance included LeAnn Nuss, and Diana Closson. All elementary teachers (and paras when available) were involved in this spring’s series of discussions that lead to the staff decision to implement a vertically designed reading program.

Staff Involved in On-going Decisions and Discussion Regarding Planning for Reading Improvement Spring 20010 as well as reviewing the SIG Application for Reading and Math	
Position	Name
Grade k	Lisa Quintinar
Grade 1	Janel Nuss
Grade 2	Mary Kropp
Grade 3	Kayla Reed *
Grade 4	Hope Wurdeman
Grade 5	Alisa Pittman
Grade 6	Sharon Schluterbusch
Special Education	Kathy Schnase
PE/reading	A'Lisa Mueller *
Title Reading/ Interventions	Brenda Broughton *
Counselor	Sue Herdt
Reading First Grant coach	Sherry Land
Paras	Carla Foland Barb Ross

When the PLAS designation was announced, the staff was involved in deciding to apply for the funding and to use it to meet the needs they had begun to identify. However, since the school year was nearly complete before the grant meetings were held in the state, the leadership team and ESU (ESU#13 Director of Staff Development, Penny Businga , was added) took on the writing task, utilizing as much involvement as could be gathered during the short time period.

Elementary staff also attended a half-day informational meeting on June 11, 2010. The purpose of this meeting was to review the major requirements of the SIG grant, describe how components proposed earlier by the staff had been incorporated into the activities, discuss the possible features of the reform project, seek staff input and determine level of agreement with the proposal. At that meeting, staff was positive about all proposals. They also developed the framework for the incentive pay proposal and asked that support for a systemic behavior plan be added in year three. Their additional requests were included in this final proposal. Attending staff were invited to sign a statement of commitment. All signed. (See the letter of commitment for signatures. Participants included all the certified staff listed above. The three certified staff members (* on the list above) who were on vacation were individually contacted, informed and also signed the commitment.) All staff will continue to be involved through their participation in monthly staff meetings, grade level meetings, curriculum meetings, and staff training.

It is the plan of the district to assign responsibility to the IPM, building principal, and instructional coach to lead the implementation with monitoring and direction by the superintendent. In addition to being the primary front-line for actual implementation, teachers will be asked to take on leadership roles in committees that work out final details for each activity. The assigned ESU staff developer will serve to support the implementation through organizational development of planned trainings,

participating in classroom walkthroughs, and helping the district respond to directions from the Implementation consultants and NDE as the project progresses.

The Minatare Board of Education has been kept informed about the AYP status of the school, the placement on the PLAS list and the SIG application. They unanimously voted to support the SIG application at the June, 2010, board meeting.

As described earlier, the Community Action Partnership of Western Nebraska and Head Start have joined with Minatare in planning the preschool component of the project. A local church has also offered to share facilities as a contribution to the little learners in the town. The PIRC council (parent governance advisors) had already disbanded activities for the year when the PLAS designation was made, but they will be involved in the coming school year as part of their advisory role.

PART C. DISTRICT BUDGET—

A district budget is not needed since Minatare is not requesting funds for district support.

C.1 District Activities

No district activities are proposed.

PART D. ASSURANCES

The district assures that it will—

(1) Use SIG to implement interventions within requirements

Minatare School has only one school. It is designated as a Tier I level. The district is committed to fully implementing the activities outlined in this proposal which are consistent with the requirements. This will be done at the building level. The district knows that involvement of the IPM in monthly meeting with the state department will also assist us in molding the project to fit growing knowledge of what works and state requirements. The Board of Education is as committed to the project as the staff and will keep the project on their board agendas for frequent review.

(2) Annual goals , measure progress

Minatare will establish annual goals and monitor progress on the leading indicators for Minatare elementary School (the Tier I school applicable.)

(3) Restart model accountability

Minatare is not using the restart model. Not applicable.

(4) Report to the NDE the school-level data

Minatare will report any required school level data as requested by NDE.

PART E. WAIVERS

None are applicable for Minatare.

Section 2. SCHOOL LEVEL INFORMATION

This Section 2 is for Minatare Elementary, the only school in the application.

PART A. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION SCHOOL LEVEL

The earlier information described as District Data and Needs Assessment in Part 1 should also be considered as school data since there is only one elementary school in Minatare. Some additional information is included in this section.

From the 2008 2009 profile: Minatare Elementary housed 103 students in a K-6, 1952 building. There was a staff of nine fulltime teachers and three other teachers that were shared with the secondary school. It is a school-wide Title I school. 78% of the students were on free or reduced lunches and over 44% were minority students. Coupled with the high mobility rate (35 students either moved in or left the district this year), this poses some challenges not always seen in other districts of similar size. Classroom size ranges from 10 to 20 students. A fulltime teacher funded by Title I worked both as an inclusion member of the staff and a pullout member in order to provide intervention work with needy students. A reading coach provided by the Reading First was also available for help with students and teachers

Analysis of Need

Intervention Project Manager

SIG requires the district to hire an intervention Project Manager (IPM.) Minatare will hire Mr. Chuck Bunner in this role on a part-time basis. In this role he can devote his time solely to organization, monitoring, facilitation and coordination with NDE. He recognizes the importance of coordinating the many roles, providers and the timeline to ensure the reform is viable and gets implemented with success. He will be contracted by the district to lead the effort. Mr. Bunner's expertise has been previously described in Part 1. He is an experienced superintendent who can utilize his organizational, evaluative, fiscal and facilitation skills to manage the projects while trading upon the relationship he has built in the community to enhance the project. He will meet monthly with the NDE SIG director to stay current on requirements and problem-solve for implementation issues.

A.1. Analysis of Need

Minatare is committed to annual reporting on student achievement and leading indicators.

(a) Student Achievement and Leading Indicators;

The analysis of need for student achievement includes the Profile for Minatare Elementary from the Nebraska State of the Schools Report for 2007-08 and 2008-09. The Profiles are pasted at the end of this application.

The table below shows 2008-09 data. The four required fields (#1,4,7 and 8 below) were not included on the official State of the Schools Report for Profile, but data from other sources was used.

Reporting Metrics for the School Improvement Grants

Student Achievement not captured on the Profile from the State of the Schools Report	
(1) Percentage of limited English proficient students (of all ELL students that were tested) who attained a Level 4 or 5 on the ELDA	76%
(2) Graduation rate (AYP graduation rate for high schools only)	Not applicable
(3) College enrollment rate (high schools only)	Not applicable
Leading Indicators	
(4) Number of minutes within the school year	70, 800 minutes elementary 2008-2009
(5) Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools or dual enrollment classes (high schools only)	Not applicable
(6) Dropout rate (total for high schools only)	Not applicable
(7) Student attendance rate	94.51% (district rate in 2008-2009)
(8) Discipline incidents (suspensions, expulsions as reported to NDE)	0 in elem.
(9) Truants (although this is a required Metric, districts do not need to report baseline data at this time)	
(10) Distribution of teachers by performance level on district's teacher evaluation system (will be collected in Spring 2011)	
(11) Teacher attendance rate (although this is a required Metric, districts do not need to report baseline data at this time)	

The identified areas of need for Minatare Elementary are:

- A. Enhance effectiveness of teachers and school leadership**
- B. Instructional reform in reading**
- C. Instructional reform in mathematics**
- D. Counseling support for emotional and educational liaison with family**
- E. Instructional reform and prevention through utilization of RTI model**
- F. Increase learning time and engagement/participation rates**
- G. Consistent positive behavior support system**

Each NEED is shown below with related data.

NEED A: Enhance effectiveness of school and principal leadership

Currently, Minatare provides the **role of principal** as a part time position through the job of superintendent. The board has directed to fulfill role of superintendent as first priority. Review of time shows that the superintendent has been very limited in contact time in the elementary building. This elementary building has a high-need, high at-risk population that would greatly benefit from having an on-site principal to provide instructional leadership, increase positive student behavior, and support parents

working with the educational process. Elementary School Student Surveys done in fall of 2008 showed that children rated the category of Instructional Leadership with only a 44% agreement rating. (For children this was heavily related to not seeing the principal face to face on a frequent basis due to the part-time position.)

A second need related to the principal role relates to attendance issues. Concern has arisen about the attendance of a handful of students to the point it is severely affecting their ability to learn. The teacher survey indicated a desire for the principal to assume a more aggressive role with this problem. , the leadership team determined that a major concern related to AYP designation was related to data quality. In the short-handed district, managing data integrity had been a challenge resulting in inconsistent facts and missed opportunities. The new role of principal will provide a leader assigned a role in ensuring building assessments are properly done, data is collected securely and reported accurately. The development of a quality , statewide, common evaluation system will also clarify behavior targets for staff.

Alignment to Transformation Model Requirements:

The Transformational Model requires the dismissal of the elementary principal. In this case, the former superintendent/elementary principal will retire. The building will utilize the SIG to add a fulltime elementary principal position. The model requires development of a quality evaluation system for both teachers and principal which can increase awareness of leadership capability and contributions to the district and give a clearer target to staff.

In 2009-2010, the district had a part-time reading coach provided through the reading first grant. Since the grant finished in summer of 2010, this leadership role would be lost. With the SIG funds, the reading coach role will be expanded to also include mathematics support. The new position will be called Instructional Coach. Research has shown that job-embedded staff development is most successful with the modeling, monitoring, feedback and support provided by an instructional coach. Recognition of the many tasks performed by a coach has also increased the need for this position. The reading coach has a major role in continued research, providing several levels of staff development, data analysis, record keeping and in maintaining, managing and ordering materials.

Minatare also recognizes that parents have a role in literacy. Using this comprehensive research-based vertical reading program may seem strange to parents, especially in the lower grades where some different letter formations are used in the beginning. The mastery learning approach is also new to parents who did not experience it themselves. The plan includes having the implementation specialist assist with initial parent orientations and train the coach to be able to continue that parent orientation in the future.

Alignment to Transformation Model Requirements:

The Transformational Model requires ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development aligned with the instructional program and designed with the school staff. While the initial training is effectively and efficiently offered in a focused event, the true skilled implementation depends upon an on-site trainer

able to work with staff right in the classroom while instruction is taking place. The instructional coach will meet this need.

NEED B: Instructional reform in reading

Reading in Grades K-6 is the primary area of need for Minatare Elementary. This is shown by being a “not met category “for two years in a row, resulting in being designated as an AYP school improvement issue. Analysis of Minatare data on state standards is hampered by the small school size. When a class is too small to be seen or used valid information in the report, it is not very useful to school planning. With small class sizes and high mobility, one or two special needs students can skew the results. This makes it difficult to ascertain program concerns. This is one reason; Minatare has determined the need to move to a highly structured reading program (Reading Mastery Plus curriculum program materials and training.) This will be implemented along with Response to Intervention assessment and system planning techniques. The RTI approach along with the reading program weekly data will provide another assessment measure to quickly screen students at risk of failure, provide weekly mastery checks and three times a year benchmarking . We will know if students are growing throughout the school year and have additional data to supplement the state standards attainment assessment data. Evidence of need for an improved reading program is shown below.

READING--PERCENTAGES OF “ALL” STUDENTS MEETING STATE STANDARDS			
READING PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS MEETING STATE STANDARDS	2007-2008	2008-2009	% of change
Grade 3 All students meeting	86.67%	60.00%	Down 26.67%
Grade 4 All students meeting	<i>Not available due to class size</i>	100%	<i>incomparable</i>
Grade 5 All students meeting	47.83%	<i>Not available due to class size</i>	<i>incomparable</i>
Grade 6 All students meeting	26.32%	48.15%	Up 21.83%

Being a small school, in the past our subgroups have seldom had the numbers needed to appear in the public charts. For example, in all the categories, only Grade 6 (Free/reduced Price Meals category) showed enough student participation numbers to be posted.. In that case, 2007-2008 shows only 16.67% of students meeting standards. In 2008-2009, 50% of the students in grade 6 Free/reduced category had meet standards. This was a positive gain of 33.3% —but was still not even close to the needed state average of 90.83 % success! Because of our demographics, we feel the major subgroups of concern for achievement are related to poverty, ethnicity and English language learners.

For this same time , DIBELS testing (designed to predict future success) also shows a large variance in success rates and has only 3 grade levels meeting the RTI standard of 80% of

the class at benchmark. Reading continues to be a need with variations (possibly due to small class size and high mobility) over time.

READING—DIBELS % of students at each Level			
Spring 2009 Spring 2010			
	Meeting benchmark	Strategic Need	Intensive Need
Grade K	85% 58%	0% 11%	15% 32%
Grade 1	100% 75%	0% 17%	0% 8%
Grade 2	64% 64%	21% 29%	14% 7%
Grade 3	50% 67%	29% 27%	21% 7%
Grade 4	64% 50%	14% 25%	21% 25%
Grade 5	89% 60%	0% 20%	11% 20%
Grade 6	59% 75%	14% 17%	27% 8%

Alignment to Transformation Model Requirements:

The Transformational Model requires a research-base and vertically aligned instructional program which accurately describes the Reading Mastery Plus program selected by the staff. The RM program is based upon continual use of student data (another requirement of the model). Permissible activities include periodic reviews (walkthroughs is one method our leadership teams will utilize)

NEED C. Instructional reform in math

While reading placed us on the AYP list, we also have concerns about mathematics. None of our scores are near the state average percentages which are all above 90%. We will need increased support in delivering our current program with fidelity and developing math interventions, especially Corrective Math.

MATH PERCENTAGES OF "ALL" STUDENTS MEETING STATE STANDARDS			
MATH PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS MEETING STATE STANDARDS	2007-2008	2008-2009	% of change
Grade 3 All students meeting	73.33%	76.92%	Up 3.59%
Grade 4 All students meeting	Not available due to class size	100%	incomparable
Grade 5 All students meeting	78.26%	Not available due to class size	incomparable
Grade 6 All students meeting	50%	74.07%	Up 22.07%

Alignment to Transformation Model Requirements:

The Transformational Model requires continuous data to differentiate to meet the needs of individual students. This will be addressed with the planned review of SAXON math for fidelity and with training to differentiate to support English Language Learners and poverty language deficits) It also requires a research-base and vertically

aligned instructional program which accurately describes the Saxon Math and the Corrective Math intervention selected by the staff. The Corrective Math program is based upon continual use of student data (another requirement of the model). Permissible activities include periodic reviews (walkthroughs is one method our leadership teams will utilize)

NEED D. Counseling support for emotional and educational liaison with family

Among challenges for Minatare is a lack of hard core data related to the affective issues of schooling, behavior, community involvement and parent attitudes regarding schooling. While parent surveys exist, there is no record of results. A need for a concerted effort to collect and manage meaningful data is needed.

Elementary School Student Surveys done in fall of 2008 showed that 78% of children agreed the school had a Safe and Orderly environment, and 71% agreed that there were High Expectations for success. The categories related to Opportunity to Learn were rated at 79% agreement. Items related to Home-School Relations only 68% agreed.

Assisting families who deal with the disadvantages of poverty and being English Language learners is a need in this district. The research is conclusive that poverty families do not usually have linguistic skills to help their children learn. Limited language skills are also associated with challenges in dealing with emotions and problem solving, often resulting in increased violence. Many parents themselves had limited success in school and find dealing with the educational system a daunting experience. This can be revealed as avoidance or even anger. Minatare has decent attendance rates overall, but a few students may be absent from school for a score of days each semester—resulting in learning problems. Hiring a **principal** and **increasing the counselor's time** will begin to meet this need. Together, the principal and counselor can follow-up on truant children before the day is over. They can spend more time in developing and enhancing staff use of mechanisms for family engagement, parent contacts and help the staff design parent involvement activities utilizing the 6 types of involvement recommended by the National Partnership for Parent Involvement (Joyce Epstein, Director.) The counselor can increase individual and group counseling with the goal of giving students high expectations for their future.

Alignment to Transformation Model Requirements:

The Transformational Model requires increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools. Use of a counselor (and principal) to intercede with parents to get students to school on time will have an impact on increasing actual learning time. A permissible activity is to create a school environment that meets students social and emotional and health needs, which will be supported by the additional use of counselor time.

NEED E: Instructional reform and prevention through utilization of RTI model

Minatare's special education percentage in 2008-2009 was 11.96%, lower than the state average of 15.21%. Yet, overall, students in Minatare have not reached high achievement levels. Minatare has not been able to yet reach the standard of 80% of students having success with the reading program without major interventions to the core program. Rtl has shown that if a district can reach that goal, enough resources can be available to provide

more intensive support for the 20% of the remaining students. After intensive work in our current core program without reaching the needed levels of success, we researched and decided to **change the core program** to one with greater research base and stronger vertical alignment. One goal of Response to Intervention is to prevent student failure which, in the traditional model, can result in growing loss of skills, building until enough discrepancy is seen that the child qualifies for special education whether they actually have a learning disability or not. The **RTI system** is designed to catch issues quickly, have strong **plans for interventions** that work, **follow student progress** closely to give all students the best possible opportunities for success. The Rtl model has great correlation to the selected reading program. Use of Rtl will enhance the reading project and help **establish a strong system** with attention to curriculum, instruction and assessment.

Alignment to Transformation Model Requirements:

The Transformational Model requires promoting the continuous use of student data—a cornerstone of the RTI process. It also lists implementing a school-wide “Rtl” model as a permissible activity.

NEED F: Increase learning time and engagement/participation rates

The total school minutes for Minatare Elementary in 2008-2009 was 70,800 minutes. The plan for 2010-2011 is to **increase learning time by first extending the school year two extra days** to a total of 182 teaching days. (It was 180 days) Then, each day will be extended for an **additional 20 minutes** which will result in a total of 75,200 minutes per year. This is an increase of 4,400 total minutes from the 2008-2009 data.

Based on observations by the leadership team, Minatare had another learning time issue. Recess and other breaks in the day were done on the honor system. It was very easy to allow the students to play a few extra minutes at lunch, or at recess—valuable minutes—adding up to hours-- could be lost from learning time. Purchasing a **bell system** will give the students a clean start and finish to their outdoor time. The principal will be asked to **develop tight schedules for lunch, recess, passing times and transitions and monitor how well the school adheres to valuing learning time!** **Time on task** studies will need to be conducted to provide a “small win” early in the project.

In addition, the reading program is designed to increase learning time through improving the use of that time with research instructional techniques for increased **student engagement**. This program requires a fast paced response rate from all students, brisk pacing and timely error correction. In addition the RM Implementation Specialist will be assisting the staff and reading coach to move to high levels of fidelity. Her involvement will provide another level of expertise and options to increase learning time and engagement. Student engagement is more important than merely adding minutes to the day. It is the quality use of those minutes that matters!

Finally, the district data indicates a need to increase learning time though developing a **public preschool/ pre-kindergarten** for Minatare children. In 2008-2009 Head Start could only accommodate 18 children. There are no private preschools in Minatare. Many more children need this learning experience. The planned partnership between CAPWN, Minatare school and a community church building has been described earlier. With the

storm damage providing the impetus to merge and community support for a merged program, many more children can be served in the planned preschool.

Alignment to Transformation Model Requirements:

The Transformational Model requires increasing learning time and permits expanding the school program to offer pre-kindergarten.

NEED G: Consistent positive behavior support system

Minatare Elementary chooses not to suspend or expel students, preferring to keep them in the learning environment. The state report card shows only our district wide attendance rate, which is very close to the state average. However, at the elementary level, in 2008-2009, there were 14 times children missed 10 or more days in a quarter. This actually was only 9 students. Four of these nine 4 are minority children that leave the United States in mid-winter for a significant period of time. This shows that a very small number of students were responsible for a significant number of absences. This results in serious loss in learning time for these specific students even when the majority of the students have good attendance. (Well over half of the students miss less than 2 days of school a year.) The attendance of this small group of habitually absent individuals is a major concern for the school and seriously impacts achievement data.

The Elementary School Student Surveys done in fall of 2008 showed that overall, children gave the topics Safe and Orderly environment a 78% agree rating. The sub-area of bullying had a lower rating, only 64% agreed

While Minatare has limited behavior data, teacher interviews reveal a strong concern about the need for a fresh approach to record-management, a need to have on-site record management and checks for accuracy, a new motivation system for rewarding students who have good behavior, and a consistent plan for preventing or dealing with issues.

Currently, the elementary school utilizes a reward system to help students monitor their behavior. Referred to as the "pencil program", children are given 3 "paper pencils" at the beginning of each morning. They related to each student was given 100 points—losing a pencil drops 5 points. Students who retain a certain level of points in a quarter get to go on a reward activity each quarter (bowling, skating, movie, and a park visit) and students are entered into a prize drawing at the end of the year. If they are reprimanded by a teacher or staff member for any infraction of the school rules, they lose one of those "pencils" and 5 points from their total. If a student loses all 3 in one day, then they have detention. In 2008-2009, 13 students actually lost all their points in the behavior program in one or more quarters. 42 students lost no pencils in one or more quarters. 25 students had no points left in the behavior banking system. That is ¼ of the student population with significant, repeated offenses and rule violation (based on 2008-2009 rewards program data)

Obviously, this is a complicated system that takes teacher management time and provides limited data to help plan for resolving problems. A need exists for a comprehensive positive behavior system that provides quality data at several levels of behavioral issues and has accompanying plans for how to handle the situations, how to prevent issues, and how to teach some students new social and behavioral skills so they can have success.

Behavior can seriously impact the learning environment and learning time. Minatare 's limited data and a lack of a system makes it difficult to support staff in handling situations, preventing problems and helping young learners learn to manage their own behavior. The addition of counselor time and an on-site principal can provide support for better data methods regarding school climate, discipline, classroom management, behavioral problems, and eventually development of a research-based comprehension, tiered behavioral system that can be consistently managed. The first year, the reading program will provide some behavioral reinforcements and consistency across the building. This will give the new principal time to analyze the situation and work with a behavior committee to begin the application process to the state PBiS improvement system. Staff will participate in training to increase their knowledge of the positive behavioral approach and PBiS system. By year three, the school will be ready to fully participate in the state PBiS training and system design. PBiS is state sponsored, so inclusion in their system will allow the work to continue beyond the SIG period.

Alignment to Transformation Model Requirements:

The Transformation Model is a match in that it requires the continuous use of data to inform instruction to meet the academic needs of students (which relates to being able to attend to learning, not behavior) and permits approaches to extend learning time by improving school climate and discipline such as systems of positive behavioral support related to safety, order and preventing bullying.

Review of the comparison of these areas of need to the transformation model:

As shown under each of the major categories of activities above, the Transformation Model can help Minatare Elementary School to meet the student achievement needs.

The baseline for formal, required leading indicators was outlined earlier in this application. This chart shows how our district will use all available data to review local indicators. Leading indicators and assessments to be used to monitor progress are listed on the chart below. Additional behavioral data is expected to be added in year three.

READING	MATH
DIBELS: Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills--- Screening, benchmarking: 3 times a year all K-6 students Progress monitoring: selected students bi-weekly depending on degree of need.	AIMSWEB MATH (or other tool selected before year two). Screening, benchmarking: 3 times a year all K-6 students Progress monitoring: selected students bi-weekly depending on degree of need.
Gates McGinnity Grades 2-3	Saxon Math unit mastery checks Curriculum based measures for K-6 students
WEEKLY PROGRESS CHECKS Weekly mastery checks for Reading Mastery programs Grades K-6	Corrective Math Curriculum based measures for students selected for intervention program. Grades K-6
NWEA MAPS Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NRT outcome measure) 2 times a year grades 3-6	NWEA MAPS Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NRT outcome measure) 2 times a year grades 3-6
NeSA-R -State standards outcome measure by all students and subgroups grades 3-6	NeSA-M -State standards outcome measure by all students and subgroups grades 3-6
Attendance	
Discipline Incidents	

Truancy
Distribution of Teachers by Performance Levels
Teacher Attendance Rate
Number of Minutes w/in School Year

(b) Services/Programs Profile:

To meet the needs of struggling students, Minatare Elementary has been providing several programs and services. The following descriptions also tell how current programs are to be reviewed and enhanced and align with new instructional programs.

Title I: Our school-wide model allows all efforts to be aimed at increasing literacy and mathematical skills. Currently a staff member is funded to serve in reading and math teaching and additional intervention support. This will continue with the new program providing even greater data for planning. It will not involve cost to SIG.

Title IIa: Minatare transfers most federal funds to Title I in order to keep that effective. Some of these funds are kept to allow teacher training. These funds can be aligned so that they support the objectives of the SIG projects but do not overlap. They might be used to allow additional teachers to participate in training or to support other training needs (i.e. technology tools related to literacy.)

Title III: ELL and Immigrant funds support additional resources and personnel. ELL students benefit from pre-teaching of classroom material and from extended time in the after school program. The teachers work closely to ensure that the lessons and programs are not disjointed and use the same materials sequentially. This does not involve cost to SIG.

21st Century Community Learning Center:

Before and After School Services: Minatare has a 21st Century Schools grant and provides breakfast and after-school support. Close communication will allow for daily support of the classroom through “pre-teaching” or “re-teaching” individual students directly tied to the new curriculum. This enhancement will not involve cost to SIG.

Summer School: Each summer, Minatare offers 30 days of extended learning focused on continuing the reading and mathematics instruction. Participation is based upon achievement scores and teacher recommendation. With the implementation of a stronger reading and math programs, even better data and more precise placements will be available to support these learners and help them close the gap. The enhancement related to the SIG reform will be to continue the reading and mathematics instruction for mastery with quality and fidelity based upon accurate progress monitoring records. This will not involve cost to SIG.

Counselor: While Minatare Elementary did have access to a school counselor, the time was limited because this person also taught courses at the high school. SIG will be utilized to place the counselor in the elementary building for more time each day allowing time for enhanced group and individual counseling and parent communication. *As indicated earlier, the Transformational Model requires increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools. Use of a counselor (and principal) to intercede with parents to get students to school on time will have an impact on increasing actual learning time. A permissible activity is to*

create a school environment that meets students social and emotional and health needs, which will be supported by the additional use of counselor time.

Parent and Family Engagement: for the last two years, Minatare has worked with the Parent Involvement Resource Center (PIRC) to develop a parent council and increase school community involvement. With PIRC support, a PIRC room with support materials, and computer has been created. With the SIG grant, the counselor will be freed to spend more time with the elementary school and helping parents utilize such resources. One of the duties of that position will be to have a role in assisting with the parent council, working with families on understanding student issues and achievement data, and helping teachers and principal develop family literacy/math nights. *The Transformational Model includes increasing community-oriented schools that provide mechanisms for family and community engagement as well as taking steps to eliminate bullying and supporting school climate.*

Community Partners:

Preschool: As described earlier, Minatare currently does not have a public or private preschool other than Head Start, which has faced storm loss and would be challenged to have a program next year under current conditions. Head Start is available for eligible families, but does not serve all the students of preschool age. Head Start has indicated a willingness and desire to work with Minatare Schools to create a joint preschool experience for residents.

Comparison of these areas of need to the transformation model:

s shown under each of the services above, the Transformation Model can help Minatare Elementary School to meet the student support needs since it requires parent involvement, extended learning time and stakeholder involvement which all align with the plans to enhance services.

(c)Staff Profile;

Minatare was recently involved in the Reading First initiative from 2006-2010. As part of that project, Minatare began to learn reading research, took part in annual reading institutes and implemented a researched reading program with fidelity. Participation in the project included outside reviewers who visited the school and assisted with some implementation. Data analysis showed growth over the duration of the project. However, the growth was not great enough to raise student achievement to state averages to meet AYP. Beginning in January,2010, Nebraska Department of Education provided a Resource Specialist (Rachel La Bounty) who worked with our Educational Service Unit Staff Developer (Sarah Richter) and our leadership team over a period of several months to review our processes and evidence to determine what needed to be done to resolve the achievement issues. The leadership team and staff found several issues related to staff.

One issue relating to staff was that **data integrity** was found to be a major concern. Training and support for data development and data entry and developing tight procedures for managing the data were needed. Staff needed to be more consistent in procedures, timelines for testing, recording and submitting scores. Especially needed is an increased commitment to **utilizing data on a frequent basis to assist students**. The new reading program will also provide strong mastery level individual student data **analysis weekly** in addition to monitoring students to national benchmarks. Attention to supporting staff and administration in data

quality issues will be a key component of the plan. *The Transformation Model requires promoting the continuous use of student data, showing a good fit with our needs.*

As a small district with around 20 students in each grade level, a Minatare staffing challenge related to reading achievement is having only one teacher per grade level. This makes it difficult to provide the required number of reading sections to match students to appropriate reading level. Using the Transformation Intervention Model, we will train and assign all available staff to assist with reading groups during the reading time (i.e. physical education, Title, Special Education.) Since we have tried a different reading program with a high degree of fidelity, but did not reach high achievement, we know that it is essential that each student be placed in an appropriate reading group and closely monitored. This will require some staffing modifications and reassignments. SIG will allow the hiring of a part time reading support person, increase counselor time in the elementary school and hire the instructional coach. It will also ensure that the paras, substitute teachers, and all staff are trained to deliver the program with quality. *The Transformation Model requires promoting the continuous use of student data, rewarding staff who implement the model and increase student success, provide quality job-embedded staff development and implementation support, conduct periodic reviews for quality and provide operational flexibility.*

The third staffing issue in Minatare is somewhat frequent staff turnover and inexperienced teachers. The current range of experience is extreme with the average years of experience being 11.69, but the median years of experience is only 5. Through the Transformation Model, teachers will be provided the opportunity to receive college credit while learning and implementing the new programs. The goal of the district is to emphasize that teachers are being provided a unique opportunity to increase their professional skills, and high performers will be rewarded with additional leadership/training opportunities. This incentive should impact staff retention. The plan will address development of a teacher induction program and mentor should new staff be added. Substitute teachers will also be included in training to ensure that programs can continue to be provided with fidelity even if the highly trained classroom teacher has to be absent. Including substitute teachers also provides another layer of depth of expertise in the community and increased community awareness of the initiatives to transform student achievement. *The Transformation Model requires quality staff development. The project will use leadership training opportunities as one form of rewarding staff that implement the model and increase student success.*

Teacher	Role	Years of experience as of 2009-2010	Education attained	Related Professional Development Provided---	Date of most recent formal evaluation
Lisa Quintinar	K	2	BS	Reading First Institute	2010
Janel Nuss	1	36	BS+36		2009
Mary Kropp	2	7	BA		2009
Kayla Reed	3	3	BS+9		2009
Hope Wurdeman	4	1	BS		2010
Alisa Pittman	5	3	BS		2010
Sharon Schluterbush	6	5	BS+9		2009

Kathy Schnase	Sped	33	BS+36		2009
A'Lisa Mueller	PE/rdg	1	BA		2010
Brenda Broughton	Rdg/Math Interventions	18	BS+36		2009
Carla Foland	Reading	22	MA		To be hired part-time
Sherry Land	Instructional coach	20	BS+36	Reading First Institute and coaching support group	2009
Sue Herdt	Counselor	17	MA+9		2009

The current **teacher evaluation system** is extremely dated. It provides feedback, but only a single final rating of recommended to continue employment or not. The district had not revised the system knowing that statewide efforts in response to federal mandates were eminent. All teachers on staff in 2008-2009 received formal evaluations. In 2009-2010 new staff and those eligible for tenure were evaluated. Currently, 100 % of the teachers were recommended for continued employment. The evaluation system does not currently include **student achievement measures**. This is a district need. The Nebraska Department of Education has told us to follow their leadership in resolving this issue. First, the plan is to utilize the current evaluation system during 2010-2011 with the addition of a component related to student achievement. NDE has hired a vendor who will come to each grant awarded district to develop this component. This will be developed immediately after receiving notification of the grant award. Minatare will plan to have the leadership team and teacher representatives ready to work on this project in August so that it can be utilized throughout the 2010-2011 school year. The addition of the full-time on-site principal will also provide the manpower to do these more comprehensive evaluations that should include supporting teachers with quality feedback, modeling, practice sessions and problem-solving throughout the year to assist them as they grow to meet the new expectations. *The Transformation Model requires a principal and teacher evaluation system that includes a component related to student achievement.*

Comparison of these areas of need to the transformational model:

As shown under each of the staff issues above, the Transformation Model can help Minatare Elementary School to meet staff support needs and increase the quality of staff since it requires enhanced leadership effectiveness, quality professional development, incentives, and support for research-based instructional programs.

(d) Curriculum/Instructional Practices Profile;

Reading

As earlier described, Minatare was involved in the Reading First initiative. Evidence indicated a need to move to a more intense, truly vertically designed reading program, Minatare chose the **Direct Instruction Reading Mastery Plus program** with associated writing components and remediation interventions for struggling students. The new reading program has already been aligned to the new Nebraska State reading standards. That alignment has been reviewed and validated by several other regional districts that already use the Reading Mastery program. The consensus of these districts is that the skills are covered by the RM program. However, the NeSA-R test uses specific terminology that is not always reinforced in

the program. Minatare teachers are aware that they will need to do an additional standards review to ensure that they include the specific terminology in their RM lessons. The formal standards alignment document is on file and is available upon request. *The Transformation Model is a match in that it requires vertically aligned as well as curriculum aligned with state standards.*

The program also requires **specific training and support** to reach a high level of quality implementation. This is to be accomplished through participation in institutes, use of the coach and implementation specialists, and developing local trainers. For several months, Minatare teachers have been reviewing the RM program and the direct instruction teaching techniques. They are scheduled to receive grade level specific training and guided practice beginning this summer (July 2010) on the program and the new skills for signaling, pacing, error correction, program delivery and data analysis. Since the program is clearly scripted and vertically designed, the grade specific teacher training will allow for teachers to have adequate time to study their own part of the program while knowing that they will be consistent across all grades. Once they have initial training, the implementation specialist and instructional coach will provide on-going support, practice and feedback. *The Transformation Model is a match because it requires high-quality staff development.*

The Assessment Plan includes several processes. First, Minatare will use **the Response to Intervention process** working with the state RTI Consortium to provide support and access to research and best practice. For reading, DIBELS will be used as the **universal screener** and for midwinter and spring benchmarking. DIBELS also provides **progress monitoring** for struggling students so that staff can see if their efforts are having result in time to make needed adaptations for the learner. The RM program has strong **placement exams** and **weekly mastery checks**. The project will hire expert RM **implementation support**. Using telephone conference calls, the specialist and the instructional coach will review the weekly assessments to determine any needed changes in grouping or pacing or teaching changes to ensure student progress. In addition to the on-going formal formative assessment, the reading coach will also be working with teachers to enhance their skills in recognizing errors "in the moment" of teaching and employing proper error correction procedures. **Summative assessment** for AYP occurs through the state test, NESAR, administered in the spring. A practice test is done in mid-winter. Minatare is also involved in the NWEA MAPS test system which serves as the state required norm-referenced test. The MAPS is given in fall and spring because it provides evidence of growth and fall testing allows for students to **set goals** and teachers to see the skill level of their students. (The NWEA MAPS is unique since it not only provides norm referenced grade information, all students are tested at their ability level so the scores give valid information on higher and lower performing students. This gives even more specific **information for differentiation** and to determine if all students have shown growth necessary to begin to close any achievement gap.) These assessments also allow for **multiple measures** for determining student achievement which will be used in the **incentive pay** program for teachers. *The Transformation Model is a match in that it requires the continuous use of student data, permits implementing a school-wide Rtl model and focuses upon the result of student achievement as shown by incentives.*

Math

Mathematics is the second instructional area of concern. Minatare will follow a plan similar to that of reading to enhance our achievement. Current evidence shows that Minatare lags in

math achievement, but not as severely as in reading. Staff discussion indicates that there is a range of implementation to the Saxon Math program and a need to differentiate for our high-poverty and ELL populations. (The Saxon math program is somewhat vertically designed and has already been aligned to state standards.) The first year in math will then be spent checking for fidelity and monitoring student success. If that needs assessment indicates, pacing support will be outlined and students will be selected for math interventions. A research-based, vertically designed intervention program, Corrective Math, has been selected for that phase. The formal standards alignment document for Saxon Math is on file and is available upon request. *The Transformation Model is a match in that it requires research-based, vertically aligned curriculum that is also aligned with state standards.*

At the beginning of the first year of the project, teachers will participate in math training (July 2010) to develop appropriate differentiation techniques within Saxon math fidelity. Once they have initial training, the instructional coach will provide on-going support. In year two, an implementation specialist for math will be hired for 5 days over time to provide some support for Corrective Math. The instructional coach will also seek opportunities for advanced coaching skills in math. *The Transformation Model is a match because it requires high-quality staff development.*

The Math Assessment Plan includes several processes. First, Minatare will use the Response to Intervention process working with the state RTI Consortium to provide support and access to research and best practice. For math a tool for universal screening and progress monitoring will be researched and selected. (For the purpose of the application, an assumption of use of AIMSWEB math was made, but with a year of research an alternate may be developed.) The Saxon Math and Corrective Math intervention have strong placement and weekly monitoring tools. The project will hire expert, short term implementation support for mathematics. In addition to the on-going formal formative assessment, the instructional coach will also be working with teachers to enhance their skills in recognizing errors "in the moment" of teaching and employing proper error correction procedures. Summative assessment for AYP occurs through the state test, NES-A-M, administered in the spring. A practice test is done in mid-winter. Minatare is also involved in the NWEA MAPS test system which serves as the state required norm-referenced test. The MAPS is given in fall and spring because it provides evidence of growth and fall testing allows for students to set goals and teachers to see the skill level of their students. (The NWEA MAPS is unique since it not only provides norm referenced grade information, all students are tested at their ability level so the scores give valid information on higher and lower performing students. This gives even more specific information for differentiation and to determine if all students have shown growth necessary to begin to close any achievement gap.) *The Transformation Model is a match in that it requires the continuous use of student data, permits implementing a school-wide RtI model and focuses upon the result of student achievement as shown by incentives.*

A summary of the comparison of these areas of need to the transformational model:

As shown under each of the curriculum/instructional practices above, the Transformation Model can help Minatare Elementary School to meet curricular needs and increase student achievement since it requires researched based programs, quality staff development for implementation, continuous use of data, and suggests conducting periodic reviews.

(e) System Profile:

Minatare has already found several areas in which systems can be enhanced in the building through participation in the SIG program.

First, the biggest area of need relates to having a clean, consistent system for data development, management and analysis. Enhancing the leadership roles in the system will provide time and expertise to increase the quality and timeliness of data for review. Involvement in Rtl and implementation support will develop the local skills and capacity and practice over time to use the data with great skill and develop decision rules appropriate to the Minatare clientele. *The Transformation Model is a match because of the requirement for continuous use of student data and permitting the implementation of a school-wide Rtl model.*

On March 5, 2009, the external CIP reviewed the Minatare continuous improvement plan . Among their recommendations was to continue the leadership team, data retreats, and to regularly review action plans. The main goal reported to the CIP External review team was to “ Improve reading in the content areas by emphasizing vocabulary skills (increases comprehension.)”. Secondary goals listed were: “improve math in the content area by computation, integers and percentiles.” “Improve rigor in all academic areas by increasing student engagement with high level activities/questions.”

It has been difficult for Minatare staff to keep Title I school wide plans, AYP Improvement Plans and state accreditation continuous School Improvement Plans consistent and focused. A review of documents revealed that the themes of reading comprehension, math and behavior/motivation/engagement are consistent, but the exact wording and planning varies. Minatare needs to have one common plan to which all the support plans are directly related.

This application provides a comprehensive action plan that addresses the goals of reading and math K-6 and provides opportunities for leadership team continuation and data analysis to a much greater degree than in the past. This plan (or alignment to this plan) will also be included in any future state required AYP School Improvement or Title I School-wide Plans. We know the importance of focus and feel the implementation of these outlined activities is a very ambitious improvement plan for the next three years. These activities directly relate to Title I School wide and AYP improvement requirements. *The Transformation Model is a match because it has provided an extensive action planning process and incentive funding to get the job done well.*

Third , Minatare will enhance their efforts of meeting Rule 10 through the activities outlined in this application. Increased principal leadership, counselor support, increased learning time all relate to meeting and exceeding minimum requirements for Rule 10. *The Transformation Model is a match because it requires increased learning time and leadership as well as other indicators of a quality school system.*

Fourth, improving our teacher and principal evaluation system through involvement with the state common project is needed in order to better determine staff professional development needs and to give quality feedback to staff. *The Transformation Model is a match because it requires attention to the evaluation systems, including development of a student achievement aspect of that system and possible incentives for performance that results in higher achievement.*

Finally, as another aspect of teacher and leader effectiveness, Minatare needs a **teacher induction system**. Nationally, a third of beginning teachers quit within their first three years on the job. If teachers can be retained, district resources are better used. Since Minatare often has new teachers, it is essential to give them adequate support. Minatare also currently has several experienced teachers who could elect to retire. Rather than leave a hole, a system must be developed so that their retirement results in leaving a legacy! In the past, if any new staff induction was attempted, it followed a model of assigning another teacher as one-on-one mentor. Recent research(Wong) on the new generation of teachers suggest that collaborative support is preferred and more effective than the old mentor model. The need for an improved induction system is apparent. *The Transformation Model is a match because it requires strategies designed to recruit and retain staff to meet the needs of students in a transformational school.*

(f) Stakeholders involved and the process used.

Minatare has recently completed an accreditation school improvement process cycle and hosted an external team in 2009. The school profile developed at that time has been updated since the school has been involved in self-examination since January 2010 as part of the response to AYP and the required Improvement Plan. Working with Rachel La Bounty, NDE resource specialist; Sarah Richter, ESU staff developer; Chuck Bunner Superintendent; Kyle Metzger, secondary principal ; and Sherry Land, reading coach, a **leadership team** was formed who began to recognize their responsibility to the district progress in achievement and a need for consistency and records management planning. The **Reading First technical support team** of Lynette Block and Jeannette Jackson also met with the team and shared their insights into district culture, data, and instructional needs. The Reading first expertise also helped outline options. The process used was facilitated discussion followed by individual assignments for research and data collection then shared data analysis and decision-making. In between sessions, the reading coach met with **classroom teachers** to seek information and share what had been discussed. Teachers were involved in the final decision to move to the reading Mastery program. Once the district received the PLAS designation, staff was convened to share the options and a decision to proceed to apply was made. A **formal staff meeting** was held on June 11, 2010 to allow for input and to refine the components of the application. In addition, the superintendent has met with **community members** regarding the need for a preschool and with directors of the **Head Start/Panhandle Community Services/Community Action** program to plan for a merged program to enhance and increase preschool opportunities in the community.

The **Transformation Intervention Model** really was the **only feasible option** since the timing of the announcement fell after the legal deadline for dismissing teachers. The requirements and permissible activities in this model were a good fit with the projects Minatare had been discussing for implementation. A few highlights from that model showing the appropriateness of fit have been described in each previous section and next. Minatare has a shared superintendent/principal position. This limits the time available for focusing on the elementary school with its high at-risk population. Since the superintendent was retiring this spring, Minatare was ready to plan a new system to meet this need. Minatare has been involved in recent awareness sessions to explore new teacher/principal evaluation system since the state has indicated a plan for a common state evaluation system. Minatare welcomes the opportunity to serve as a pilot for a new system. In regards to quality, job-embedded professional development, Minatare was already investigating the scientifically research based direct

instruction reading model which requires intensive teacher support at the classroom level. We have applied to be included in the state RTI Consortium team training for 2010-2011 to ensure that our efforts are systematic and are a comprehensive reform. Between our reading program and the RTI system, the quality assessment program can be put in place. In year two, we can use those skills to enhance the mathematics program. Minatare has an ELL population, often second or third generation students who also face poverty and lack of opportunity to develop background knowledge. The Transformation Model allows us to also focus on how to best serve this population. Minatare recognizes that being a small school has allowed a great deal of flexibility, but in some cases that led to "time drift." The model suggests increasing learning time. The programs selected focus on time on task, pacing, student engagement and responses per minute to get the most out of the available learning time. Minatare is committed to increase the school day and tighten the schedule. As a final example, Minatare is excited about the possibility of developing programming for pre-kindergarten to begin to address prevention through increased learning time.

In short, Minatare has been exploring the new reform movements and sees a strong match of need to new practices. The Transformation Model will provide the direction and imperatives to get the initiatives implemented to lead to student success.

A.2. Action Plans

Transformation Intervention Model - 1	
Requirement (1A): Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness (A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model	
Activity 1A	Develop a full-time principal position Previously in Minatare School District, the superintendent assumed the role of elementary principal. While this was considered a dual duty, the board instructed the superintendent to conduct all superintendent business before undertaking the duties of elementary principal. The previous superintendent will leave the position June 30, 2010. Leadership has been identified as a key component in raising student achievement. An informal exit survey of elementary teachers indicated a need for more direct building level leadership support. The teachers recommended having a full-time principal. The addition of a full-time principal to Minatare Elementary would provide the cohesive focus required to raise student achievement.
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current principal/superintendent resigns, effective June 30, 2010. 2. Begin advertising for possible principal position, June, 2010 3. SIG approval, July 8, 2010 4. Revise job description, establish interview questions 5. Review applicants, conduct interviews 6. Hire principal 7. Encourage principal to participate in summer reading institutes in July. 8. Principal begin duties approximately August 2, 2010
Start Date	August 2, 2010 (Some steps have to be accomplished before position begins -see above)
Full implementation date	August , 2013
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent
Monitor and evaluate	<p>-Check progress on hiring process</p> <p>-Conduct frequent leadership meetings to enhance communication and awareness of progress of building on activities.</p> <p>-Require principal to submit evidence and artifacts showing attention to components of revised principal evaluation tool and eventually the state evaluation tool.</p> <p>-Conduct formal evaluation conferences, with feedback and any improvement plans.</p> <p>(See Principal PD under the PD section_</p>

Cost for three years	\$310,270.00
Activity 1B	Develop part-time Intervention Project Manager position This position is a SIG requirement. Hiring the current superintendent will allow a continuation of the proposal development with implementation since the timeline for project start-up is so fast.
1. Key steps	SIG approval, July 8, 2010 1. Develop job description and initial plan for time in the district. 2. Develop contract. 3. Meet with leadership team to clarify roles and assignments. 4. IPM begins duties approximately August 2, 2010 5. Ensure that needed materials are ordered and registrations completed for July/August. 6. Create timeline of priorities for first quarter 7. Participate in leadership meetings and NDE monthly meetings in addition to managing project.
Start Date	August 2, 2010 July 8, 2010 (Some steps have to be accomplished before position begins -see above)
Full implementation date	August, 2013
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent
Monitor and evaluate	-Meet with IPM to verify timelines -Request frequent updates and evidence of accomplishments to be shared at leadership team meetings. -Conduct formal evaluation conferences, with feedback and any improvement plans.
Cost for three years	\$198,020.00

Transformation Intervention Model - 2

Requirement (1B): Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness
 (B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--
 (1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; and
 (2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement

Activity 2

Design principal and teacher evaluation systems Including a component related to student achievement.
 The current Minatare evaluation system is very outdated and does not currently include student achievement measures. The Nebraska Department of Education has told us to follow their leadership in resolving this issue. First, the plan is to utilize the current evaluation system during 2010-2011 with the addition of a component related to student achievement. NDE has hired a vendor who will come to each grant awarded district to develop this component. This will be developed immediately after receiving notification of the grant award. Minatare will plan to have the leadership team and teacher representatives ready to work on this project in August so that it can be utilized throughout the 2010-2011 school year. The addition of the full-time on-site principal will also provide the manpower to do these more comprehensive evaluations that should include supporting teachers with quality feedback, modeling, practice sessions and problem-solving throughout the year to assist them as they grow to meet the new expectations. Identification of teachers who are in need of a plan of assistance will take place through the new and improved evaluation system and the use of a full time principal who will be able to more closely monitor and evaluate the situation. Teachers who have failed to improve after ample opportunity to do so will be removed.

Key steps

1. Superintendent reviews the current evaluation systems for both principal and teachers.
2. Contact NDE to set date for NDE selected vendor to work with district on the achievement component.
3. Conduct planning/design session with vendor, leadership team, representative teachers. Invite participation from PIRC Council.
4. Conduct training session with principals to ensure they are competent to administer the revised instrument.
5. Conduct awareness session with staff so they are prepared for the evaluation system.
6. Ensure that staff is supported to analyze formative assessment results and to reflect on student needs for instructional change throughout school year.
7. Conduct evaluations (formal and informally) throughout the school year so that all staff is evaluated. Deadline by mid-March.
8. Gather student achievement data (multiple assessments when possible.)
9. Apply pre-determined rules for final evaluation decision and for earning

	<p>incentive pay for achievement results/professional performance.</p> <p>10. Submit required staff evaluation data to NDE.</p> <p>11. Revise evaluation system as required based on newly developed state plans and tools. Expect some required travel for training and development.</p> <p>12. Counsel with staff not meeting evaluation requirements, develop improvement plans and or terminate employment.</p>
Start Date	August 2, 2010
Full implementation date	July 2013
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent
Monitor and evaluate	<p>-Presence of revised instrument.</p> <p>-Leadership team reports and problem-solving on progress and challenges.</p> <p>-Presence of completed evaluations by superintendent on principals and by principals on teachers.</p>
Cost for three years	\$7,644.00

Transformation Intervention Model - 3	
<p>Requirement (1C): Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness (C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so</p>	
Activity 3.A	<p>School-wide incentive for increased achievement.</p> <p>The district will develop a system of identification and reward based on McREL/Goddard’s collective efficacy research. When teachers believe that through collaboration a difference can be made, student achievement raises. The Guiding Principles for Teacher Incentive Fund Grants released in May 2010 states, “...it is best to start with school-wide plans as they foster collaboration.” The plan is to set aside funds contingent on meeting the annual goals each year. Receiving funds depends on the school average exceeding the state average (meeting the goal) AND a degree of individual accountability. IF the goals are met and each individual has evidence that outlined individual accountability criteria are met, then all eligible staff will share equally in the available incentive funds. The incentive committee will determine details related to individual criteria (i.e. average of one year’s growth, as shown in DIBELS, Ne-SA/STARS, NWEA, English language learners reaching proficiency, and/or other elements of effective teaching such as meeting all data and record-keeping deadlines, completing lesson progress charts, efficiency time studies, and attendance.)</p>
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish Incentive Committee including administrators, representative teachers, and invite board and parent representation. 2. Clarify the group and individual criteria for inclusion in the incentive funding. 3. Provide staff with written and oral explanation of the incentives. 4. Offer to clarify individual accountability requirements at staff meetings as new skills result in criteria being revealed. 5. Provide instructional coach to support teachers through the change. 6. Collect evidence of individual accountability requirements. Use these same artifacts as part of teacher evaluation system so as not to overburden staff. 7. Conduct mid-year benchmark/ progress review mini-data retreat and plan for needed steps to be on track to meet goal. 8. Collect summative data, analyze multiple measures and determine if collective goal and individual accountability was met. 9. Announce results and award earned incentive funds by July paycheck. 10. Evaluate the process and refine for rear two. 11. Modify to fit requirements following adoption of state evaluation system.
Start Date	August 2, 2010
Full implementation date	July 2013

Person(s) responsible	Principal
Monitor and evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Existence of committee -Document outlining the plan and criteria -Evidence of mid-year data review session -Evidence for individual accountability criteria -Requests for payment -Existence of plan for improvement.
Cost for three years	\$83,520.00
Activity 3B	<p>Incentives for instructional excellence and career growth</p> <p>Due to the small size of Minatare Elementary, promotions such as grade level leaders and department chairs are not available. Career growth through quality professional development leading to certification as a local/regional/national trainer will be our focus. As an additional incentive to reach for excellence in teaching performance, the project will seek to select an educator each year to attend the National Conference for Direct Instruction to receive advanced training and receive certification as a trainer. (Because the educational attainment of staff has not been high, this will both increase staff skills and also develop long-term capacity to deliver future training for ourselves and the region.) While it does mean more work for the teacher both during the summer and in the future, it can also be exciting to travel and network with teachers across the nation. The person is recognized for their skills by teachers outside the district and is eligible to give trainings in the region. ESU 313 will assist these new trainers in developing such trainings. The criteria will be related to the degree of quality of implementation in the classroom based on administrator and instructional coach reviews and resulting student achievement based on growth from the starting point. The first such opportunity to develop a trainer at the conference will be sometime around July 25th, 2011. This person will be accompanied by the instructional coach and an ESU staff developer who will be trained in additional programs to be able to increase local capacity at home.</p>
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work with staff while in training to clearly outline expectations for implementation of instructional methodology and record keeping. 2. Develop walkthrough/coaching visit checklists and record keeping methods 3. Describe project to staff. 4. Coach and monitor staff throughout the year, ensuring that quality feedback and practice sessions are provided. 5. Review records of implementation and student achievement and select staff for first training. Celebrate excellence. 6. Register and make travel arrangements 7. Attend certification conference sessions and plan for sharing any information and “roll-out” to the rest of the staff. 8. Make long-term plans for training in this program area. 9. Review steps and adjust for years 2 and 3 of the project. Project can

	extend to mathematics as well.
Start Date	August 2, 2010
Full implementation date	August , 2013
Person(s) responsible	Principal
Monitor and evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Use of “non-negotiable” teaching behaviors/expectations developed at the program training. -Use of walk-through information from principal and coach. -Leadership team review of information and student achievement records -Follow-up review the following year to review how each person’s new skills were used in the district and in the region.
Cost for three years	\$23,139.00

Transformation Intervention Model - 4

Requirement (1D): Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness
 (D) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies

<p>Activity 4A</p>	<p>Reading Literacy professional development that meet quality criteria</p> <p>Working with the Reading Mastery program gives Minatare access to staff development planning that has been well established for all the stages of results-based staff development. A few nearby schools have implemented this program earlier, lending their knowledge of needed training and support. Initial training, on-going implementation support, and advanced skills training have been planned within a framework of continuous data analysis both for student achievement and teacher implementation of the program.</p>
---------------------------	--

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| <p>Key steps</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading Institute at ESU 13, July 26-28, 2010, Summer s2011, 2012 and 2013 for teachers, coach, principal, substitute teachers, and paras.) 2. DIBELS Training with Dynamic Measurement Group, August 2-3, 2010. (Instructional coach, special education teacher, principal) 3. Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading on-site implementation training, monitoring, support , weekly progress check by Deborah Loschiavo . 8 days plus weekly conference calls in 2010-11, 6 days plus weekly conference calls in 2011-12, 4 days plus weekly conference calls in 2012-2013. (conference calls are budgeted with data requirement) 4. Instructional Coach providing daily walkthrough and classroom support, monthly practice sessions on identified skills, individual coaching with staff on daily basis. Coach position had been dropped at end of reading first, so will be part of SIG proposal. (60% reading, 40% math) Position is responsible for Professional development- Groupings: veteran teachers, new teachers, teachers on improvement plans, subs, paras Settings: whole staff, small focus groups, individuals Content: Core, interventions, classroom management Development Steps: Knowledge, model/demonstrate, low risk feedback, follow-up, long term maintenance; Data-assess, enter, analysis, report; Teach intervention groups; Materials- ordering, distribute, process, store, prepare benchmarking and progress monitoring materials, prepare supplemental and intervention materials 5. Instructional Coach Training through ESU 13 Coaching Cadre’s series of training sessions (4 sessions each year beginning with Principals and Instructional Coaches Partnership for Success on September 14. Additional dates in year one are Nov. 9, Jan. 18, and March 8)) for duration of grant. 6. Taking Action on Adolescent Literacy (October 19, 2010 and Feb. 21, |
|------------------|--|

	<p>2011) with Judith L. Irvin, National Literacy Project. (Teachers in Grades 5-6 and principal)</p> <p>7. Response to Intervention Universal team Training, (October 28, 2010, Nov. 8, Jan. 27 and March 14 in year 1) Similar dates in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. (RTI Team: principal, special education, instructional coach, title/teacher representative)</p> <p>8. National Conference for Direct Instruction Training for Trainers in Oregon July 23-28,2011 and following summer s, 2012 and 2013 (Teacher selected for instructional excellence, instructional coach, ESU staff developer)</p> <p>9. Coaching Project Institute conference with Dr. Jim Knight, university of Kansas, Summer 2011 for Instructional Coach and ESU Staff Developer</p> <p>10. Additional literacy support training will be developed for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 based on data to meet specific needs evidenced by staff and student achievement. At this time the expectation is that these would relate to increasing skills in differentiation and specific interventions for unique subgroups of students (i.e. Spoken English to support ELL, REWARDS for intermediate students, or supporting literacy in the content areas.)</p> <p>11. On-going data review, progress monitoring, feedback and conversations as part of teacher evaluation process.</p>
Start Date	July 26, 2010
Full implementation date	July, 2013
Person(s) responsible	Instructional coach and Intervention Project Manager
Monitor and evaluate	<p>Registration and attendance records</p> <p>Interviews on quality and practicality of training sessions</p> <p>Coach and Principal observations of implementation and subsequent support of staff to implement the skills learned in the trainings.</p>
Cost for three years	\$204,646.00
Activity 4B	<p>Math professional development that meet quality requirements</p> <p>During fall of the first year, staff will have an opportunity to review Saxon math with an emphasis on language support and differentiation. During the first year, the leadership team will collect evidence of implementation fidelity and teacher skills with the program as well as student data. In the second year of the project, screening and progress monitoring in the math aspects of the RTI system and a strong intervention, Corrective Math, will be introduced. Following the successful use of an instructional coach and lead teachers to support the program will be a key component of on-going staff development.</p>
Key steps	<p><i>Some training from literacy section will have direct implications and transfer to the math efforts (i.e. RTI team series and the Coaching Cadre session), but that training is not repeated here.</i></p> <p>1. Saxon Math Strategies for English Language Learners, August 4, 2010. (Teachers, principal, instructional coach)</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Instructional Coach providing daily walkthrough and classroom support, monthly practice sessions on identified skills, individual coaching with staff on frequent basis. No math Coach position had ever existed.. will be added to reading for a full time position 60% reading, 40% math) 3. Meeting the Needs of Mathematically Gifted Students, Sept 27, 2010 (teachers grades 5-6 and principal) 4. Leadership team analysis of Saxon fidelity of instruction challenges and of needs of students needing assistance (late fall 2010) 5. Discussions with teachers on pacing, use of curriculum provided assessments, review of alignment to state standards. (Mid-winter 2011) 6. Saxon Math Train the Trainers, Summer 2011 (Instructional coach, selected teacher and ESU staff developer) 7. On-going support from on-staff Saxon trainers to rest of staff through mini-sessions throughout 2011-2012 school year. 8. Corrective Math intervention --on-site training to staff delivering this intervention, monitoring, and implementation support by Georgene Haire. 5 days over 2 school years. (i.e. August 2011, October 2011, January 2012, Aug 2012 Oct. 2012) 9. AIMSWEBpro complete training (or other selected screener/ progress monitoring tool for mathematics) Summer/Fall 2011 (Instructional coach, special education teacher, principal) 10. Implementation of math screening 3 times a year and progress monitoring of selected students with math assessment team (principal, instructional coach, lead teacher) 11. On-going data review, progress monitoring and conversations as part of teacher evaluation process.
Start Date	August 4, 2010
Full implementation date	Math professional development will begin in the summer of 2011 and peak during 2011-2012 and conclude during the 2012-13 school year.
Person(s) responsible	Intervention Project Manager
Monitor and evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Attendance records -Evaluations of trainings -Classroom walk-through information on implementation -Feedback on implementation efforts through staff evaluation process
Cost for three years	\$110, 924.00
Activity 4C	<p>Administrative School Leaders Effectiveness and Evaluation Skills professional development that meet quality requirements</p> <p>In order to support this comprehensive change reform, the building principal will also need support and professional development. The principal will be included in much of the reading, math and behavioral support training and in some session with the instruction coach. (Those costs are included in previous sections of this application) But, the principal will need additional leadership and administrative</p>

	<p>skills support. In addition to obvious training needs (i.e. development and use of the state evaluation system), Minatare can anticipate a need for specific additional skills related to the Principal's own background when hired. Minatare will ask Principal to show that such requested trainings can be supported with the levels of results-based DP (awareness through follow-up).</p>
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include principal in most teacher and coach trainings, requesting specific time for presenters to meet with principal to discuss specific administrative components of the training and implementation. (begin July, 2010) 2. Teacher Evaluation System training. Take part in any support offered by NDE for their new state-de system as it is developed. 3. Analyzing principal's own needs, select specific administrative support training from that which is regional available. (i.e. support with interpreting specific assessments, time management, supervision of difficult people)
	July 2010
Full implementation date	July 2013
Person(s) responsible	Principal
Monitor and evaluate	<p>-Participation records</p> <p>-Personal goals</p>
Cost for three years	\$6,000.00
<p>Professional Development for Teacher Induction Activity, Response to Intervention Activity, Early Childhood Activity , Positive Behavior Support Activity and Counselor Activity are included within their separate sections. Every effort will be made to ensure that such professional development is planned to fit within a results-based plan (awareness through follow-up support.)</p>	

Transformation Intervention Model - 5	
<p>Requirement (1E): Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness (E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school</p>	
Activity 5A	<p>This requirement is also met by the previously described activities in Section 3:</p> <p>Activity 3A School –Wide Incentives addresses financial incentives for increasing achievement and teaching excellence</p> <p>Activity 3B Incentives for Instructional Excellence and Career Growth addresses career growth through becoming a trainer and recognition of teaching excellence</p> <p>Create a system for teacher induction and mentoring</p> <p>Minatare will utilize the <i>Ready for Anything: Supporting New Teachers for Success</i> site-based seminar model as a basis for developing a more formal induction system. This model already provides a systematic series of mini-seminars on essential aspects of schooling. It can be easily personalized for the Minatare system. Since Minatare is starting new programs and systems, this is an ideal time to use the SIG processes to develop the needed support materials and mini-sessions for future induction sessions on each aspect of learning such as the instructional strategies and lesson delivery, expectations for reporting, classroom management, assessment systems, even stress reduction! Integration with the INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) Standards provides the framework for what new teachers need to know and be able to do. In addition, strategies and activities, for the building principal, which support and motivate new teachers, are included. The Ready for Anything model will provide Minatare an approachable framework to begin to develop a quality system. Since classroom personnel the first fall are acquainted with the system and will be part of the change process, the emphasis will be on developing materials, recoding needed information to use in the future years and developing teacher facilitators to lead the process.</p>
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine Teacher Induction Committee (Principal, instructional coach, selected teacher facilitators) 2. Ready for Anything facilitator training September 27, 2010. 3. Outline an action plan for development of needed district policies and practices for each seminar (winter 2011) 4. As developed, present the Minatare “personalizations” to the basic seminar outlines to staff to seek input on what would be needed by a new staff member in the future. (This step also helps clarify current expectations among the staff related to reading program)

	<p>expectations and will enhance their success (Winter 2011) this can be done by piloting bi-monthly 45 minute seminars (after school or as part of a staff meeting) as part of recognizing the change process, building common language on school expectations and supporting the inexperienced teachers on the staff. (To some degree all staff this year are inexperienced because of the degree of change!) Utilize these “ pilot” sessions to revise materials for future. One required seminar: Stress Management!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Continue personalizing additional mini-seminars to match Minatare procedures in Year 2. . Pilot more seminars with whole staff to keep awareness of the induction system and build staff collegiality and common expectations for mathematics program expectations. 6. Allow facilitators to network with teacher induction teams across region. 7. Continue personalizing the mini-seminars to match Minatare procedures in Year 3. . Pilot more seminars with whole staff to keep awareness of the induction system and build staff collegiality and common expectations for behavioral support program expectations. 8. Evaluate the seminars in regard to teacher evaluations and formative data discussed at leadership meetings.
Start Date	September 20, 2010
Full implementation date	June, 2013
Person(s) responsible	Principal
Monitor and evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Existence of committee, meeting minutes -Existence of lead teachers -Enhancement and existence of provided PowerPoint’s with Minatare specific procedures and expectations. -Conduct evaluation of “pilot” seminars -Interview teacher facilitators for plan for rolling out induction program as needed in years 2 and 3 and for succession for facilitators if needed.
Cost for three years	\$2,555.00
Activity 5B	<p>Increase credentials of quality teaching by providing college credit</p> <p>Since staff members need to be encouraged to take advanced coursework and stay involved in professional growth, the district has developed a partnership between Chadron State College, ESU#13 and Minatare. Unique college credit, with tuition fees paid by the grant, will be available to Minatare teachers who are successfully involved and implement the reform project each year. The unique aspect will be the emphasis on going beyond initial training (knowledge.) They will be requires to participate in coaching, instructional practice, serve on committees and do evaluation /feedback sessions. While other trainings will be offered for college credit, these grant funded courses will be for three credit hours, one “course” offered for each school year. Since taking coursework also</p>

	leads to potential salary advancement, the opportunity for in-depth study and application is also an incentive for teachers.
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contact ESU and CSC to develop the course proposal. 2. Explain to teachers and register in August 3. Collaborate with ESU, principal, coach, specialist to accomplish the work.
Start Date	August 2010
Full implementation date	June 2013
Person(s) responsible	Principal and ESU Staff developer
Monitor and evaluate	<p>-Evidence collected for coursework requirements can also be used as part of program evaluation and teacher evaluation.</p> <p>-Meet with coach and implementation specialists to ensure on-going practice sessions and support are on target with school needs.</p> <p>-Course evaluation form each year</p> <p>-After three years see if teacher credentials have increased , and if they are taking additional coursework beyond that provided by the SIG.</p>
Cost for three years	\$21,714.00

Transformation Intervention Model - 6	
<p>Requirement (2A): Comprehensive Instructional reform strategies (A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards</p>	
Activity 6A	Implement a research-based and vertically designed reading program
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership team (NDE, ESU, Supt, Secondary Principal and Reading Coach) formed and began review of data and procedures. January 2010. 2. Achievement data (DIBELS, STARS, NWEA), mobility data, English language proficiency data (ELDA) and anecdotal performance data from reading first evaluators all indicated the need for improved instructional programming in reading and future review of math program. 3. Administration, reading coach, and elementary teachers research and select a vertically designed, scientifically research based reading program (SRA Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading/Spoken English) 4. Review available documents to check program alignment to state standards. Verify that some terms may need to be reinforced; students may need additional support with vocabulary. (Alignment document available upon request.) May 2010 5. Utilize LouEtta McHenry (RM consultant) to assist outlining plan and reviewing student data in May 2010 so that students can be appropriately placed in the RM series for the first week of school. Also use the placement data to determine number of teachers needed to implement in fall to meet student needs. 6. Obtain SIG notification of approval, July 8, 2010. 7. Order materials 8. Ensure that PE teacher also received training so that person is qualified to teach reading groups. 9. Hire additional part-time teacher to ensure adequate staff to cover needed reading level. 10. Begin quality professional development program (see complete outline in 3A for Reading) 11. Utilize proposed implementation specialist and reading coach to ensure successful implementation and teacher support as evidenced by student mastery checks and benchmark data. 12. Utilize implementation specialist to lead a parent session to explain the new reading program and how parents can be supportive. August 2010. 13. Utilize specialist for weekly student data reviews via faxed charts and conference calls. 14. Monitor student achievement and teacher implementation against fidelity checks. Make needed adjustments in length of class periods, additional opportunities for repetition, intensity, pacing, need for any additional interventions, coordination with after school, ELL support and summer school based on data. On-going on weekly, each semester and yearly

Start Date	January 2010
Full implementation date	June 2013
Person(s) responsible	Principal
Monitor and evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Program research on file -Standards alignment document on file -Purchase orders showing materials -Staff development calendar and training records -Data analysis and student achievement records for program and for benchmarking. -records of student progress, group changes. -Annual review of program, implementation and student results.
Cost for three years	\$131,082.00 (includes part-time position)
Activity 6B	Implement a research-based and vertically designed math and math intervention program
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership team (NDE, ESU, Supt, Principals and Reading Coach) begin review of data and procedures. January, 2010 2. Achievement data (STARS, NWEA), mobility data, English language proficiency data (ELDA) all indicated the need for future review of math program. March 2010. 3. Administration, reading coach, and elementary teachers research current math program and determine it is vertically designed and aligned to state standards. Since a new state test will be implemented in coming year, additional data will then be available to determine if this program is needing to be replaced. At this time, the evidence is that teachers needed support to better implement it with quality and fidelity. (Alignment document is available upon request.) May 2010. 4. Select a vertically designed; scientifically research based strong intervention for math. (Corrective Math) May 2010 5. Outline a staff development plan that involves initially assisting teachers with differentiation ideas to support language issues (July 2010) and use the first year of the SIG project to obtain further math implementation information. 6. Obtain SIG notification of approval, July 8, 2010. 7. Order materials for Corrective Math in Spring 2011. 8. Continue quality professional development program with math emphasis in year 2(see complete outline in 3B for Math) Coordinate mathematics into RtI system. 9. Utilize proposed implementation specialist and math coach to ensure successful implementation and teacher support as evidenced by student data. 10. Utilize implementation specialist and or reading coach to lead a

	<p>parent session to explain the math program and how parents can be supportive.</p> <p>11. Monitor student achievement and teacher implementation against fidelity checks. Make needed adjustments in length of class periods, additional opportunities for repetition, intensity, pacing, coordination with after school, ELL support and summer school based on data.</p>
Start Date	January 2010
Full implementation date	June 2013
Person(s) responsible	Principal
Monitor and evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Program research on file -Standards alignment document on file -Purchase orders showing materials -Staff development calendar and training records -Data analysis and student achievement records for program and for benchmarking. -Records of student progress -Annual review of program, implementation and student results.
Cost for three years	\$2,772.00
<p>Other aspects of this application are strongly research-based. The PBIS behavior support system and Response to Intervention systems are leaders in the field of educational research. In addition, research-based components will be used in the Teacher Induction System and the Preschool also described in those activities.</p>	

Transformation Intervention Model - 7

Requirement (2B): Comprehensive Instructional reform strategies
 (B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students

Activity7A	<p>Continuous use of student data for reading and math</p> <p>Minatare is already utilizing a universal screener and administers benchmark assessments three times a year to find students at risk of failure in reading. Continuing this practice with the additional expertise and support of the RtI consortium will increased knowledge of research on progress monitoring the most struggling students and give us research-based options for their support. The RM program adds comprehensive placement tests, and weekly mastery checks. Support from the Implementation Specialist will enhance Minatare’s knowledge (i.e. placement in proper instructional level, how to fast-track students with additional support to help close the achievement gap, how to differentiate and add additional support for struggling students.) Use of outcome (summative) measures through Gates McGinnity and NWEA as well as the state NeSA-R and NeSA-M will also be used as part of a comprehensive assessment plan.</p>
-------------------	---

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Key steps | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initial placement tests related to RM (May 2010) 2. Universal screen and two additional benchmark testing with DIBELS (September, January, May) Analysis of results and regroup students and/or add needed interventions. 3. Attend DIBELS Training August 2-3, 2010 4. Formative assessments through the use of RM weekly mastery progress checks are conducted on Thursday. Results are faxed/scanned to Reading Intervention Specialist who conducts a conference call with the reading coach each Friday to discuss each student’s progress. Suggestions for repeating lesson, changing groups, fast-tracking or adding additional interventions are made and implemented. Coach and classroom teachers note the unique suggestions made for differentiating for success so that similar plans can be used with future students with same patterns of need. 5. Additional diagnostic assessments are utilized when needed for individual students. Core Phonics Survey is expected to be used most frequently in the beginning. 6. Progress monitoring through DIBELS is added bi-weekly for students below the benchmark score for their grade level. Progress monitoring is used to evaluate if interventions are working. 7. Students are taught how to set goals for their growth on NWEA |
|-----------|--|

	<p>assessments (Follows Black and Williams' research on student involved assessment) NWEA MAPS assessments are administered in Fall and Spring as outcome measures and measures of student growth in grades 3-6. Staff analyzes data for program effectiveness, classroom goals, for building progress and for individual student progress. This is for both reading and math</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. State standards assessments (NeSA-R and NeSA-M) are given in the spring each year. When available results are analyzed. The reading and math program is analyzed for areas in which students did not achieve. If needed a plan to resolve any issues is made. 9. Parents are provided with information on student progress throughout the school year. 10. Board is apprised of student achievement results. 11. Accurate records are kept and updated for school improvement process. <p>A similar data usage system is developed for mathematics</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Review current usage of Saxon program placement and mastery checks. Increase fidelity. (Winter 2011) 13. Select a universal screener/bench mark/progress monitoring system for Mathematics (i.e. AIMSWEB) (Spring 2011) 14. Implement mathematics screening and progress monitoring system (fall 2011) 15. Review assessment systems and make recommendations for scheduling annually. 16. Conduct annual data retreats to review data. 17. (Some additional assessments are needed for ESL students and special needs students. They are beyond the scope of this project, but such data should be considered when appropriate.)
Start Date	August 2, 2010
Full implementation date	July 2013
Person(s) responsible	Principal
Monitor and evaluate	<p>-Existence of testing schedules</p> <p>-Data compiled and kept in central location , access and use of computerized systems (DIBELS, MAPS data) is apparent</p>

	<p>-Evidence of weekly monitoring</p> <p>-Evidence of staff data retreat, analysis of progress monitoring (can also be through RTI team) following benchmarking sessions , return on NWEA or NeSA data.</p> <p>-Annual Interview with Implementation Specialist regarding assessment system and staff use of data.</p> <p>-Teacher evaluation to include discussion on student data usage and student achievement component.</p>
Cost for three years	\$4,100.00
Permissible	
Activity 7B	<p>Response to Intervention is implemented for reading and math.</p> <p>(Positive Behavior support is also a Response to Intervention program, but is described in another Activity.)</p> <p>RTI is a comprehensive, research-based instructional reform model . In this model, a system of service delivery is designed to provide effective instruction for all students using comprehensive and preventive problem solving approach. It employs a tiered method of instructional delivery in which the core program meets the needs of most students (tier 1), additional instruction is provided for those need support (tier 2) and intensive and individualized services are provided for those students with profound needs (Tier 3) . The foundation of Rtl is measuring the performance of all students using universal screeners and benchmarks, and basing educational decisions regarding curriculum, instruction and intervention intensity on how well students respond. Minatare will begin with reading and add mathematics following the RTI frameworks (knowing that math research is not yet as readily available.)</p>
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apply for participation in Nebraska RTI Consortium Universal team Training (April 2010) 2. Develop RTI Leadership team including some membership from old Student Assistance Team. August 2010 3. Follow directives from consortium to prepare and attend first session. (October 28, 2010) 4. Enter data into consortium website, conduct recommended analysis, begin development of current system and needed portions in the Tier I analysis. 5. Inform staff about research learned, program progress and how it all relates to reading program design. 6. Attend consortium training sessions and complete homework between sessions. (All work is a direct tie to examining reading program and achievement data) Explore any needed 7. Continue with RTI membership in subsequent years, adding data and exploration of mathematics as it becomes available.

Start Date	October 20, 2010
Full implementation date	July 2013
Person(s) responsible	Special Education Teacher
Monitor and evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Attendance records -Existence of up-to-date data and plans on consortium website -Tier I LAG checklist completed -Decision rules for program and intervention placement formalized. -Monthly RTI team meetings calendared and minutes
Cost for three years	\$6,363.00

Transformation Intervention Model - 8	
Requirement(3A): Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools (A) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the USDE guidance)	
Activity 8A	Extend school year and school day The total school minutes for Minatare Elementary in 2008-2009 was 70,800 minutes. The plan for 2010-2011 is to increase learning time by first extending the school year two extra days to a total of 182 teaching days. Each day will also be extended for an additional 20 minutes which will result in a total of 75,200 minutes per year. This is an increase of 4,400 total minutes from the 2008-2009 data.
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notify board of this component. Board general approval. June 2010 2. Develop new calendar and hours of teaching day. July 2010 3. Formalize board of education adoption of new calendar. 4. Negotiate for needed salary increase related to additional time. Aug. 2010 5. Implement new calendar. (Aug. 2010)
Start Date	July 2010
Full implementation date	June 2013
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent
Monitor and evaluate	-Existence of calendar and agreements.
Cost for three years	\$105,318.00
Activity 8B	Establish schedules to increase/protect learning time Tighten the schedule and expectations related to recess, lunch, passing times, standing in line, transition times. Purchasing a bell system will give the students a clean start and finish to their outdoor time. Monitor how well the school adheres to valuing learning time!
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Order and install bell for elementary school. (July 2010) 2. Develop schedules and help staff to understand importance. (Aug 2010) 3. Closely monitor use of time, especially for the first quarter of school, working with staff to resolve issues. 4. Use a time on task study as evidence of growth. 5. Celebrate with staff and students when short-term goals are evidenced. 6. Continue to evaluate progress towards best utilization of available time.
Start Date	July 2010
Full implementation date	June 2013

Person(s) responsible	Principal
Monitor and evaluate	-Purchase order for bell system. -Presence of a schedule and expected behaviors. -Use of data to show students progress in best use of time.
Cost for three years	\$3,000.00
Activity 8C	Increase learning time through research-based strategies The reading program is designed to increase learning time through instructional techniques for increased student engagement. Fast paced response rate from all students, brisk pacing and timely error correction is trained, expected and monitored. RM Implementation Specialist will be assisting the staff and reading coach to move to high levels of fidelity. Her involvement will provide another level of expertise and options to increase learning time and engagement. Similar techniques will be used with mathematics in Year 2. Development of a comprehensive positive behavior system in Year 3 will also have the potential to lesson time off task for discipline and increase learning time.
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ask trainer to establish the relationship between the required teaching behaviors and research on engagement and learning. 2. Train teachers in active response strategies (July 26-28, 2010) 3. Establish the relationship between use of the studies, teacher evaluation process and eligibility to be included in the school-wide incentive program. Sept. 2010 4. Provide implementation specialist and coach to support teachers to learn, master and implement the strategies. Include monthly mini-practice session for strategies that are more difficult. 5. Provide whole faculty feedback as well as individual feedback throughout the year.
Start Date	July 26, 2010
Full implementation date	June 2013
Person(s) responsible	Principal
Monitor and evaluate	-Classroom walkthrough data -Outside evaluation and recommendations by implementation specialist -Implementation data shared and discussed at a faculty meeting(review and informal goal setting) -Inclusion as part of teacher evaluation conference.
Cost for three years	No additional cost.
Permissible Activities	

<p>Activity 8D</p>	<p>Positive Behavior Support with quality data professional development that meet quality requirements</p> <p>Working with Jolene Palmer and Nebraska’s system for developing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support. (PBIS), the school will collect more data on all aspects of behavior, attend training for awareness and knowledge about the programs available, and apply to be part of the PBIS system. By year three of the SIG process, the school will be working with a more comprehensive, planned and consistent model for support student behaviors that increase learning and success. Although the serious implementation of this aspect of the project will not be enacted until year three, the state PBIS system will allow the district to continue those efforts into the future and to refine and reach a level of true implementation.</p>
<p>Key steps</p>	<p><i>Some training from literacy section will have direct implications and transfer to the behavior efforts (i.e. the reading program has reinforcement for quality student involvement and behavioral expectations that been shown to improve classroom management in other schools.)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership team (NDE, ESU, Supt, Principals and Reading Coach) begin review of data and procedures. January, 2010 2. Administration, reading coach, and elementary teachers research behavioral support programs and determine involvement in Positive Behavior Support would create a more comprehensive system to address all levels of behavior. May 2010. 3. Principal and counselor develop knowledge and awareness of current behavioral data and needs. Winter 2010 4. Take advantage of regional opportunities to expose staff to PBS training, conferences and awareness sessions. 5. Form Positive Behavioral Support Leadership Committee fall 2011 and collect needed data following recommendations of NDE specialist (principal, counselor, teacher, sped attend leadership events) 6. Review NDE PBIS training plan from the website http://www.npbis.org/docs/PBStrainingplan.doc 7. Conduct PBIS readiness checklist http://www.npbis.org/docs/PBSIReadinessChecklist.doc 8. Leadership Team attends research-based BEST Training (Building Effective Schools Together) 2 day training. When offered in 2012. Team replicates key aspects of this training to share with building staff. 9. Create action plan incorporating PBiS and instructional strategies. 10. Building orientation to PBiS research, action plan requirements and needed skills. 11. Team meets on regular basis to review data and progress towards goals. 12. Instructional Coach and Principal providing some support for PBiS monitoring. 13. AIMSWEBPro complete training (or other selected screener/ progress monitoring tool for mathematics) Summer/Fall 2011 (Instructional coach, special education teacher, principal) 14. On-going data review, progress monitoring and conversations as part of teacher evaluation process.
<p>Start Date</p>	<p>August 4, 2010</p>
<p>Full implementation date</p>	<p>July 2013 with continuation beyond the scope of the SIG</p>

Person(s) responsible	Intervention Project Manager
Monitor and evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Existence of leadership team and meeting notes -Review of behavioral data (i.e. self-assessment tool, surveys, checklists, referrals.) -Program research on file -PBIS data and application on file -Staff development calendar and training records -Data analysis and student behavior t records -Annual review of program, implementation and results
Cost for three years	\$5,110.00
Activity 8D	<p>Increase learning time through development of a preschool</p> <p>In 2008-2009 Head Start could only accommodate 18 children. (And in June 2010, that building was severely damaged, making continuance impossible.) There are no private preschools in Minatare. The planned partnership between CAPWN, Minatare school and a community church building has been described earlier. With the storm damage providing the impetus to merge and community support for a merged program, many more children can be served in the planned preschool. Increasing the quality of the preschool will also include professional development for staff. A review of staff background will reveal the specific areas for training. Preschool staff will be included in reading training so that they are aware of the continuum of learning needs for their children and because parts of the reading program are appropriately started in preschool (i.e. Language for Learning a few minutes each day) Setting up a new program requires reviewing these areas: Environmental rating Scales, HighScope or Creative Curriculum (state recommended) , Results Matters assessment tools, Early Learning Guidelines and Social Emotional development using Positive Behavior Support for Early childhood involving the teaching pyramid. Parent Involvement would also be a topic for consideration. Candis Jones, Panhandle Early Childhood Professional Developer is prepared to support the school in finding needed resources and training.</p>
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initiate discussions and options to increase preschool opportunities in the community. (May 2010) 2. Storm causes severe damage to old Head start facility requiring new options. (June 2010) 3. Meet with CAPWN /Head Start directors to establish feasibility of merged program. (June 2010) 4. Meet with church to develop temporary facility (June 2010) 5. Meet with other district leaders who have successfully established merged programs and use as models for governance, funding, food service, supervision structures. (July 2010) 6. Hire staff (July/ August, 2010) and determine staff need for professional development in approved preschool curriculum and assessment methods, arrange for training.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Advertise for students, hold open house, register students. (Aug 2010) 8. Begin services (Aug/Sept 2010) 9. Maintain frequent contact with CAPWN for problem solving as program is developed. 10. Develop needed professional development plan 11. Conduct an analysis of early childhood staff credentials and background skills in areas of curriculum, assessment and instruction of early childhood. (Following determining the staffing for the new preschool) (Aug 2010) 12. --Work with Early Childhood PD to learn of statewide availability, services that can be delivered on-site and on-line training support. 13. --Determine priorities for each year and develop training or local on-site support plan. 14. --Utilize teacher evaluations and conversations to refine training needs for year two and three. 15. Evaluate staff and provide feedback. 16. Evaluate initial pilot year and plan for year 2
Start Date	May 2010
Full implementation date	June 2013
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent
Monitor and evaluate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Agreements and procedures established -Training needs, plans and attendance records -Staff in place and evaluated -Joint evaluation of project with partnership members
Cost for three years	\$203,729.00

Transformation Intervention Model - 9	
Requirement(3B): Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools (B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement	
Activity 9	<p>Increase availability of elementary counselor.</p> <p>Currently the counselor also teaches high school classes. SIG funds will be used to purchase more time for serving the elementary school. In this additional time, the counselor will be asked to (1) provide individual and group counseling which includes increasing home support and relationships, (2) assist the principal in monitoring truancy and absenteeism with the goal to contact homes early in the morning to verify reasons for absences and encourage attendance of habitual offenders, (3) assist in explaining student progress and data to parents, (4) begin collecting data needed for positive behavior support systems design, (5) support the PIRC parent governance advisory by designing and implementing a district system for providing snacks and child care during the one hour monthly meeting , (6) assist teachers in developing family nights focused on learning with their children, and (7) supporting the development, implementation and analysis of frequent, simple parent and community surveys and or focus groups to gauge satisfaction and needed support.</p>
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contact counselor once grant is approved and inform of new role. July 2010 2. High school to decide how to cover for classes previously taught by counselor. July 2010 3. Provide counselor with PIRC budget, information, potential contacts for child care/mentoring (i.e. WNCC student athletes) (August 2010) 4. ESU provides counselor and principal information about the National Partnership resources and the 6 types of parent involvement (parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making and collaborating with the community) so that plans can be made to prioritize actions to better match local needs and resources. (September , 2010) 5. Counselor works with principal to clarify method of collecting information (i.e. behavioral data, absenteeism , truancy) and develop plans for contacts/responses/engaging parents for both positive behavior and challenging situations. (Fall, 2010) 6. Implement outlined duties. (Fall 2010) 7. Research PBiS and share information with leadership team, develop plan for data collection. Work with principal and leadership team to complete application to state PBiS support system (Spring 2012)
Start Date	Start of school, August , 2010
Full implementation date	June 2013
Person(s) responsible	Counselor
Monitor and evaluate	-Existence of easily assessable behavioral and attendance data

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Calendar of student counseling sessions -PIRC meeting minutes and attendance logs -Data from surveys/focus groups -Participation in behavioral support training -Baseline information developed (ie. records of volunteerism and other components of parent involvement) then compared to final evidence. -PBiS project initiated
Cost for three years	\$10, 399.00

Transformation Intervention Model - 10

Requirement(4A): Providing operational flexibility and sustained support
 (A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates

Activity 10	<p>Leadership Team Meetings</p> <p>Minatare does not anticipate issues with operational flexibility. In this small district, written, strongly enforced regulations seldom exist. The Board of Education has already indicated a willingness to work with the project for calendar and incentive issues. (The Board recognizes that the incentive pay is directly related to the project and funding does not apply to the secondary school who is not involved in such tremendous work load in implementing change.) Minatare will use regularly scheduled leadership team meetings to address any challenges that arise, to problem-solve possible solutions and then to propose any needed waivers or policy changes to the Board of Education along with a rationale. Minatare will have to work within the law and due process requirements regarding staffing, but will increase diligence in evaluation procedures and documenting efforts in improvement so that this does not become an issue. Participation in the IPM required monthly session with NDE will also provide direction and options for issues.</p>
--------------------	---

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Key steps | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish composition of Leadership Team (i.e. Supt, Principals, IBM, reading coach, ESU staff developer, other representation as agenda indicates as needed.) 2. Establish regular, formal, calendared, monthly meeting dates 3. Establish general agenda and process for adding to the agenda 4. Assign staff to take action minutes during meetings and store in accessible location on server. 5. At first meeting, establish group norms and plan to review the group process at the end of each session. 6. Implement Leadership team meetings. 7. Utilize group process review as a means of formative assessment. 8. Host short, quarterly staff sessions to keep staff informed and seek their input. 9. Hold an annual retreat to review data and progress of the project as a whole, reestablish timelines and problem-solve for the future. |
|-----------|--|

Start Date	August 2010
------------	-------------

Full implementation date	July 2013
--------------------------	-----------

Person(s) responsible	Principal working with IPM
-----------------------	----------------------------

Monitor and evaluate	<p>-Existence of calendar of meetings</p> <p>-Existence of action minutes with norms, agenda summaries and group</p>
----------------------	--

	processing.
Cost for three years	\$5,382.00

Transformation Intervention Model - 11	
Requirement(4B): Providing operational flexibility and sustained support (B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO)	
Activity 11	Involvement for sustained support Since Minatare has only one elementary school, ensuring local support is accomplished by administrative and Board of Education support and monitoring of the project. Minatare is confident that the use of the IPM in monthly meetings with the State department designee will also provide on-going impetus for maintenance of effort, support and networking with other schools facing the challenges of change.
Key steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Board of Education unanimous approval of SIG application, June 14, 2010 2. Update new superintendent and principal July 2010 3. Ensure IPM participates in monthly meetings with NDE 4. Utilize leadership team and state meetings to present questions and problems and to seek needed solutions, even those requiring some flexibility. 5. Request continued involvement by Educational Service Unit staff developers.
Start Date	June 14, 2010
Full implementation date	July 2013
Person(s) responsible	Superintendent
Monitor and evaluate	<p>-Reports from IPM after monthly meetings with NDE.</p> <p>-Reports to Board of Education on progress and problems</p> <p>-Reflect with leadership team on district and state flexibility and support annually</p>
Cost for three years	\$300.00

A.3. Action Plans for Tier III Schools

Not applicable

PART B. BUDGETS

See separate file.

APPENDIX A: REQUIRED PROFILES from NDE

2007-2008 Minatare Elementary Building

2007-2008 State of the Schools Report
A Report on Nebraska Public Schools

SCHOOL DISTRICT: MINATARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL BUILDING: MINATARE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

► School Profile

School Profile 2007 - 2008

School Characteristics

School Data	State Statistics	District Statistics	School Statistics
Poverty Percentage	37.33%	65.45%	72.88%
English Language Learners Percentage	6.47%	15.00%	16.10%
Mobility Percentage	12.38%	17.73%	18.64%
Enrollment	290,767	220	118

2007-2008

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Reading

Grades	03	04	05	06
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	86.67%	*	47.83%	26.32%
Special Education Students	*	*	*	*
English Language Learners	▲	*	*	*
Gender				
Male	*	*	36.36%	*
Female	*	*	58.33%	10.00%
Race / Ethnicity				
American Indian / Alaska Native	▲	▲	▲	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	▲	▲	▲	▲
White, Not Hispanic	91.67%	*	40.00%	23.08%
Black, Not Hispanic	▲	▲	▲	▲
Hispanic	*	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	83.33%	*	46.67%	16.67%
Migrants	*	▲	▲	▲

2007-2008

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Mathematics				
Grades	03	04	05	06
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	73.33%	*	78.26%	50.00%
Special Education Students	*	*	*	*
English Language Learners	▲	*	*	*
Gender				
Male	*	*	72.73%	50.00%
Female	*	*	83.33%	50.00%
Race / Ethnicity				
American Indian / Alaska Native	▲	▲	▲	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	▲	▲	▲	▲
White, Not Hispanic	75.00%	*	80.00%	53.85%
Black, Not Hispanic	▲	▲	▲	▲
Hispanic	*	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	75.00%	*	73.33%	50.00%
Migrants	*	▲	▲	▲

2007-2008

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Science		
Grades	04	05
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	N / A	45.83%
Special Education Students	N / A	*
English Language Learners	N / A	*
Gender		
Male	N / A	33.33%
Female	N / A	58.33%
Race / Ethnicity		
American Indian / Alaska Native	N / A	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	N / A	▲
White, Not Hispanic	N / A	40.00%
Black, Not Hispanic	N / A	▲
Hispanic	N / A	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	N / A	43.75%
Migrants	N / A	▲

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Writing	
	04
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	*
Special Education Students	*
English Language Learners	*
Gender	
Male	*
Female	*
Race / Ethnicity	
American Indian / Alaska Native	N / A
Asian or Pacific Islander	N / A
White, Not Hispanic	*
Black, Not Hispanic	N / A
Hispanic	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	*
Migrants	N / A

* Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:

- 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
- 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

▲ Any zero shown above is not included in computing the overall average of the standards. For further information, see comments for each standard on the school building report page.

2007-2008

Student Performance Decision used for AYP	
AYP	Elementary
Reading	
All students	NOT MET
American Indian/Alaska Native	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	*
White, Not Hispanic	NOT MET
Black, Not Hispanic	*
Hispanic	~
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	NOT MET
Special Education Students	~
English Language Learners	*
Math	
All students	NOT MET
American Indian/Alaska Native	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	*
White, Not Hispanic	MET
Black, Not Hispanic	*
Hispanic	~
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	MET
Special Education Students	~
English Language Learners	*
No Child Left Behind Qualified Teachers	100.00%

2007-2008

- * Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:
 - 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
 - 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

- ~ To be included for AYP determinations, a group must have at least 30 students.

2008-2009 Minatare Elementary Building

A Report on Nebraska Public Schools

SCHOOL DISTRICT: MINATARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SCHOOL BUILDING: MINATARE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

► School Profile

School Profile

2008 - 2009

School Characteristics

School Data	State Statistics	District Statistics	School Statistics
Poverty Percentage	38.35%	71.90%	76.24%
English Language Learners Percentage	6.31%	17.70%	23.00%
School Mobility Rate	12.02%	17.22%	18.00%
Enrollment	292,030	210	101

2008-2009

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Reading

Grades	03	04	05	06
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	60.00%	100.00%	*	48.15%
Special Education Students	*	*	▲	*
English Language Learners	*	▲	*	*
Gender				
Male	*	*	*	33.33%
Female	*	*	*	66.67%
Race / Ethnicity				
American Indian / Alaska Native	*	▲	▲	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	▲	▲	▲	▲
White, Not Hispanic	*	100.00%	*	44.44%
Black, Not Hispanic	▲	▲	▲	▲
Hispanic	*	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	*	*	*	50.00%
Migrants	*	*	▲	▲

2008-2009

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Mathematics				
Grades	03	04	05	06
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	76.92%	100.00%	*	74.07%
Special Education Students	*	*	▲	*
English Language Learners	*	▲	*	*
Gender				
Male	*	*	*	60.00%
Female	*	*	*	91.67%
Race / Ethnicity				
American Indian / Alaska Native	*	▲	▲	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	▲	▲	▲	▲
White, Not Hispanic	*	100.00%	*	77.78%
Black, Not Hispanic	▲	▲	▲	▲
Hispanic	*	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	90.91%	*	*	70.00%
Migrants	*	*	▲	▲

2008-2009

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Science		
Grades	04	05
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	N/A	*
Special Education Students	N/A	▲
English Language Learners	N/A	*
Gender		
Male	N/A	*
Female	N/A	*
Race / Ethnicity		
American Indian / Alaska Native	N/A	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	N/A	▲
White, Not Hispanic	N/A	*
Black, Not Hispanic	N/A	▲
Hispanic	N/A	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	N/A	*
Migrants	N/A	▲

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Writing	
	04
<u>All Students (including ELL and Special Education)</u>	75.00%
<u>Special Education Students</u>	*
<u>English Language Learners</u>	*
Gender	
<u>Male</u>	*
<u>Female</u>	*
Race / Ethnicity	
<u>American Indian / Alaska Native</u>	N / A
<u>Asian or Pacific Islander</u>	N / A
<u>White, Not Hispanic</u>	69.23%
<u>Black, Not Hispanic</u>	N / A
<u>Hispanic</u>	*
<u>Free / Reduced Priced Meals</u>	72.73%
<u>Migrants</u>	*

* Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:

- 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
- 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

▲ Any zero shown above is not included in computing the overall average of the standards. For further information, see comments for each standard on the school building report page.

Student Performance Decision used for AYP		
AYP	Elementary	
Reading		
All students	NOT MET	
American Indian/Alaska Native	*	
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	
White, Not Hispanic	NOT MET	
Black, Not Hispanic	*	
Hispanic	~	
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	NOT MET	
Special Education Students	~	
English Language Learners	~	

2008-2009

Math	
All students	MET
American Indian/Alaska Native	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	*
White, Not Hispanic	MET
Black, Not Hispanic	*
Hispanic	~
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	MET
Special Education Students	~
English Language Learners	~
No Child Left Behind Qualified Teachers	N/A

2008-2009

- * Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:
 - 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
 - 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

- ~ To be included for AYP determinations, a group must have at least 30 students.

2007-2008 Minatare DISTRICT Profile

NEBRASKA Department of Education reportcard.nde.state.ne.

2007-2008 State of the Schools Report
A Report on Nebraska Public Schools

SCHOOL DISTRICT: MINATARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

▸ District Profile

District Profile 2007 - 2008

District Characteristics		
District Data	State Statistics	District Statistics
Poverty Percentage	37.33%	65.45%
English Language Learners Percentage	6.47%	15.00%
Special Education Percentage	15.19%	10.91%
Mobility Percentage	12.38%	17.73%
Graduation Rate Percentage	89.17%	77.78%
Attendance Percentage	94.71%	94.59%
Enrollment	290,767	220
High School Teachers Endorsed Percentage	94.65%	91.84%

Assessment Quality

2007-2008

Assessment Quality					
Reading			Mathematics		
Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High
Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Reading							
	03	04	05	06	07	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	86.67%	*	47.83%	26.32%	38.10%	53.33%	80.00%
Special Education Students	*	*	*	*	*	*	▲
English Language Learners	▲	*	*	*	*	*	*
Gender							
Male	*	*	36.36%	*	*	*	*
Female	*	*	58.33%	10.00%	33.33%	*	*
Race / Ethnicity							
American Indian / Alaska Native	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	*
White, Not Hispanic	91.67%	*	40.00%	23.08%	30.77%	*	*
Black, Not Hispanic	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	*
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	83.33%	*	46.67%	16.67%	31.25%	*	*
Migrants	*	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

2007-2008

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Mathematics							
	03	04	05	06	07	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	73.33%	*	78.26%	50.00%	38.10%	86.67%	75.00%
Special Education Students	*	*	*	*	*	*	▲
English Language Learners	▲	*	*	*	*	*	*
Gender							
Male	*	*	72.73%	50.00%	*	*	*
Female	*	*	83.33%	50.00%	41.67%	*	*
Race / Ethnicity							
American Indian / Alaska Native	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	*
White, Not Hispanic	75.00%	*	80.00%	53.85%	30.77%	*	*
Black, Not Hispanic	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	*
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	75.00%	*	73.33%	50.00%	31.25%	*	*
Migrants	*	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

2007-2008

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Science				
	04	05	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	N / A	45.83%	6.67%	31.25%
Special Education Students	N / A	*	*	▲
English Language Learners	N / A	*	*	*
Gender				
Male	N / A	33.33%	*	*
Female	N / A	58.33%	*	*
Race / Ethnicity				
American Indian / Alaska Native	N / A	▲	▲	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	N / A	▲	▲	*
White, Not Hispanic	N / A	40.00%	*	*
Black, Not Hispanic	N / A	▲	▲	*
Hispanic	N / A	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	N / A	43.75%	*	*
Migrants	N / A	▲	▲	▲

2007-2008

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Writing			
	04	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	*	100.00%	84.21%
Special Education Students	*	*	*
English Language Learners	*	*	*
Gender			
Male	*	*	*
Female	*	*	100.00%
Race / Ethnicity			
American Indian / Alaska Native	N / A	N / A	N / A
Asian or Pacific Islander	N / A	N / A	*
White, Not Hispanic	*	*	*
Black, Not Hispanic	N / A	N / A	*
Hispanic	*	*	90.00%
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	*	*	92.31%
Migrants	N / A	N / A	*

* Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:

- 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
- 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

▲ Any zero shown above is not included in computing the overall average of the standards. For further information, see comments for each standard on the school building report page.

2007-2008

Percentage of Students Above U.S. Average on National Tests

	04	08	11
Standardized Reading Test	*	*	*
Standardized Mathematics Test	*	*	*
ACT			N/A

- * Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:
- 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
 - 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

2007-2008

Student Performance Decision used for AYP

AYP	Elementary	Middle	High
Reading			
All students	NOT MET	NOT MET	~
American Indian/Alaska Native	*	*	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	*	*
White, Not Hispanic	NOT MET	~	*
Black, Not Hispanic	*	*	*
Hispanic	~	~	*
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	NOT MET	~	*
Special Education Students	~	*	*
English Language Learners	*	*	*
Math			
All students	NOT MET	NOT MET	~
American Indian/Alaska Native	*	*	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	*	*
White, Not Hispanic	MET	~	*
Black, Not Hispanic	*	*	*
Hispanic	~	~	*
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	MET	~	*
Special Education Students	~	*	*
English Language Learners	*	*	*
No Child Left Behind Qualified Teachers	90.00%		

- * Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:
- 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
 - 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

~ To be included for AYP determinations, a group must have at least 30 students.

2008-2009 Minatare DISTRICT Profile

Nebraska Department of Education - Windows Internet Explorer

http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/Page/Profile.aspx?Level=di&CountyID=79&DistrictID=00C

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

Nebraska Department of Education

NEBRASKA Department of Education

2008-2009 State of the Schools Report
A Report on Nebraska Public Schools

SCHOOL DISTRICT: MINATARE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

▸ District Profile

District Profile
2008 - 2009

District Characteristics

District Data	State Statistics	District Statistics
Poverty Percentage	38.35%	71.90%
English Language Learners Percentage	6.31%	17.70%
Special Education Percentage	15.21%	11.96%
School Mobility Rate	12.02%	17.22%
Graduation Rate Percentage	89.74%	83.33%
Attendance Percentage	94.84%	94.51%
Enrollment	292,030	210
High School Teachers Endorsed Percentage	94.50%	91.58%

2008-2009

Assessment Quality					
Reading			Mathematics		
Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High
Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary

2008-2009

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Reading							
	03	04	05	06	07	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	60.00%	100.00%	*	48.15%	52.38%	50.00%	75.00%
Special Education Students	*	*	▲	*	*	*	*
English Language Learners	*	▲	*	*	*	*	*
Gender							
Male	*	*	*	33.33%	58.33%	*	54.55%
Female	*	*	*	66.67%	*	57.14%	92.31%
Race / Ethnicity							
American Indian / Alaska Native	*	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
White, Not Hispanic	*	100.00%	*	44.44%	58.33%	58.33%	88.24%
Black, Not Hispanic	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	*	*	*	50.00%	57.14%	43.75%	75.00%
Migrants	*	*	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

2008-2009

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Mathematics							
	03	04	05	06	07	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	76.92%	100.00%	*	74.07%	70.00%	80.00%	72.00%
Special Education Students	*	*	▲	*	*	*	*
English Language Learners	*	▲	*	*	*	*	*
Gender							
Male	*	*	*	60.00%	63.64%	*	54.55%
Female	*	*	*	91.67%	*	78.57%	85.71%
Race / Ethnicity							
American Indian / Alaska Native	*	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
White, Not Hispanic	*	100.00%	*	77.78%	83.33%	75.00%	77.78%
Black, Not Hispanic	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	90.91%	*	*	70.00%	76.92%	75.00%	58.33%
Migrants	*	*	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

2008-2009

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Science				
	04	05	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	N/A	*	20.00%	54.17%
Special Education Students	N/A	▲	*	*
English Language Learners	N/A	*	*	*
Gender				
Male	N/A	*	*	36.36%
Female	N/A	*	21.43%	69.23%
Race / Ethnicity				
American Indian / Alaska Native	N/A	▲	▲	▲
Asian or Pacific Islander	N/A	▲	▲	▲
White, Not Hispanic	N/A	*	25.00%	58.82%
Black, Not Hispanic	N/A	▲	▲	▲
Hispanic	N/A	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	N/A	*	18.75%	41.67%
Migrants	N/A	▲	▲	▲

2008-2009

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Writing			
	04	08	11
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	75.00%	100.00%	95.83%
Special Education Students	*	*	*
English Language Learners	*	*	*
Gender			
Male	*	*	90.00%
Female	*	100.00%	100.00%
Race / Ethnicity			
American Indian / Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian or Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A
White, Not Hispanic	69.23%	100.00%	94.12%
Black, Not Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	*	*	*
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	72.73%	100.00%	91.67%
Migrants	*	N/A	N/A

- * Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:
- 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
 - 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

▲ Any zero shown above is not included in computing the overall average of the standards. For further information, see comments for each standard on the school building report page.

2008-2009

Percentage of Students Above U.S. Average on National Tests			
	04	08	11
Standardized Reading Test	*	*	41.67%
Standardized Mathematics Test	76.92%	65.00%	62.50%
ACT			20.00

- * Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:
- 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
 - 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

2008-2009

Student Performance Decision used for AYP				
AYP	Elementary	Middle	High	
Reading				
All students	NOT MET	MET	~	
American Indian/Alaska Native	*	*	*	
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	*	*	
White, Not Hispanic	NOT MET	~	~	
Black, Not Hispanic	*	*	*	
Hispanic	~	~	*	
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	NOT MET	NOT MET	~	
Special Education Students	~	~	*	
English Language Learners	~	*	*	
Math				
All students	MET	MET	~	
American Indian/Alaska Native	*	*	*	
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	*	*	
White, Not Hispanic	MET	~	~	
Black, Not Hispanic	*	*	*	
Hispanic	~	~	*	
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	MET	MET	~	
Special Education Students	~	~	*	
English Language Learners	~	*	*	
No Child Left Behind Qualified Teachers	N/A			

- * Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:
- 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
 - 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

~ To be included for AYP determinations, a group must have at least 30 students.

2008-2009

NAEP - Grade 04 Mathematics		
Years	National Average	State Average
2000	224	225
2003	234	236
2005	237	238
2007	238	239
2009	239	239

NAEP - Grade 08 Mathematics		
Years	National Average	State Average
2000	272	280
2003	276	282
2005	278	284
2007	280	284
2009	282	284

NAEP - Grade 04 Reading		
Years	National Average	State Average
2002	217	222
2003	216	221
2005	217	221
2007	220	223

NAEP - Grade 08 Reading		
Years	National Average	State Average
2002	263	270
2003	261	266
2005	260	267
2007	261	267

Use this budget for only one school implementing the Transformation Model.
 Additional Transformation Budgets are provided for additional schools that will be implementing this model.

TRANSFORMATION MODEL BUDGET FOR YEAR 1 (2010-11)

NDE County District No.:	79-0002						
District Name:	Minatare Public Schools						
NDE School No.:	01						
School Name:	Minatare Elementary Schools						
	100	200	300	400	500	600	
	Salaries	Employee Benefits	Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	Computer Hardware / Equipment	Travel Professional Development	Total for Listed Activity
(See Instructions for Full Descriptions of Required and Permissible Activities)							
Intervention Project Manager (Required)	41,000	19,580		1,000		2,000	\$63,580
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(d)(1)(i)(A) replace principal	70,000	26,200		1,000		2,000	\$99,200
(d)(1)(i)(B) evaluation systems for teachers & principals	386	62				2,100	\$2,548
(d)(1)(i)(C) reward school leaders	25,800	4,128				5,625	\$35,553
(d)(1)(i)(D) ongoing professional development	57,176	24,148	9,600	1,000		6,405	\$98,329
(d)(1)(i)(E) recruit/retain staff with necessary skills	692	111				7,358	\$8,161
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(d)(1)(ii)(A) attract/retain staff with necessary skills							\$0
(d)(1)(ii)(B) institute a system for measuring changes							\$0
(d)(1)(ii)(C) mutual consent for hiring teachers							\$0
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(d)(2)(i)(A) use of data for implementing program	17,000	8,720		30,000			\$55,720
(d)(2)(i)(B) continuous use of student data			1,000				\$1,000
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(d)(2)(ii)(A) conducting periodic reviews							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(B) implementing schoolwide RTI model	1,656	265				200	\$2,121
(d)(2)(ii)(C) provide additional supports/prof. Development							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(D) technology based supports/interventions							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(1) increase rigor in secondary schools							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(2) student transition							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(3) increase graduation rates							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(4) early-warning systems for at-risk students							\$0
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(d)(3)(i)(A) strategies to increase learning time	28,800	4,608		3,000			\$36,408
(d)(3)(i)(B) ongoing family/community engagement	2,270	363				700	\$3,333

<u>Permissible Activities:</u>								
(d)(3)(ii)(A) partnering to create safe school environments								\$0
(d)(3)(ii)(B) restructuring the school day								\$0
(d)(3)(ii)(C) improve school climate and discipline								\$0
(d)(3)(ii)(D) full-day kdg or pre-kdg	37,500	21,256		6,000		2,000		\$66,756
<u>Required Activities</u>								
(d)(4)(i)(A) flexibility to increase graduation rates	1,288	206				300		\$1,794
(d)(4)(i)(B) ongoing, intensive TA/support						100		\$100
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>								
(d)(4)(ii)(A) new governance arrangement								\$0
(d)(4)(ii)(B) budget weighted based on student needs								\$0
Totals by Object Code	\$283,568	\$109,647	\$10,600	\$42,000	\$0	\$28,788		\$474,603

TRANSFORMATION MODEL BUDGET FOR YEAR 2 (2011-12)

NDE County District No.:
 District Name:
 NDE School No.:
 School Name:

79-0002
 Minatare Public Schools
 01
 Minatare Elementary Schools

Activity	100 Salaries	200 Employee Benefits	300 Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	400 Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	500 Computer Hardware / Equipment	600 Travel Professional Development	Total for Listed Activity
(See Instructions for Full Descriptions of Required and Permissible Activities)							
Intervention Project Manager (Required)	43,050	20,559				2,000	\$65,609
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(d)(1)(i)(A) replace principal	73,500	27,510				2,000	\$103,010
(d)(1)(i)(B) evaluation systems for teachers & principals	386	62				2,100	\$2,548
(d)(1)(i)(C) reward school leaders	25,800	4,128				5,625	\$35,553
(d)(1)(i)(D) ongoing professional development	58,254	24,148	24,700			10,985	\$118,087
(d)(1)(i)(E) recruit/retain staff with necessary skills	600	96				7,358	\$8,054
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(d)(1)(ii)(A) attract/retain staff with necessary skills							\$0
(d)(1)(ii)(B) institute a system for measuring changes							\$0
(d)(1)(ii)(C) mutual consent for hiring teachers							\$0
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(d)(2)(i)(A) use of data for implementing program	17,850	9,156		12,772			\$39,778
(d)(2)(i)(B) continuous use of student data			1,550				\$1,550
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(d)(2)(ii)(A) conducting periodic reviews							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(B) implementing schoolwide RTI model	1,656	265				200	\$2,121
(d)(2)(ii)(C) provide additional supports/prof. Development							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(D) technology based supports/interventions							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(1) increase rigor in secondary schools							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(2) student transition							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(3) increase graduation rates							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(4) early-warning systems for at-risk students							\$0
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(d)(3)(i)(A) strategies to increase learning time	30,240	4,838					\$35,078
(d)(3)(i)(B) ongoing family/community engagement	2,383	381				700	\$3,464
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(d)(3)(ii)(A) partnering to create safe school environments							\$0

(d)(3)(ii)(B) restructuring the school day							\$0
(d)(3)(ii)(C) improve school climate and discipline							\$0
(d)(3)(ii)(D) full-day kdg or pre-kdg	39,375	22,319		3,250		2,000	\$66,944
Required Activities							
(d)(4)(i)(A) flexibility to increase graduation rates	1,288	206				300	\$1,794
(d)(4)(i)(B) ongoing, intensive TA/support						100	\$100
Permissible Activities:							
(d)(4)(ii)(A) new governance arrangement							\$0
(d)(4)(ii)(B) budget weighted based on student needs							\$0
Totals by Object Code	\$294,382	\$113,668	\$26,250	\$16,022	\$0	\$33,368	\$483,690

TRANSFORMATION MODEL BUDGET FOR YEAR 3 (2012-13)

NDE County District No.:
 District Name:
 NDE School No.:
 School Name:

79-0002
 Minatare Public Schools
 01
 Minatare Elementary Schools

Activity	100 Salaries	200 Employee Benefits	300 Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	400 Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	500 Computer Hardware / Equipment	600 Travel Professional Development	Total for Listed Activity
(See Instructions for Full Descriptions of Required and Permissible Activities)							
Intervention Project Manager (Required)	45,202	21,629				2,000	\$68,831
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(d)(1)(i)(A) replace principal	77,175	28,885				2,000	\$108,060
(d)(1)(i)(B) evaluation systems for teachers & principals	386	62				2,100	\$2,548
(d)(1)(i)(C) reward school leaders	25,800	4,128				5,625	\$35,553
(d)(1)(i)(D) ongoing professional development	59,221	24,148	4,800			10,985	\$99,154
(d)(1)(i)(E) recruit/retain staff with necessary skills	600	96				7,358	\$8,054
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(d)(1)(ii)(A) attract/retain staff with necessary skills							\$0
(d)(1)(ii)(B) institute a system for measuring changes							\$0
(d)(1)(ii)(C) mutual consent for hiring teachers							\$0
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(d)(2)(i)(A) use of data for implementing program	18,742	9,614		10,560			\$38,916
(d)(2)(i)(B) continuous use of student data			1,550				\$1,550
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(d)(2)(ii)(A) conducting periodic reviews							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(B) implementing schoolwide RTI model	1,656	265				200	\$2,121
(d)(2)(ii)(C) provide additional supports/prof. Development							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(D) technology based supports/interventions							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(1) increase rigor in secondary schools							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(2) student transition							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(3) increase graduation rates							\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(4) early-warning systems for at-risk students							\$0
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(d)(3)(i)(A) strategies to increase learning time	31,752	5,080					\$36,832
(d)(3)(i)(B) ongoing family/community engagement	2,502	400				700	\$3,602
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(d)(3)(ii)(A) partnering to create safe school environments							\$0

(d)(3)(ii)(B) restructuring the school day							\$0
(d)(3)(ii)(C) improve school climate and discipline			110			5,000	\$5,110
(d)(3)(ii)(D) full-day kdg or pre-kdg	41,344	23,435		3,250		2,000	\$70,029
Required Activities							
(d)(4)(i)(A) flexibility to increase graduation rates	1,288	206				300	\$1,794
(d)(4)(i)(B) ongoing, intensive TA/support						100	\$100
Permissible Activities:							
(d)(4)(ii)(A) new governance arrangement							\$0
(d)(4)(ii)(B) budget weighted based on student needs							\$0
Totals by Object Code	\$305,668	\$117,948	\$6,460	\$13,810	\$0	\$38,368	\$482,254

DO NOT ENTER INFORMATION IN THE BUDGET BELOW. IT IS DESIGNED TO TOTAL THE BUDGET FROM ALL 3 YEARS.

TRANSFORMATION MODEL COMBINED BUDGET FOR YEARS 1, 2, & 3 (2010-13)

NDE County District No.: 79-0002
 District Name: Minatare Public Schools
 NDE School No.: 01
 School Name: Minatare Elementary Schools

Activity (See Instructions for Full Descriptions of Required and Permissible Activities)	100 Salaries	200 Employee Benefits	300 Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	400 Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	500 Computer Hardware / Equipment	600 Travel Professional Development	Total for Listed Activity
Intervention Project Manager (Required)	129,252	61,768	0	1,000	0	6,000	\$198,020
Required Activities							
(d)(1)(i)(A) replace principal	220,675	82,595	0	1,000	0	6,000	\$310,270
(d)(1)(i)(B) evaluation systems for teachers & principals	1,158	186	0	0	0	6,300	\$7,644
(d)(1)(i)(C) reward school leaders	77,400	12,384	0	0	0	16,875	\$106,659
(d)(1)(i)(D) ongoing professional development	174,651	72,444	39,100	1,000	0	28,375	\$315,570
(d)(1)(i)(E) recruit/retain staff with necessary skills	1,892	303	0	0	0	22,074	\$24,269
Permissible Activities:							
(d)(1)(ii)(A) attract/retain staff with necessary skills	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(d)(1)(ii)(B) institute a system for measuring changes	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(d)(1)(ii)(C) mutual consent for hiring teachers	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
Required Activities							
(d)(2)(i)(A) use of data for implementing program	53,592	27,490	0	53,332	0	0	\$134,414
(d)(2)(i)(B) continuous use of student data	0	0	4,100	0	0	0	\$4,100
Permissible Activities:							
(d)(2)(ii)(A) conducting periodic reviews	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(B) implementing schoolwide RTI model	4,968	795	0	0	0	600	\$6,363
(d)(2)(ii)(C) provide additional supports/prof. Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(D) technology based supports/interventions	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(1) increase rigor in secondary schools	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(2) student transition	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(3) increase graduation rates	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(4) early-warning systems for at-risk students	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
Required Activities							
(d)(3)(i)(A) strategies to increase learning time	90,792	14,526	0	3,000	0	0	\$108,318
(d)(3)(i)(B) ongoing family/community engagement	7,155	1,144	0	0	0	2,100	\$10,399
Permissible Activities:							
(d)(3)(ii)(A) partnering to create safe school environments	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0

(d)(3)(ii)(B) restructuring the school day	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(d)(3)(ii)(C) improve school climate and discipline	0	0	110	0	0	5,000	\$5,110
(d)(3)(ii)(D) full-day kdg or pre-kdg	118,219	67,010	0	12,500	0	6,000	\$203,729
Required Activities							
(d)(4)(i)(A) flexibility to increase graduation rates	3,864	618	0	0	0	900	\$5,382
(d)(4)(i)(B) ongoing, intensive TA/support	0	0	0	0	0	300	\$300
Permissible Activities:							
(d)(4)(ii)(A) new governance arrangement	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(d)(4)(ii)(B) budget weighted based on student needs	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
Totals by Object Code	\$883,618	\$341,263	\$43,310	\$71,832	\$0	\$100,524	\$1,440,547