

ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants (SIG)

District Name: ___Shelton Public Schools_
County-District Number: ___10-0019___

Introduction

School Improvement Grants, authorized under Section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEA = Nebraska Department of Education or NDE), to local educational agencies (LEA = districts) for use in eligible schools that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students. Under the final requirements, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January 2010, these school improvement funds are to be used to implement identified Intervention Models in the persistently lowest-achieving schools identified as:

Tier I Schools means the five (5) or 5% (whichever is greatest) of all lowest-achieving Title I schools identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring plus any Title I served secondary school with a graduation rate of less than 75% over the three latest years that was not captured in the above five schools.

- For every year after the initial year, previously identified Tier III schools that have a Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant will be included and Tier I schools with school improvement waivers that are implementing the Turnaround model will be excluded.

Tier II Schools shall mean the five (5) or 5% (whichever is greatest) lowest ranked secondary schools where the “all students” group meets the minimum n-size for AYP that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds plus any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that has a graduation rate of less than 75% over the three latest years and was not captured in the above schools.

- For every year after the initial year, previously identified Tier II schools that have a Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant will be excluded and Tier III schools that fall within the bottom five (f) or 5% (whichever is greater of the pool of schools for Tier II will be included.

Tier III Schools means any Title I school identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I School and any school that is ranked as low as the Tier I and Tier II schools but has no groups of at least 30 students.

The procedure used to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools, including the definitions used, is found in Appendix A of this application.

If a district has a Tier I school, it must apply to serve that school or explain how it lacks the capacity to serve it. If a district has a Tier I and Tier II school(s), it may elect to serve schools in both Tiers, but if it elects to serve only the Tier II school(s) and not the Tier I school(s), it must explain how it lacks the

capacity to serve the Tier I school(s). If a district has Tier I and Tier III schools, it may not elect to serve only Tier III schools. Districts may submit applications that contain Tier III schools but all Tier I and Tier II schools in the state must be served, or demonstrate that districts lack the capacity to serve them, prior to any Tier III school being approved for funds.

Nebraska has applied for a waiver from section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA. This waiver allows Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to “start over” in the school improvement timeline. Nebraska has also applied for a waiver of the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit Title I schools to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

To ensure commitment and support, the Cover Page of the district application must be signed by the President of the School Board and the Superintendent or Authorized Representative.

The guidance from the U. S. Department of Education for ESEA Section 1003(g) grants provides the information needed for understanding the requirements, the four intervention models and should be studied prior to completing this application. The guidance is on NDE’s American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and the Title IA school improvement page at:

http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Title_1_Part_A_SIG.html

All district applications that are approved will be posted at the above cited locations within 30 days of being approved. Additional information on the ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants is also available on the U. S. Department of Education website at:

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>.

Use of Funds

In the Tier I and Tier II schools a district chooses to serve, the district must use these funds to implement one of these four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. Section 2 of this application contains the description of the four intervention models taken from the U. S. Department of Education guidance. This description identifies all the requirements to be implemented and some permissible activities for each of the four models. These are the only activities that can be funded with the ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants in Tier I and Tier II schools. Tier III schools that are Title I schools currently identified to be in school improvement, corrective action or restructuring can apply to use ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to implement one of these models or for other school improvement activities designed to support, expand, continue or complete school improvement activities approved in the school’s Title I Accountability Funds application. Tier III schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds can apply for these funds to implement a variation of the Transformation intervention model. This variation of the Transformation model allows, but does not require, a school to replace the principal or the staff (Sections A and C of part (1)(i) of the model as defined in this application. This is also indicated on the Action Plans.)

Districts must demonstrate capacity to implement the selected intervention model in the first year and fully implement the model within the three years of funding of these grants.

In addition to the requirements of each intervention model, Nebraska is requiring each school receiving ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to have a full-or part-time Intervention Project Manager. The intervention models are designed to turnaround a school and the requirements are numerous and specific. A school making a commitment to take on the major changes involved must have a person devoted solely to

managing and coordinating the process. The Intervention Project Manager must be experienced and qualified to lead the effort and must be an employee of the district or on contract to the district. The responsibilities of this person include: working with the school principal and district administrators to assist with coordinating implementation activities, conducting ongoing evaluations of progress, ensuring appropriate collection and management of data for reporting progress on the goals established for student achievement and leading indicators, and coordinating and reporting progress to the NDE. The costs of the Intervention Project Manager are to be included on the budgets for each school.

Available Funds

For the three year grants that begin in 2013-14, approximately \$2,645,000 are available from ESEA for these Section 1003(g) funds. Depending on future appropriations from Congress, the State should continue to receive similar ESEA amounts in future years. ESEA funds available now must follow the requirements of this application, which includes a waiver for use over three years –2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16.

A district may apply for the amount of funds needed to fully and effectively implement one of the four intervention models in a Tier I or Tier II school not to exceed two (2) million dollars a year for three years per school. There is a minimum of \$50,000 per year per school. This minimum amount is not required if a district can demonstrate that it can fully implement one of the intervention models with fewer funds. Applications must contain a budget for each of the three years identifying the costs of implementing an intervention model in each school. The NDE will award grants based on the proposals by school(s) within a district. This means a district could apply for funds for more than one school but may not be funded for all the schools included in the application. The amount requested may also be reduced based on funds availability. Districts with Tier III schools can apply for the same or a lesser amount of funds per school. However, the State cannot award a grant to a district for a Tier III school unless and until all Tier I and Tier II schools in the State, that are eligible and have the capacity, receive funds.

Continued Funding

While the application will be approved for the full three years, it must be reviewed and approved for continued funding each year. There are three considerations for approval for continued funding in years two and three that will be applied on a school level basis: (1) demonstrating progress in student achievement and leading indicators, (2) being on target, or close to, meeting the timelines identified in the Action Plans, and (3) spending the approved funds in a timely fashion. Each year's budget must reflect the amount of funds needed in that year. Budget forms are found in a separate EXCEL file at: http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Title_1_Part_A_SIG.html

Supplement, not supplant

ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Funds are supplemental funds (see pages 43-44 of March 1, 2012 USDE *Guidance on Fiscal Year 201 School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*) and as such must be in addition to the regular state and local funding provided to the school. Schools that are not currently Title I schoolwide projects must become a schoolwide project in order to implement one of the intervention models. A waiver that allows this is included in the application. The waiver also allows the planning for this application to replace the required year of planning for a schoolwide project.

Application Writing Assistance

NDE will provide meetings and/or conference calls to support the districts intending to apply. Districts are encouraged to review the Reviewers Rating and Checklist designed for application reviewers to ensure that all components are addressed. The Reviewers Rating and Checklist is found in Appendix B of this application.

Application Approval Process

Nebraska will convene a panel of NDE staff with experience and expertise in Title I and school improvement activities to review all applications. Each application will be reviewed and rated by two panelists. The scoring checklist is included as an appendix to the district application. Each school's application will be reviewed and rated individually. Districts may submit an application that includes an application for more than one school and may include schools from any Tier. To ensure that the schools with the highest need are selected, the following process will be used to determine the applications to recommend to the State Board of Education for approval.

After the panel has reviewed and rated all applications, the score from Section 1 District information will be added to the score received by the school for Section 2 School Information for a "total score". For applications containing multiple schools, the district's score will be added to the score of each school for a "total score" for each school. The schools will be rank ordered by the total scores. The highest ranking schools will determine the finalists, considering the amount of funds requested and the amount of funds available. NDE reserves the right to adjust budget requests, if needed, to increase the number of finalists or to ensure more equitable distribution of grants relative to size of school or geographic location.

Schools that are finalists must participate in a team interview with NDE staff either on-site or via electronic means. This interview is an opportunity for NDE staff to validate application responses and evaluate school staff commitment and capacity before making the recommendations for final approval.

Applications Timelines

Applications are due by midnight (Central Daylight Savings Time) on March 11, 2013 and should be submitted electronically to: randy.mcintyre@nebraska.gov. In addition, the district must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the district's authorized representative and the president of the school board to the address listed below.

Randy McIntyre, School Improvement Coordinator
Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
PO BOX 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509

Application Contents

The ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant application consists of

- Introduction
- Cover Page
- Section 1 – District Level Information
- Section 2 – School Level Information
- Appendix A – Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools
- Appendix B – Checklist for Reviewers
- Appendix C – Sample Budget Forms. The link to all Budget Forms is found at:
http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Title_1_Part_A_SIG.html

A completed application includes:

- A cover page signed by the president of the school board and the authorized representative of the district.
- Section 1. District Information
- Section 2. School Information (A Section 2 completed for each school in the application)
- Budget pages (EXCEL spreadsheet) for each school for each year of the grant
- A copy of each school's Profiles from the State of the Schools Report for the two previous school years.

ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

| | |
|--|--|
| District Name: Shelton Public Schools County/District Number: 10-0019 | District Mailing Address: 210 9 th Street Shelton, NE 68876 |
| District Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Shanna Bombeck Position and Office: Elementary Principal Contact's Mailing Address: P.O. Box 610 Shelton, NE 68876 Telephone: 308-647-6558 Fax: 308-647-5233 Email address: shbombec@esu10.org | |
| President of the School Board (Printed Name): Russ Muhlbach | Telephone: 308-216-0194 |
| Signature of the President of the School Board X _____ | Date: |
| Authorized Representative of the District (Printed Name): Brian Redinger | Telephone: 308-647- 6742 |
| 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 |
| Shelton Elementary | | | X | | | | X |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

PART B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION DISTRICT LEVEL

Analysis of Need and Capacity

Shelton Elementary is in year 1 of Title I School Improvement Status. In the year 2010-2011 68.86% of all students in grades 3-6 met the goal in Reading with one subgroup not meeting the goal. In the year 2011-2012 66.46% of all students in grades 3-6 met the goal in Reading with the same subgroup not meeting the goal. The state reading goal for last year was to have 78% of all students in grades 3-6 proficient on the reading standards. Shelton Elementary will be in School Improvement Status until all subgroups are able to meet the reading goal two years in a row.

Because of the status, Shelton will develop and implement a two-year plan to help the subgroup meet the goal. A committee will develop and submit a plan to the Nebraska Department of Education. The plan will include strategies to promote parent involvement as well as incorporate instructional strategies based on scientifically based research.

Comprehensive Instructional Reform Strategies

Shelton will design and implement intervention activities consistent with the final requirements of the models for Tier I and Tier II Schools. Shelton Elementary School is a Title I school in school improvement, corrective action, and will complete intervention A.3 turnaround model 8, which is increasing learning time and creating community oriented schools. Shelton Elementary establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time and provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

B.1.

The district will provide support to the school by employing an Intervention Project Manager (IPM). The IPM will coordinate the SIG process, and will work with the school's administration to improve the

effectiveness and sustainability of the school's Student Assistance Team (SAT) and Response to Intervention (RTI) processes. The IPM will also help to improve the school's methods of collecting and analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data to best inform all aspects of "schooling". This may include the selection and implementation of a system such as Datawise, to manage data and create standardized assessments.

Additionally, the district will support the school by providing the resources (program fees and costs, professional development costs) needed to effectively implement a wider array of Tier 3 interventions. The district will also providing the financial support to staff extended school times, to also be determined with the assistance of the IPM.

B.2. **Sufficient Human and Fiscal Resources**

Past History of Successful Reform Initiatives

School Identifies Improvement Efforts, Strategies, Resources, and Interventions

Shelton's district wide school improvement goal is **all students will improve vocabulary across content areas**. This goal was chosen because our data showed vocabulary to be very low in all grade levels. Interventions were then selected and put into practice. We are now in our fourth year in our school improvement cycle. We have collected data and made adjustments to our school improvement action plan as needed.

Current Improvement Efforts

Adopting Treasures Reading Program: One need that was identified at the beginning of our School Improvement Cycle was a consistent read program K-6. At the time there were several different reading programs throughout the elementary. This was a concern because reading instruction lacked consistency and cohesiveness. Updating the reading program has provided our students with that consistency in instruction, and it provides teachers with consistency in assessments. This helps with data collection and progress monitoring. All teachers were provided training for Treasures through staff development opportunities at our Educational Service Unit, as well as a representative coming to our school.

Also I the summer of 2009, Language Arts teachers worked with the staff at ESU 10 to develop our language arts curriculum. Our former curriculum was very old and outdated. We now have a current curriculum that is aligned to the new standards and we have a scope and sequence that allows instruction to flow smoothly.

ELL/ Title I Teacher: Shelton created a new position for an ELL and Title I teacher. The data showed that our ELL population was underserved. By creating this position, these students are able to get more one-on-one instruction. ELL students gained an additional 50- 90 minutes of ELL instruction each day.

Utilizing UNK Students: Shelton has developed a partnership with the University of Nebraska- Kearney. College students come regularly to help administer AIMSweb tests to our students. This allows us to assess more quickly and so we are able to monitor student progress more effectively and efficiently.

Renaissance Place: In 2008, Shelton purchased Renaissance Place, which gives us over 12,000 quizzes. Students have more books to choose from and teachers have more report options to help us better monitor student growth. Because vocabulary is a School Improvement goal, teachers also have the option to have their students complete vocabulary quizzes. The norm references have been updated on this new program.

Star Early Literacy: Another program that was purchased was STARS Early Literacy. This is geared toward our K-2 students, but it also helps ELL students as well as struggling readers, which are targeted populations at Shelton.

Pacing Guides: As we analyzed our data for School Improvement, it became very clear that we needed a different system for gathering data. One concern was that there wasn't a consistent testing system. We were giving the ITBS test at the same time, but STARS testing, AIMSweb, and all of our formative assessments were given at different times. Pacing guides were created to ensure that teachers were teaching concepts and assessing students at similar times. This also allowed us to consistently progress monitor students. This has helped us gather data on a regular basis and analyze it more effectively so that teachers can adjust instruction accordingly.

RTI Implementation: The data showed that we had a significant number of students reading below grade level. As a result, we implemented a 90 minute reading block which allows us to spend 45 minutes a day on whole group instruction and 45 minutes a day on small group instruction. This allows us to provide Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions to students.

Reading Interventions: We also have an additional 45 minutes built into our schedule that allows us to provide reading interventions (Tier 3) to those students who have been identified as needing intensive interventions. We use multiple sources of data to determine which students need an intervention. The data sources used are NWEA MAP Assessment, AIMSweb, Treasures Benchmark Assessments, and NeSA-R. Students are progress monitored weekly to determine if the interventions are working. Adjustments are made accordingly. Interventions that are currently used are Corrective Reading in grades 3-6, EIR (Early Intervention in Reading) grades K-2.

1. Corrective Reading:

Corrective Reading is designed to provide differentiated personalized instruction to each learner. It is a complete core program that uses:

- Two major strands and four instructional levels address a wide range of reading problems.
- The **Decoding** and **Comprehension** strands can be used separately as a supplemental reading intervention or combined for use as a comprehensive reading intervention program.
- Multiple points of entry and fast-cycle options appropriately address skill levels of students in Grades 4-Adult.
- Fully integrated assessments monitor progress and guide movement through the program.

Choose the Decoding strand for students who do not read accurately or whose oral reading is choppy, as well as for less fluent readers who lack comprehension when they read.

Select the **Comprehension** strand for students who need to develop vocabulary, background information, and reasoning skills that are the foundation of comprehension.

Features:

- Research-based direct instruction teaching model
 - Direct teaching of critical skills and strategies to accelerate progress
 - Frequent interactions between teacher and students to maximize time spent learning
 - Teacher modeling and demonstration to boost student confidence and success
 - Guided and independent practice and application to gradually transfer responsibility for learning
- Adequate practice and review to develop deep mastery of skills and concepts

2. Early Intervention in Reading (EIR):

Early Intervention in Reading is a program designed to provide extra instruction to groups of students at risk of failing to learn to read. The program uses picture books to stress instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, and contextual analysis, along with repeated reading and writing. In grades K, 1, 2, the program is based on whole class instruction, with additional small group instruction provided for struggling readers. Teachers are trained for nine months using workshops and an Internet-based professional development program.

Strategies for Further Improvement

RTI Implementation in Math: In 2011-2012 an RTI model was implemented for math. We have a 90 minute math block and an additional 30 minutes for math interventions for students needing additional Tier 2 and 3 support.

Corrective Math: Used in grades 3-6 for students needing additional Tier 3 support in math instruction.

Curriculum Development Schedule: Shelton has revitalized its curriculum development process. We completed curriculum development in language arts during the 2009 summer, math during the summer of 2010, science curriculum during the summer of 2011, and social studies will take place during the summer of 2013.

Staff Development: All staff was trained in the 2008-2009 school year in Treasures implementation. We had four full days of Program Specific Training provided by our ESU. We also contracted with our local ESU to provide monthly staff development training in Classroom Instruction that Works. The training was provided during the 2009-2010 school year and will be completed during the 2010-2011 school year. We will be working with the ESU to provide staff development in differentiated instruction during the 2011-2012 school year. In addition we partnered with the ESU to host Dr. Lee Jenkins from L to J Consulting, Inc. He provided two days of professional development to all staff members on utilizing the L to J method in their classrooms. A survey was distributed to the staff to get teacher input on what types of staff development training is needed once this 3 year plan is completed. In addition, we used our walkthrough data to identify staff development needs for our long term professional development

plan. Staff also participated in the Adolescent Literacy Project presented by Dr. Kevin Feldman and ESU #10. The focus of Adolescent Literacy is on explicit vocabulary instruction, student engagement, and comprehension strategies. Professional development in the area of differentiated instruction will continue for the 2012-2013 school year as teachers prepare differentiated courses.

RTI Committee: We have an RTI committee in place. The committee is currently in the process of developing a written plan that outlines our assessment protocol; procedures for providing Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention; and a process and timeline for data collection and analysis. The purpose of this written plan is to build consistency in best practices. The RTI Committee has also put a fidelity check in place. Teachers video themselves teaching a lesson. These videos are analyzed during monthly staff meetings where the core fidelity check is completed and discussed. The results are consistent research based instruction strategies occurring across grade levels.

HAL Committee: We have a High Ability Learners committee that meets monthly to monitor the progress of students who have been identified as learning above grade level. These students have an option to receive differentiated instruction within the regular education classroom or take part in accelerated classes designed to teach them at their instructional level. Decisions about a students ability to accelerate are based data such as NWEA MAP Assessment; NeSA reading, math, and writing; AIMSweb, Teacher nomination, and Parent nomination.

Credentials of Staff

Teacher Qualifications

The Shelton Elementary staff consists of a principal, 9 classroom teachers, a Title I/ ELL teacher, a Special Education teacher, a school psychologist, a shared speech pathologist, and shared P.E., music, and art teachers.

| Teacher Name | Grade Level | Years of Experience | Degree | Professional Development Attended |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------|---|
| Shanna Bombeck | Elem. Principal | 2 | MA | Write Tool, Saxon Phonics, Treasures Reading Series, Platte River Corridor Project, Six Traits, Curriculum Alignment, Quantum Learning, Gifted Ed., Classroom Management, State Writing Assessment Scoring, Fall Analytical Scoring, Using Primary Sources in the Classroom, Seven Strategies of Highly Effective Readers, Program Specific Training, Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J, |
| Lance Ellison | 2 | 1 | BS | Treasures Reading Series, Differentiated Instruction, L to J, Classroom Instruction |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|----|------------------------|---|
| | | | | that Works |
| Lori Glenn | K | 27 | BA + 36 | Write Tools, Saxon Phonics, Treasures Reading Series, Platte River Corridor Project, Six Traits Writing, DIBELS, School Improvement, Curriculum alignment, Quantum Learning, Gifted Ed, Classroom Management, A.R. Training, Character Counts, Science K-4 Boystown, Math Their Way, TACT- Technology Academy, Guided Reading |
| Kelsey Ostrander | Title I/ ELL | 1 | BA, ELL Endorsement | Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J, Treasures Lesson Maps and Templates, RTI |
| Krystal Jepsen | 1 | 4 | BA | Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J |
| Amy Altmaier | 2 | 29 | BA +39 | Write Tools, Treasures Reading Series, Saxon Phonics, Platte River Corridor Project, Six Traits, Quantum Learning, L to J, A.R. Training, Character Counts, RTI, Classroom Instruction That Works, Math Academy, Integrated Language Arts |
| Roxanne Talbitzer | 3 | 14 | MA | Write Tool, Saxon Phonics, Treasures Reading Series, Platte River Corridor Project, Six Traits, Curriculum Alignment, Quantum Learning, Gifted Ed., Classroom Management, State Writing Assessment Scoring, Fall Analytical Scoring, Using Primary Sources in the Classroom, Seven Strategies of Highly Effective Readers, Putting the Puzzle Together, Integrated Language Arts I, Integrated Language Arts II, Tools for Diverse Learners, Creative Training, Effective Instructional Practices, Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J |
| Lauren Ramsay | 4 | 5 | BA | L to J, Classroom Instruction that Works, Differentiated Instruction |
| Julie Wiese | 5 | 11 | BA +33 | Quantum Learning, L to J, Classroom Instruction that Works |
| Jenette Meyer | 6 | 9 | MA | Write Tools, Six Traits, School Improvement, Curriculum Alignment, Quantum Learning, REWARDS, Manilla |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---|----|---|--|
| | | | | Training |
| Jeanne Pope | K-12 Media/ 5th Grade English | 14 | MA + 18 | Treasures Reading Series, Platte River Corridor Project, Six Traits, School Improvement, Curriculum Alignment, Quantum Learning, Power School, A.R., Library Media Specialist Day, Love and Logic, SMART Board, RTI, Web Academy, From Fluency to Comprehension, Nebraska Leadership Conference for Assessment |
| Kelly Devorss | Speech Path. | 19 | MS/ Comm Dis | Saxon Phonics, Six Traits, DIBELS, School Improvement, A.R., REWARDS, Sound Partners, Autism/ Steps Training, PK-Results Matters Training, RTI |
| Jennifer Rumery | School Psych | | | Contracted through ESU #10 |
| Becky Roe | SPED | 4 | BS | Treasures Reading, DIBELS, classroom management, Corrective Reading, EIR, REWARDS, autism workshops, Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J |
| Matt Walter | P.E. | 4 | BA/ Endorsements in P.E./ coaching | Quantum Learning, Action for Healthy Kids Summit, NE Kids Fitness and Nutrition Day, Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J |
| Josh Hellerich | Art | 7 | BA + 21 | Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J, Differentiated instruction, Quantum Learning |
| | | | | |

Ability to Recruit New Teachers

Strategies To Attract Highly Qualified Teachers

*Mentoring Program for new teachers

*Embrace current research strategies

*Professional climate among staff

*Excellent media center/ technology

*Centrally located between Hastings, Kearney, and Grand Island

*Competitive Salary with surrounding districts

Support of Parents, Community, and Teachers Union:

Shelton Elementary has an active Parent Teacher Organization. We also are fortunate to have a positive working relationship with the teachers' association and have the full support of the classified staff for the improvement efforts described in this grant application. The parents and community are encouraged by this opportunity for improvement.

B.3. Shelton Public Schools does not have any Tier I schools in the district.

B.4. External assistance in improvement efforts will be provided by Educational Service Unit #10 in Kearney, NE. This provider is knowledgeable of school improvement efforts, state standards and accountability, curriculum development, professional development of staff, research based instructional strategies, use and implementation of data, and AYP requirements.

B.5. N/A

B.6. Currently Shelton Public Schools offers summer school assistance to students with an IEP that qualify for summer school. In order to qualify a student must show a regression that is greater than his/her peers. In an effort to increase the number of students that can qualify for summer schooling, Shelton Public Schools will need to utilize a classroom teacher to teach summer school to any student that would show regression that is greater than his/her peers which would open this option to any student who needs additional instructional time not just students with an IEP.

B.7. Shelton Public Schools is committed to creating system-wide changes to improve student achievement. We plan to involve all teachers, administrators, school improvement steering committee members, and ESU 10 Professional Development staff in this process. We have baseline data to show student achievement prior to the implementation of the transformation model. We will continue to collect data to evaluate the effectiveness of the initiatives. That data will be presented to the Board of Education on an annual basis. We believe that by increasing student opportunity to learn we will increase student achievement in the areas of reading and math. The data will support that the system-wide changes have a positive impact on student achievement and will therefore greatly improve the sustainability of the program.

B.8. The district must establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both Reading and Mathematics and the leading indicators in order to monitor schools that receive these school improvement funds. The chart below provides the minimum goal for each student achievement and leading indicator. The district may decide to accept these minimum goals or set higher goals. If Tier III schools are included in this application, the district will be held accountable for meeting the annual measurable goals established in the Title I Accountability Plan for Section 1003(a) funds or these goals if using the variation of the

Transformation model. If the district goal will be the same as the State goal, complete the district column with "Same".

| 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 at least zero). Progress is MET if a majority of the groups demonstrate an increase. | Same |
| 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 at least zero). Progress is MET if a majority of the groups demonstrate an increase. | Same |

Leading Indicators

| Leading Indicator | State Goals | District Goals |
|--|--|----------------|
| AYP Status (includes both Reading and Math) | Fewer NOT MET AYP decisions | Same |
| Graduation rate (high schools only) | Measurable increase from the previous year | |
| College enrollment rate (high schools only) | Measurable increase from the previous year | |
| English proficiency | Increase in percentage of English Language Learners that reach Levels 4 or 5 on ELDA (if applicable) | Same |
| Leading Indicators (includes dropout rate, student attendance, number and percentage of students completing advanced | Measureable improvement from previous year (or baseline for initial year of grant) | Same |

| | | |
|--|--|------|
| coursework (high school only), discipline incidents, truancy | | |
| Teacher attendance and teacher performance | Measurable improvement from previous year (or baseline data for initial year of grant) | Same |

| Statewide Average Change (2011-12 AYP Data) | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Group | Reading | | Math | |
| | Percentage Points | District Goal | Percentage Points | District Goal |
| All Students | 2.42 | 2.52 | 4.59 | 4.69 |
| Hispanic | 4.16 | 4.26 | 5.83 | 5.93 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 1.89 | 2 | 2.31 | 2.4 |
| Asian | .85 | .95 | 2.31 | 2.41 |
| Black or African American | 3.98 | 4 | 7.30 | 7.4 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | -3.01 | .5 | 2.70 | 2.8 |
| White | 2.12 | 2.22 | 4.35 | 4.45 |
| Two or More Races | 2.55 | 2.65 | 5.27 | 5.37 |
| Students Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch | 3.30 | 3.4 | 5.32 | 5.42 |
| Special Education Students | 2.58 | 2.68 | 4.39 | 4.49 |
| English Language Learners | 6.97 | 7 | 7.55 | 7.65 |

- B.9. A team was created to develop this application. The team responsible for developing the application consisted of Brian Redinger, Superintendent; Shanna Bombeck, Elementary Principal; Susan Evans, ESU #10 Professional Development Coordinator; and Kelsey Ostrander, Title I/ELL Teacher. The persons responsible for supporting the implementation of the intervention model will be all elementary staff and support staff.
- B.10 The pre-implementation costs that would occur for Shelton would be the cost of the summer program teacher and the program materials. A research based reading intervention is needed as well as a research based math intervention. One factor we will consider when purchasing these programs is that they are comprehensive meaning that they provide explicit instruction in multiple areas of reading and math. In addition to the intervention programs and materials, there would be a cost for the teacher(s) implementing the program.

The initial costs are outlined in year 1 of the budget proposal attached.

PART C. LEA-LEVEL BUDGET

A LEA-level budget is needed only if the district is requesting funds for LEA-level support for the school(s) to assist in implementing one of the models as identified in question B.1. above. LEA-level costs are allowable but cannot cause the entire application to exceed the established funding limitations (\$50,000 to \$2,000,000) per school and must clearly be LEA-level activities and necessary to assist the school(s) to implement one of the models.

- C.1 Describe the proposed activities, including the pre-implementation activities, and how the activities will assist the school(s) to implement, fully and effectively, one of the intervention models within the time period of this grant. See B.10 above for requirements, allowable uses, and evaluation of pre-implementation costs included in LEA-level budgets.
- C.2 Complete the LEA-level Budget (EXCEL Spreadsheet will contain all budget pages, for all three years, including a summary budget for the entire application. Appendix C contains a sample budget page for the LEA.) The link to all Budget Forms is found at:
http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Title_1_Part_A_SIG.html

PART D. ASSURANCES

The district assures that it will—

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

PART E. WAIVERS

Check each waiver that the district will implement.

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

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

Section 2. SCHOOL LEVEL INFORMATION

Complete a Section 2 for each school included in the application.

PART A. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION SCHOOL LEVEL

Each school must conduct and complete the Analysis of Need (A.1.). That information should be used to select an intervention model. Action Plans (A.2.) and Budget forms are designed for each intervention model. Applicants should duplicate forms as needed and delete unnecessary forms before submitting.

School Level Information for Tier III Schools

- Tier III schools that are Title I schools in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring have the option to use these funds to support, expand, continue or complete the plan approved for the school's Title I Accountability funds under Section 1003(a). These schools must complete the Action Plan (A.3.).
- Tier III schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds can only apply to use these funds for a variation of the Transformation intervention model. The school must meet all of the requirements EXCEPT requirements A1 and C1. The Action Plans note this option for these Tier III schools.

In addition to the requirements of each intervention model, Nebraska is requiring each school receiving ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to have a full-or part-time Intervention Project Manager (IPM). The intervention models are designed to turnaround a school and the requirements are numerous and specific. A school making a commitment to take on the major changes involved must have a person devoted solely to managing and coordinating the process. The Intervention Project Manager (IPM) must be experienced and qualified to lead the effort and must be an employee of the district or on contract to the district. The responsibilities of this person include: working with the school principal and district administrators to assist with coordinating implementation activities, conducting ongoing evaluations of progress, ensuring appropriate collection and management of data for reporting progress on the goals established for student achievement and leading indicators, and coordinating and reporting progress to the NDE. The costs of the Intervention Project Manager are to be included on the budgets for each school.

Prior to completing the school Level Information, it is important to read the Guidance provided by the U. S. Department of Education. The guidance for ESEA Section 1003(g) grants provides the information needed for understanding the requirements, the four intervention models and is on NDE's Title IA school improvement homepage at:

http://www.education.ne.gov/federalprograms/Title_1_Part_A_SIG.html

A.1. Analysis of Need

Perceptual Data:

*See student, Parent, and Staff surveys attached.

Complete the table below using 2011-12 data. Provide an explanation if any data is not available.

| 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 | .06% |
| (2) Graduation rate (AYP graduation rate for high schools only) | N/A |
| (3) College enrollment rate (high schools only) | N/A |
| Leading Indicators | |
| (4) Number of minutes within the school year | 68,640 |
| (5) Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools or dual enrollment classes (high schools only) | N/A |
| (6) Dropout rate (total for high schools only) | N/A |
| (7) Student attendance rate | 95.18% |
| (8) Discipline incidents (suspensions, expulsions as reported to NDE) | 1 |
| (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 | |
| (11) Teacher attendance rate (although this is a required Metric, districts do not need to report baseline data at this time) | |

- (a) Student Achievement and Leading Indicators – a review of the district data from 2011-2012 state of the school report shows that Shelton Public School has a declining enrollment. Twenty-five percent of the students are non-white. Shelton Public School is slightly below the state's average with 5.92% ELL students. The district Special Education percentage is also slightly below the state average with 14.47%. The percentage of who meet the poverty index that allows participation in the Nation School Lunch Program is 41.48%.

Reading test scores have been fairly steady in the elementary over the past three years; however, the test scores have not shown any measurable improvement. Shelton remains below the state average of 74.21%. In analyzing and breaking down the data by grade level, it appears that every grade has shown improvement except the 4th grade. That will be an area of focus and continued improvement.

Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) - Reading
 All students
 Percent Proficient

| All Grades | |
|-------------------|---------|
| 2009-2010 | 70.00 % |

2010-2011 64.21 %

2011-2012 70.10 %

Percent Proficient By Grade

| | Grade 03 | Grade 04 | Grade 05 | Grade 06 |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 2009-2010 | 64.71 | 78.26 | 61.90 | 72.41 |
| 2010-2011 | 67.86 | 60.00 | 76.92 | 47.62 |
| 2011-2012 | 76.19 | 57.14 | 77.27 | 73.08 |

Average Scale Scores: Range 0-200

| Level | | Grade 03 | Grade 04 | Grade 05 | Grade 06 |
|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| State | 2009-2010 | 101.01 | 103.84 | 101.08 | 101.38 |
| State | 2010-2011 | 104.41 | 109.01 | 107.65 | 108.81 |
| State | 2011-2012 | 108.66 | 111.62 | 114.26 | 112.59 |
| District | 2009-2010 | 101.76 | 104.48 | 91.57 | 100.14 |
| District | 2010-2011 | 97.54 | 94.15 | 107.58 | 88.38 |
| District | 2011-2012 | 110.57 | 96.32 | 107.09 | 104.42 |
| School | 2009-2010 | 101.76 | 104.48 | 91.57 | 100.14 |
| School | 2010-2011 | 97.54 | 94.15 | 107.58 | 88.38 |
| School | 2011-2012 | 110.57 | 96.32 | 107.09 | 104.42 |

Participation

| Level | | Students Tested | % | Students Not Tested | % |
|----------|-----------|-----------------|----------|---------------------|--------|
| State | 2009-2010 | 147,240 | 99.90 % | 145 | 0.10 % |
| State | 2010-2011 | 149,460 | 99.88 % | 175 | 0.12 % |
| State | 2011-2012 | 151,823 | 99.94 % | 86 | 0.06 % |
| District | 2009-2010 | 147 | 100.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |
| District | 2010-2011 | 167 | 100.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |
| District | 2011-2012 | 164 | 100.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |
| School | 2009-2010 | 90 | 100.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |
| School | 2010-2011 | 95 | 100.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |
| School | 2011-2012 | 97 | 100.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |

Math test scores have improved from 61.54% to 66.46%; however, Shelton remains just slightly below the state average of 67.39%. We will continue to work to improve this through the Response to Intervention Process.

Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) - Mathematics
All students

Percent Proficient

| | All Grades |
|-----------|------------|
| 2010-2011 | 67.71 % |
| 2011-2012 | 71.13 % |

Percent Proficient By Grade

| | Grade 03 | Grade 04 | Grade 05 | Grade 06 |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 2010-2011 | 67.86 | 61.90 | 88.46 | 47.62 |
| 2011-2012 | 66.67 | 64.29 | 86.36 | 69.23 |

Average Scale Scores: Range 0-200

| Level | | Grade 03 | Grade 04 | Grade 05 | Grade 06 |
|-------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| State | 2010-2011 | 103.49 | 102.64 | 102.67 | 100.35 |

| | | | | | |
|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| State | 2011-2012 | 107.84 | 106.36 | 108.48 | 106.09 |
| District | 2010-2011 | 100.61 | 95.05 | 118.12 | 77.19 |
| District | 2011-2012 | 105.05 | 97.61 | 120.18 | 95.58 |
| School | 2010-2011 | 100.61 | 95.05 | 118.12 | 77.19 |
| School | 2011-2012 | 105.05 | 97.61 | 120.18 | 95.58 |

Participation

| Level | | Students Tested | % | Students Not Tested | % |
|----------|-----------|-----------------|----------|---------------------|--------|
| State | 2010-2011 | 149,725 | 99.86 % | 207 | 0.14 % |
| State | 2011-2012 | 152,085 | 99.94 % | 92 | 0.06 % |
| District | 2010-2011 | 169 | 100.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |
| District | 2011-2012 | 164 | 100.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |
| School | 2010-2011 | 96 | 100.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |
| School | 2011-2012 | 97 | 100.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |

The School Improvement team members feel that Shelton Elementary the most effective intervention would be the transformation model. Shelton would benefit from an extended school year allowing students to received explicit instruction on skills during the summer months.

With support from ESU 10, we will put together a comprehensive, research based, summer program to provide extended learning opportunities for struggling readers. We will use data to determine which students will qualify for the summer learning opportunities, but the program will be designed to be more inclusive rather than exclusive in an effort to provide access to as many students as possible. A teacher or teachers will be trained in the program and a schedule will be created. Using data we will be able to measure the impact such a program has on student achievement in the area of reading.

- (b) Programs/Services Profile – Shelton Elementary will expand its summer school intervention opportunities for students who are struggling. The program will be a continuation of the reading interventions during the school year in an effort to accelerate the students’ rate of improvement over the summer in an effort to bring them to benchmark more quickly.

The staff that teaches the extended year program will be trained in the reading interventions and supervised by the Intervention Project Manager. The supervision, data collection, evaluation, and adjustment of this program will be some of the job requirements for the Intervention Project Manager.

(c) **Staff Profile**

The Shelton Elementary staff consists of a principal, 9 classroom teachers, a Title I/ ELL teacher, a Special Education teacher, a school psychologist, a shared speech pathologist, and shared P.E., music, and art teachers.

| Teacher Name | Grade Level | Years of Experience | Degree | Professional Development Attended |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---|
| Shanna Bombeck | Elem. Principal | 2 | MA | Write Tool, Saxon Phonics, Treasures Reading Series, Platte River Corridor Project, Six Traits, Curriculum Alignment, Quantum Learning, Gifted Ed., Classroom Management, State Writing Assessment Scoring, Fall Analytical Scoring, Using Primary Sources in the Classroom, Seven Strategies of Highly Effective Readers, Program Specific Training, Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J, |
| Lance Ellison | 2 | 1 | BS | Treasures Reading Series, Differentiated Instruction, L to J, Classroom Instruction that Works |
| Lori Glenn | K | 27 | BA + 36 | Write Tools, Saxon Phonics, Treasures Reading Series, Platte River Corridor Project, Six Traits Writing, DIBELS, School Improvement, Curriculum alignment, Quantum Learning, Gifted Ed, Classroom Management, A.R. Training, Character Counts, Science K-4 Boystown, Math Their Way, TACT- Technology Academy, Guided Reading |
| Kelsey Ostrander | Title I/ ELL | 1 | BA, ELL Endorsement | Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J, Treasures Lesson Maps and Templates, RTI |
| Krystal Jepsen | 1 | 4 | BA | Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J |
| Amy Altmaier | 2 | 29 | BA +39 | Write Tools, Treasures Reading Series, Saxon Phonics, Platte River Corridor Project, Six Traits, Quantum Learning, L to J, A.R. Training, Character Counts, RTI, Classroom Instruction That Works, Math Academy, Integrated Language Arts |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|----|--------------|---|
| Roxanne Talbitzer | 3 | 14 | MA | Write Tool, Saxon Phonics, Treasures Reading Series, Platte River Corridor Project, Six Traits, Curriculum Alignment, Quantum Learning, Gifted Ed., Classroom Management, State Writing Assessment Scoring, Fall Analytical Scoring, Using Primary Sources in the Classroom, Seven Strategies of Highly Effective Readers, Putting the Puzzle Together, Integrated Language Arts I, Integrated Language Arts II, Tools for Diverse Learners, Creative Training, Effective Instructional Practices, Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J |
| Lauren Ramsay | 4 | 5 | BA | L to J, Classroom Instruction that Works, Differentiated Instruction |
| Julie Wiese | 5 | 11 | BA +33 | Quantum Learning, L to J, Classroom Instruction that Works |
| Jenette Meyer | 6 | 9 | MA | Write Tools, Six Traits, School Improvement, Curriculum Alignment, Quantum Learning, REWARDS, Manilla Training |
| Jeanne Pope | K-12 Media/ 5th Grade English | 14 | MA + 18 | Treasures Reading Series, Platte River Corridor Project, Six Traits, School Improvement, Curriculum Alignment, Quantum Learning, Power School, A.R., Library Media Specialist Day, Love and Logic, SMART Board, RTI, Web Academy, From Fluency to Comprehension, Nebraska Leadership Conference for Assessment |
| Kelly Devorss | Speech Path. | 19 | MS/ Comm Dis | Saxon Phonics, Six Traits, DIBELS, School Improvement, A.R., REWARDS, Sound Partners, Autism/ Steps Training, PK-Results Matters Training, RTI |
| Jennifer Rumery | School Psych | | | Contracted through ESU #10 |

| | | | | |
|----------------|------|---|---|---|
| Becky Roe | SPED | 4 | BS | Treasures Reading, DIBELS, classroom management, Corrective Reading, EIR, REWARDS, autism workshops, Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J |
| Matt Walter | P.E. | 4 | BA/ Endorsements in P.E./ coaching | Quantum Learning, Action for Healthy Kids Summit, NE Kids Fitness and Nutrition Day, Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J |
| Josh Hellerich | Art | 7 | BA + 21 | Classroom Instruction that Works, L to J, Differentiated instruction, Quantum Learning |
| | | | | |

Area of Need: One identified area of need with regard to staff profile is a concern with staff turnover. Shelton Elementary has experienced high rates of staff turnover. A new staff induction program was created in an effort to provide support for new teachers and improve the quality of instruction. Staff retention continues to be an area of need. The intervention model selected will help meet this need by providing successful teaching experiences.

(d) **Curriculum/Instructional Practices Profile –**

Curriculum Development Schedule: Shelton has revitalized its curriculum development process. We completed curriculum development in language arts during the 2009 summer, math during the summer of 2010, science curriculum during the summer of 2011, and social studies will take place during the summer of 2013. Shelton utilizes ESU #10 Professional Development Staff to facilitate the curriculum development process.

Instructional Practices: The RTI committee has also focused on Core Instruction. The elementary principal conducts weekly walkthroughs designed to offer feedback and coach teachers on research based instructional strategies. Classroom teachers are videoed teaching a lesson and the instruction is analyzed in staff meetings using a Core Fidelity Check. Teachers receive feedback from their peers. The peers offer validations on sound practices observed in the classroom, and they offer one polisher that the teacher can work to improve.

Assessment Practices: Shelton Public School uses NWEA MAP Assessment, NeSA, and AIMSweb, and classroom assessments as data sources to drive instructional practices. The MAP and AIMSweb are given 3 times a year. After each benchmark session, staff analyzes data, and decisions are made about adjusting instruction as well as adjusting the instructional grouping of students.

Area of Need: Intensive research based interventions provided during the school year and also summer months to any struggling students in the area of reading and math.

(e) **System Profile –**

Shelton Elementary is currently a schoolwide Title I school. Our current schoolwide plan is designed to address the needs of all students.

Strategies Addressing the Needs of All Children

Through a process of collecting and assessing data, Shelton has chosen strategies that focus on helping our low achieving students. Shelton has adopted a problem-solving model of the RTI process. We have implemented a 90 minute reading block which consists of 45 minutes of whole group instruction, 45 minutes of small group instruction, and we have added an additional 45 minutes of reading intervention time. During small group instruction lessons are tailored to meet the needs of the students.

A variety of assessment tools are used to determine the level of intervention needed for all students. We analyze data collected from, NWEA MAP Assessment, AIMSweb assessments, Treasures Benchmark and Placement tests, as well as NeSA to assess all students. Students identified through these assessment tools as being below benchmark are progress monitored on a weekly basis. Depending on the level of need, students that do not achieve benchmark receive Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions. Students that are close to benchmark are also progress monitored weekly and receive a Tier 2 intervention to prevent them from falling below benchmark.

The type of reading intervention needed is determined through analyzing the assessment results. Once students are placed in an intervention, they continue to be monitored. After seven weeks the RTI team analyzes data to determine if the student is showing progress. If the team determines the student is making sufficient progress, the student will remain in the intervention. If the team determines the student is not making sufficient progress, the intervention strategy will be adjusted to better meet the student's needs.

Shelton created a new position for the 2008-2009 school year. The data showed that our ELL population was struggling with reading in all grade levels. Because of this, an ELL/Title I teacher was hired full time to give these students more instructional time in reading. Having this teacher on staff provides opportunities for reading interventions and math interventions for those students as well as providing those students with extra support in the classrooms.

School Improvement Efforts

Shelton Public School is in the process of analyzing data to establish new school improvement goals. Great focus has been placed on finding a quality data source that will give teachers multiple assessment opportunities throughout the year to monitor student progress and valuable information that will help teachers adjust instruction throughout the school year to better meet student needs.

This data collection piece will be essential in implementing the transformation model. The data collection and analysis will be used by the Intervention Project Manager, Classroom Teachers, Special Education Teachers, and Title I/ELL Teachers to coordinate implementation activities, conduct ongoing evaluations of progress, and collect and manage data for reporting progress to the NDE.

Area of Need: An identified area of need in the system profile is for an extended school year. The intervention model selected would help the school meet this need by providing programming needed to extend the school year for students who are identified as below benchmark or those that show more regression over the summer than their peers. This programming needs to be extended to students who are not currently on an IEP.

(f) **Processes and Involvement-**

A committee was formed consisting of Superintendent, Elementary Principal, Title I/ELL Teacher, and ESU personnel to complete the application process. This committee worked with the school improvement committee consisting of Superintendent, Elementary Principal, High School Principal, Guidance Counselor, Elementary Reading Teacher, Middle/ High School Math Teacher, Parent/Community Member, and Board member to analyze the needs of the school. The two committees worked in conjunction with one another because the school improvement committee was currently in the process of analyzing student achievement and perceptual data to determine school improvement goals and had already identified some areas of need. Representatives from each stakeholder group were represented in the creation of this action plan.

A.2. Action Plans

Shelton Elementary has developed an action plan in accordance with transformation model 3 listed in the intervention models from the USDE Guidance.

Required Activities:

1. Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time: A plan is in place to extend the school year and offer summer school opportunities to any students below benchmark or who would regress more than their peers over the summer. The Title I/ELL Teacher would continue instruction for 45 minutes 4 days a week on reading and language instruction to those students who qualify.
2. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement: Shelton conducts an annual survey to gather input from parents and community. Parent/Teacher conferences are also conducted twice a year in an effort to communicate with parents. In addition we plan to hold periodic meetings with parents and public to discuss current programming.
3. Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline: Students and staff also complete a survey annually. We analyze the data and use that information to make changes as needed to address school climate and discipline issues.
4. Expanding the school program to offer a pre-kindergarten program: Shelton Elementary is currently exploring the option of a pre-kindergarten program. We are assessing the need within the district for such a program and also exploring our options for housing a preschool program within the current building set up.

Completing the Action Plans

A.3. Action Plans for Tier III Schools

A Tier III school that is a Title I school in school improvement, corrective action or restructuring has an option to use the ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to support, expand, continue or complete the plan approved for the school's Title I Accountability Funds under Section 1003(a). If using this option, an Action Plan must be completed for each activity that the school is requesting funds.

The activities must be described with sufficient specificity for reviewers to see the connection to identified needs and the potential to produce outcomes that meet the purpose of these funds – to increase achievement and assist schools to exit the AYP improvement status.

| Tier III – Improvement Activities | |
|--|--|
| Activity | Utilize the Project Manager to assist with fidelity of instruction |
| Key steps | Project Manager will compile data and present to staff to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. The project manager will also work with Elementary Principal to ensure that effective explicit instruction is occurring in the classrooms. The project manager will offer feedback to the Elementary Principal on the quality of instruction. |
| Start Date | August 2013 |
| Full implementation date | August 2013 |
| Person(s) responsible | Project Manager/ Elementary Principal |
| Monitor and evaluate | Elementary Principal |
| Cost for three years | \$31,350 |

| Tier III – Improvement Activities | |
|--|---|
| Activity | Utilize Project Manger or Data Analysis |
| Key steps | Project Manger will collect MAP and AIMSweb data 3 times a year. They will compile the data and communicate results to teachers and administration. The Project Manager will also use the data to assist the classroom teacher with adjusting instruction to better meet students' needs. |
| Start Date | September 2013 |
| Full implementation date | September 2013 |
| Person(s) responsible | Project Manager |
| Monitor and evaluate | Elementary Principal |
| Cost for three years | \$61,700 |

| Tier III – Improvement Activities | |
|--|--|
| 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 | Summer school offered to any student below benchmark or showing regression greater than that of their peers over the summer. |
| Key steps | Provide a teacher to instruct the summer school program. Create a schedule allowing 45 minutes of instruction 4 days/week. Provide necessary resources and materials to support instruction. |
| Start Date | June 1, 2013 |
| Full implementation date | June 1, 2013 |
| Person(s) responsible | Brian Redinger, Superintendent; Shanna Bombeck, Elementary Principal; Kelsey Ostrander, Title I/ELL |
| Monitor and evaluate | NWEA MAP Assessment will be used to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of programming on student achievement. The program will be evaluated in the fall of each school year to determine effectiveness. |
| Cost for three years | \$50,500 |

| Tier III – Improvement Activities | |
|--|--|
| Activity | Utilize Project Manager to facilitate Shelton’s RTI process |
| Key steps | Project Manager will facilitate monthly RTI meetings. Project manager will set up and oversee the progress-monitoring schedule. They will compile progress-monitoring data and identify students not making adequate progress and report to teacher. Problem solve with teacher on ways to adjust instruction. |
| Start Date | August 2013 |
| Full implementation date | August 2013 |
| Person(s) responsible | Project Manager/ Elementary Principal |
| Monitor and evaluate | Elementary Principal |
| Cost for three years | \$220,450 |

PART B. BUDGETS

*See attached 3 year budget spreadsheet.

Appendix A.

Process and Definitions used in identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools

Definitions for Nebraska

School shall mean the school as used for the elementary, middle and high school designations for AYP. This does not include Rule 10 (Accreditation) Special Purpose Schools or preschools. Students being served in programs are reported in the school where they would be attending.

Secondary school shall mean any middle, junior high or senior high.

Number of years shall mean three years.

Graduation rate means the AYP Graduation Rate data from all secondary schools that is averaged for the three latest years.

Performance Rank shall mean the total number of students in the “all students” group at the proficient level in both Reading and Math divided by the total number of students enrolled a Full Academic Year (FAY as defined for AYP) in Reading and Math to determine a percent proficient for each school.

Progress Over Time Rank shall mean the total number of students in the “all students” group at the proficient level in Reading and Math for the three latest years divided by the total number of students enrolled a Full Academic Year (FAY) in Reading and Math for the three latest years to determine a percent proficient.

Weighting shall mean the performance rank will be weighted (multiplied by two) and added to the progress over time rank.

Final Rank shall mean the combination of performance rank and the progress over time rank. Persistently lowest-achieving schools (PLAS) Identification Procedure

Performance Rank

Using the most current data for all schools, add the numbers of students at the proficient level in Reading to the number of students at the proficient level in Math, then divide by the total number of students enrolled a full academic year (FAY as defined for AYP) in Reading and Math to get a percent proficient. Rank the schools by this percent proficient for a performance rank.

Progress Over Time Rank

For the latest three years, add the number of students at the proficient level in Reading and Math, then divide by the number of students enrolled a full academic year (FAY) for

both Reading and Math for all three years to find a percent proficient. Rank the schools by this percent proficient for a progress over time rank.

Final Rank to Determine the Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

The performance rank is doubled before adding to the progress over time rank. Schools are then ranked to determine a final rank and the five or 5% (whichever is greater) schools are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in each Tier.

Graduation Rate

Using the AYP graduation data for all high schools in the state for the last three years, calculate a PLAS graduation rate using the AYP formula.

