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Introduction
School Improvement Grants (SIG) are grants to states used to make competitive sub grants to school districts 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 students in their lowest-performing schools. In the SDE’s application for continuation funding from the USDOE in March 2015, it was stated that SIG funds would not be guaranteed for each school, but a rigorous review process will be applied to ensure that all schools have the opportunity to demonstrate progress toward the goals inherent in their chosen model.

This report will be used to assess the progress made by each SIG school over the past three years of SIG funding, and should be submitted electronically to Dr. Karen Anderson (kanderson1@alsde.edu) no later than August 5, 2015. A team of district and school leaders should work collaboratively to compile this report. Four components comprise this document: (1) School Information, (2) Report of SIG Metrics (from each school’s annual Leading and Lagging Indicator Report), (3) SIG Implementation Narrative, and the (4) SIG Continuation Funding Request Narrative.

Scoring SIG School Reports
Reports will be scored according to the following rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT COMPONENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MAXIMUM POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPORT OF SIG METRICS</td>
<td>LEADING AND LAGGING INDICATORS</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIN IMPLEMENTATION NARRATIVE</td>
<td>MODEL IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASSESSING QUALITY AND USE OF EXTERNAL PROVIDERS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALIGNMENT OF RESOURCES WITH INTERVENTIONS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MODIFYING PRACTICES AS NEEDED</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG CONTINUATION FUNDING REQUEST NARRATIVE</td>
<td>PLAN FOR USE OF FUNDS</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SIG School Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Name</th>
<th>DALLAS COUNTY</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
<th>MR. DON WILLINGHAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>BRANTLEY ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>LEA Contact Name</td>
<td>MRS. TONYA MILES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>AUDREY STRONG</td>
<td>LEA Contact’s Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MILSESTS@DALLASK12.ORG">MILSESTS@DALLASK12.ORG</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal’s Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:STRONGAL@DALLASK12.ORG">STRONGAL@DALLASK12.ORG</a></td>
<td>SIG Model Transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 1 – Report of SIG Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of minutes in the school day</td>
<td>9240</td>
<td>9240</td>
<td>9270</td>
<td>9270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Students completing advanced coursework (AP, Dual Enrollment)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Attendance %</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attendance %</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of 10th grade students that met the ACT Plan benchmark in reading and mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of students at/above proficient</th>
<th>Reading/Language</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARMT</td>
<td>ARMT</td>
<td>ACT/Aspire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>86.13</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69.45</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>86.48</td>
<td>62.86</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.77</td>
<td>84.78</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of students at/above proficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading/Language</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>83.73</td>
<td>77.42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69.45</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88.19</td>
<td>77.14</td>
<td>14.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.46</td>
<td>47.82</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Average Scale Scores on State Assessments in Reading/Language Arts and in Mathematics, by Grade, for the "All Students" Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reading/Language</th>
<th>ARMT</th>
<th>ARMT</th>
<th>ACT/Aspire</th>
<th>ACT/Aspire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>624</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>612</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>646</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>648</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Math**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>ARMT</th>
<th>ARMT</th>
<th>ACT/Aspire</th>
<th>ACT/Aspire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2 – SIG IMPLEMENTATION NARRATIVE

DIRECTIONS
In this section, state what your school has accomplished over the past three years of implementing your SIG model. Include celebrations and challenges experienced during the implementation period. Each of the five parts listed below should be included in your narrative in order to earn the maximum amount of points for your school’s report.

1. How has your district and school designed, implemented and documented interventions? Consider how your district and school:
   a. Assessed the engagement of stakeholders (staff, parents, community, etc.) to provide input into the design and implementation process;
   b. Assessed the scheduling of regular (at least biweekly) data meetings to identify school/teacher/student weaknesses and to adjust plans for supports to address those weaknesses;
   c. Maintained accurate documentation of meetings and communications using AlaStar and other means;
   d. Followed and/or revised schedules, goals, and timeline as needed, and
   e. Submitted all data/forms to the SDE or in AlaStar in accordance to timeline.

   • At Brantley Elementary, we assessed the engagement of our stakeholders (parents, community partners, and faculty) using school surveys, ICare monthly parental feedback forms, parental conference documentation, and regularly scheduled PTO meeting’s attendance. These are used to assess the culture and climate of the school. A suggestion box was also strategically placed in the office for stakeholders to place suggestions or complaints. The surveys were analyzed and the suggestions were addressed each month during the leadership meetings and/ or PTO meetings.

   • Data meetings were scheduled at the beginning of the year and given to each teacher. During biweekly data meetings, Global Scholar Pre/Post test data, classroom assessments, and DIBELS data were analyzed to identify school/teacher/student weaknesses. Adjustments and plans were developed to address results so that instruction could be differentiated to meet the needs of the students.

   • As a result of the analysis and dialogue among the teachers, “Reteach Friday” was incorporated into the schedule. During the period of time designated for “Reteach Friday” teachers provided instruction of non-mastered standards to specific students. Teachers continually reteach standards each day as students are formatively assessed during instruction, but “Reteach Friday” is dedicated to specific standards. Weekly grade level meetings (GLP) were used as a brief and pointed review of instructional goals, successes, and areas of needed improvement. The grade level chairperson was responsible for the topics to discuss, the sign in sheets, and minutes of the meeting. Documentation of meetings was included in AlaStar biweekly. The documentation of the leadership meetings; agenda and people present were added. The leadership meetings to discuss identified leading and/or lagging indicators were held biweekly.
• Data notebooks were maintained to track the progress of the students using Global Scholar, DIBELS, and classroom assessments. Notebooks were routinely brought to each data meeting in order to compare areas of success and needs both horizontally and vertically. Prior to each leadership meeting, sign in sheets and an agenda, which outlined the main topics of discussion and the indicators to be assessed, was followed and entered into AlaStar. Documentation of meetings was included in AlaStar biweekly. The documentation of the leadership meetings; agenda and people present were added. The leadership meetings to discuss identified leading and/or lagging indicators were held biweekly.

• Accountability Grades 3-6 Global Scholar Posttest Data 2014-2015

• ELA and Math Grade Level Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>ELA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>55.65%</td>
<td>59.45%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>66.65%</td>
<td>48.55%</td>
<td>56.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Global Scholar data indicates a deficiency in both ELA and Math for all accountability grades.

• The leadership team, revised schedules, goals, and timelines within the 30-60-90 Day Plan as needed. Upon review of the students’ progress, the staff met to determine the effectiveness of the strategies used to increase reading and math scores in all grades. If the strategies were not producing increased scores, revisions were made to the 30-60-90 day plan and immediately implemented in the classroom. Indicators in AlaStar were revised based on any relevant changes to the data school improvement goals. The indicators were discussed in the leadership meeting and if the team deemed changes needed to be made, (tasks added, changed) they were done so immediately and revisited in the next meeting.

2. Explain the process for recruiting, screening, selecting and monitoring the use of external providers to support your turnaround efforts. Consider how your district and school:
   a. Identified external providers based on each school’s SIG needs;
   b. Interviewed and analyzed external providers to determine evidence-based effectiveness, experience, expertise, and documentation to assure quality and efficiency of each external provider based on each schools identified SIG needs;
   c. Selected an external provider based upon the provider’s commitment of timely and effective implementation and the ability to meet school needs;
   d. Aligned the selection with existing efficiency and capacity of district and school resources, specifically time and personnel;
e. Assessed the regular (at least biweekly) communication with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school’s identified needs;

f. Assessed the utilization of multiple sources of data to evaluate the effectiveness of the supports provided;

g. Assessed the monitoring of records for quality and frequency of supports provided by the selected service provider(s); and

h. Assessed the in-school presence to monitor the interactions of the school administration, faculty, and staff with the selected service provider(s) to ensure the full implementation of supports.

In order to identify our external provider. We then looked at the list of external providers, their success with grant writing, and their successes with their clients. A roundtable discussion with all stakeholders was held to make a decision about the provider, before meeting with the external provider to write our grant. When assessing the list of external providers we looked at their evidence based effectiveness, experience, expertise, and skills they had to offer the schools/district. In order to monitor the effectiveness of the external provider, the primary consultant had to submit a weekly report to the transformational specialist. The transformational specialist met with members of the ITS team (primary and senior consultants) to discuss the percentage of growth, as measured by Global Scholar in order to make data supported decisions.

## Accountability Grades 3-6 Global Scholar Posttest Data 2014-2015

### ELA and Math Grade Level Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>ELA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>55.65%</td>
<td>59.45%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>55.65%</td>
<td>66.65%</td>
<td>48.55%</td>
<td>56.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Global Scholar data indicates a deficiency in both ELA and Math for all accountability grades.

**Summary Report - DIBELS Next**

District: Dallas County Schools

School: Brantley Elementary
Grade: Kindergarten  
Year: 2014-2015  
Need For Support: Former Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNF</td>
<td>Goal: Not defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>42.7 (19.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSF</td>
<td>Goal: 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>49.4 (23.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWF-CLS</td>
<td>Goal: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>55% at or above benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NWF-WWR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal: Not defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 45% at or above benchmark
- 41% below benchmark
- 14% well below benchmark
District: Dallas County Schools  
School: Brantley Elementary  
Grade: First Grade  
Year: 2014-2015  
Need For Support: Former Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LNF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWF-CLS</td>
<td>Goal: 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Test</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>84.1 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65% at or above benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12% below benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23% well below benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWF-WWR</td>
<td>Goal: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Test</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>22 (18.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54% at or above benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORF-Words Correct</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORF-Accuracy</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORF-Retell</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORF-Retell Quality</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary Report - DIBELS Next

District: Dallas County Schools  
School: Brantley Elementary  
Grade: Second Grade  
Year: 2014-2015  
Need For Support: Former Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NWF-CLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWF-WWR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORF-Words Correct</td>
<td>Goal:87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>79.4 (36.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORF-Accuracy</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>90.5 (16.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DORF-Retell</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td>18.3 (12.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>30% at or above benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19% below benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52% well below benchmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DORF-Retell Quality</th>
<th>Goal:2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Goal:238</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Tested</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>196.7 (102.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41% at or above benchmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the third year, the district made the decision to terminate its contract with Information Transport Solutions (ITS) due to increasing costs of the company; even though, test scores (Global Scholar and weekly classroom assessments) reflected an overall increase of 5%. ACT Aspire, DIBELS and Global Scholar data was used to assess the external provider’s effectiveness by the coaching support provided to each teacher.

3. Each district and school has additional resources to devote to the turnaround effort, in addition to SIG funds. How has your district and school aligned those resources with interventions? Consider how your district and school:

   a. Identified resources currently being utilized in an academic support capacity (ARI, AMSTI, etc.);
   b. Identified additional and/or potential resources that may be utilized in an academic support capacity;
   c. Assessed the alignment of other federal, state, and local resources based on evidence-based effectiveness and impact with the design of interventions;
   d. Assessed the alignment of other federal, state, and local resources with the goals and timeline of the grant (e.g., fiscal, personnel, time allotments/scheduling, curriculum, instruction, technology resources/equipment);
   e. Conducted regularly scheduled reviews of the resource alignment to ensure all areas are operating fully and effectively to meet the intended outcomes or making adjustments as necessary; and
   f. Redirected resources that were not being used to support the school improvement process.
• In addition to resources provided from SIG funds, Brantley Elementary School uses the following as academic supports: Supervisory Staff from Dallas County Schools, Reading and Math Interventionists, Instructional Coaches, Alabama State Department of Education SIG Site and On-Line Coach (AlaStar), Alabama Math and Science Technology Institute Coach, and Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI) Regional Coach.

• Additionally, the following resources will be utilized in an academic support capacity: Edivate PD 360 an on-demand professional learning resource that creates a highly personalized learning experience for all educators, Concordia College of Education students used as tutors and small group instructors.

• We assessed the alignment of resources with goals during data and leadership meetings by analyzing data from formative and summative assessments. The effectiveness of the resources was measured by pre and post assessments and instruction was modified as needed. Data from Global Scholar Assessments, ARMT and ACT Aspire, DIBELS, STAR Reading, and classroom formative and summative assessments were used to align our resources with our goals.

• We also assessed the alignment of other resources with the goals and timeline of the grant by creating curriculum guides and analyzing data collected from Global Scholar pre and post assessments, ACT Aspire, and DIBELS.

• Regularly scheduled reviews were conducted bi-weekly during grade level meetings, data meetings, faculty meetings and leadership meetings to determine that all areas are fully operative and effective. If the reviews revealed the resources were ineffective, the teachers were given an opportunity to defend or support the findings. Ultimately, changes were made if they were deemed ineffective.

4. No implementation effort proceeds without challenges. How has your district and school modified its practices to facilitate full implementation of the SIG model? Consider how your district and school:

   a. Identified ALSDE and/or district challenges that have slowed or halted the school improvement implementation process;
   b. Assessed, designed, and implemented a policy modification protocol that includes input that may include state and local education agency administrators, board members, and personnel; and
   c. Developed an ongoing process to assess areas that may be considered for policy and process modification that include, but will not be limited to:
      i. School administrator and staff hiring practices;
      ii. School administrator and staff transfer procedures;
      iii. Teacher-performance rewards; and
      iv. Altering the traditional school day and/or calendar to include additional instructional and planning time

• The only challenge that slowed the school improvement process was the loss of the external providers.

• A round table panel including stakeholders met to discuss solutions to the challenges. The district needs assessment was analyzed and weaknesses were identified. Initially, an external provider was secured to help write and attain the SIG grant.
• The loss of the external provider was one of the greatest challenges. As a result, department chairs were assigned to support their peers. Each department met to discuss ways and areas support was needed. As department, they participated in the “Shared Teaching Experience” where they observed each other’s instruction and provided feedback. The librarian, teachers and parents were used as an extension of technology support by using what they knew to offer assistance with programs or technical issues.

• Teachers are evaluated, in part, based on their performance in the classroom.

• A professional development plan is established based on in-class observations by the principal. In addition, teachers participate in on-going professional growth activities that will help them improve instruction and their ability to work with students, parents, and other colleagues.

• Decisions made concerning school administrator and staff transfer procedures are deemed by the Superintendent. Teacher-performance rewards were implemented at the school level, through Teacher of the Month Reward Program was created to award teachers for their willingness to do beyond the call of duty. Teachers also received awards based upon the percentage of student growth on the Global Scholar Series. Growth was determined by the pre and post test scores in each quarter. Teachers earned this award by achieving a 10% increase from pre to post test. This was given each quarter to classroom teachers only.

• The traditional school day was altered to incorporate a thirty minute block, in the morning, referred to as Extended Learning Opportunity (ELO). During this time, students receive intense remediation three days per week for Reading and Math only (Monday through Wednesday) and standards based enrichment classes two days per week (Thursday and Friday). Students completed interest surveys for class suggestions and then had the opportunity to select the class of their choice. The students rotated to a different class every nine weeks. These enrichment classes include cooking/nutrition, exercise, and photography.

5. What plans have been made to sustain your turnaround efforts? Consider how your district and school:
   g. Developed processes to assure effective training of school leadership staff to ensure the understanding and efficient implementation of interventions into operating flexibility of the school;
   h. Developed processes to assure effective training of school staff to ensure the understanding and efficient implementation of interventions into the classroom curriculum and activities;
   i. Identified alternative funding sources to sustain operational protocol that may require financial support;
   j. Identified meaningful professional development for school leadership and staff that support short-term and long-term initiatives of educational improvement;
   k. Demonstrated a commitment to the continuous development of teacher knowledge and skills to incorporate changes into their instruction as evidenced by an extensive action plan;
   l. Developed a process to embed interventions and school improvement activities in an extensive strategic long-term plan to sustain gains in student achievement;
   m. Developed an evaluation system to monitor strategic checkpoints and end of the year results and outcomes to inform and assist practitioners with problem-solving and decision-making that supports short-term and long-term educational fidelity;
   n. Developed a process to sustain alignment of resources with the school’s mission, goals, and needs;
o. Planned a growth model for both the fiscal and human capital within the district for implementation and sustainability of interventions and school improvement activities; and

p. Established and implemented accountability processes that provide effective oversight of the interventions, school improvement activities, financial management, and operations of the school.

- Brantley’s plans to sustain the school’s turnaround efforts include various funding sources. In order to sustain the special education teachers at Brantley, Special Education funds will be used.
- The Reading and Math Interventionists are being used to close the current achievement gap. Each student receiving intervention services are provided additional instruction in their areas of concern for both math and reading. Math and Read 180 are used for grades 5 and 6 for intervention. The instructional strategies utilized by the interventionists were being integrated in the classrooms by the teachers with assistance from the Education Management Organization (EMO). Additional personnel, librarian and counselor will also work with small groups during the morning.
- Capacity has been developed by the Academic Coach with the teachers in order to turnaround the instructional and intervention strategies. Support is also given within departments. Department chairs will provide support to the teachers and provide follow-up and feedback. Teachers continue to implement the strategies daily.
- The district plans to keep the interventionists using Title I funds to pay their salaries. Title I funds, grants, and corporate partnerships will help sustain the maintenance of the current technological needs and equipment.
- The process to sustain alignment of resources with the school’s mission, goals, and needs is evidenced in the Alabama Continuous Improvement Plan (ACIP).
- The funds allocated by the ALSDE are budgeted by the district and the transformational specialist works collaboratively with the school administrator on purchases and hiring practices.
- A needs assessment is conducted each year to determine the effectiveness of all external partners such as the intervention programs Read 180 and Math 180, as well as, observations of teacher instruction, practice, and interventions put in place. State and local assessment data is reviewed throughout the year to determine growth, gaps, strengths and weaknesses.
- From data gathered the Transformational Specialist works as a liaison between the school leader, and district leadership team to determine sustainability of interventions and school improvement activities. The Transformational Specialist also works with district supervisors to identify additional services to aid in transformational efforts.
- Non-negotiables are outlined by the district and school to establish accountability. This is a continual process where discussion and reflection take place between all stakeholders. Brantley’s non-negotiables are providing standard’s based instruction, differentiating instruction for those students not performing on grade level in both math and reading and offering enrichment classes to all students during Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO).
- Fiscal needs are also determined by a needs assessment where the district leadership team, administrators, school staff, Transformational Specialist, and Superintendent identify what will be responsible and effective resources to ensure sustainability.
SECTION 3 – SIG CONTINUATION FUNDING REQUEST NARRATIVE

In this section address, in a narrative below, how your district and school plans to utilize additional funding. Include a budget. If the school has not yet met its goals, particularly in the sections referenced above, state how additional funding will support this endeavor with regard to your ACIP.

The Vision Statement asserts that all students should leave Brantley Elementary prepared for the next level of education, socially, academically and technologically. The Dallas County School District in conjunction with Brantley Elementary and Southside High School plan to utilize additional funds based upon budgeting through the Electronic Grants Application Process (EGAP). Line items are the delineated into McAleer Solutions Educational software management system. The line items include instructional supplies, technology and salaries. Special education teachers, interventionist, , a Response to Intervention (RTI) facilitator, a Transformational Specialist, and an Instructional Aide are paid from continual SIG funding. These positions were written in the initial grant and therefore continue to be funded through SIG. The Transformational Specialist oversees the SIG funding and works collaboratively with the principal to provide guidance in academics in order to close the achievement gap. The RTI facilitator oversees the RtI process and guides the school in choosing effective intervention strategies. Brantley’s Instructional Aide provides daily standard based Handwriting Instruction. The Reading and Math Intervention teachers provide small group instruction to those students who score below proficiency in Math and Reading. The students receiving services have been identified through the RtI guidelines. Intervention teachers use Math and Read 180 as an instructional tool. Also included in the continual SIG funding are purchase services. Purchase services include, guest speakers for needs assessed professional development. Professional development items include fees for teachers to attend professional development teaching sessions, library and media resources, technology licensing fees, and educational applications. (APPS). All district and school-wide goals were met as indicated in the set grant goals. However, ITS was unable to be rehired during the third year of the SIG grant implementation due to lack of funding. When the SIG grant funding has been depleted, Title I, Special Education, and State foundations funding will be shifted, as needed to sustain all. This includes sustaining personnel, as well as, fourth year focuses. These focuses will be to be update technology in the computer labs. As computer labs are updated, the old computers will be moved into classrooms. The following is a list of technology equipment and software used to enhance student learning and allow students to become more technologically advanced: Class sets (K-6) NEO2, 2 Laptop carts with 30 student laptops each, laptops for all teachers, one to on iPad student initiative, Apple Education accounts for each teacher to purchase apps, document cameras, projector and screen for technology presentations, Promethean Boards for each class, digital cameras computers, scanners, printers, Discovery Education (Web-Based) and e-Books. Intense professional development has been provided for all teachers on integrating technology in their classrooms. The entire school is a completely wireless infrastructure. The Vision Statement asserts that all students should leave Brantley Elementary prepared for the next level of education, socially, academically and technologically. All of the technology provided for the students gives them the opportunity to succeed in middle school.

The school will continue to analyze the needs-assessment in order to continue to budget the funding in areas of most need. The continued SIG funding is not to supplant other funding sources, ie. Title I, Special Education, and State Foundation funds.