

**SD GEARUP and SDCACG Grant Concerns**  
**Meeting with SD DoE and MCEC**  
**April 10, 2012**  
**Pierre, SD**

1. In the SDGEARUP grant agreement Mid Central is referred to as a grant partner, but the Project Director refers to Mid Central as a contractor. **Please clarify MCEC role as a partner or a contractor.** *Relevance?*
2. **Besides responding to financial questions from the SD DOE, the SDGEARUP and SDCACG grant staffs are not in any way participating in the decision-making or grant management process.** At this point the grant staff for both SDGEARUP and SDCACG are not part of primary decision-making process for either of these two grants. The only project management input that the staff has is when it comes time to answer questions while the bills are reviewed. *What participation do they think they're entitled to?*
3. The award letter from the US Department of Education for the GEARUP grant was received by South Dakota on or around September 29, 2011. **A contract to fully implement the SDGEARUP grant and authorize the managing partner to contract and disperse grant funds to partner schools or other entities was not returned to Mid Central until after March 20, 2012.** Mid Central and AIII have *?* fronted over \$500,000 to operate the program at a basic level. The State has had authority to drawdown grant funds for over six months.
4. The award letter for the SD College Access Challenge Grant was received in South Dakota on or around September 2, 2011. **Signed SDCACG contracts were not received back to the managing entities until after February 17, 2012.** Activities were initiated, however distribution of funds to partners did not occur until January 12, 2012. Mid Central and AIII have fronted approximately \$450,000 to operate the SDCACG program even though grant funds were available six months ago.
5. **The Annual Progress Report for the first grant year of SD GEARUP is due on April 16, 2012.** Since grant funds were not given authorization to be dispersed by a contract earlier in the project year, the APR will highlight very significant issues. The very low level of funds draw down combined with narrative and data from the APR,

will raise an alert with the Project Officer. On February 2, 2012, the SDGEARUP Project Officer sent an email expressing concerns over the low grant drawdowns.

6. The evaluator selection process for SDGEARUP was not posted until March 2, 2012 and the due date for the evaluator RFP's was listed as April 2, 2012. **The selection process, criterion, and timelines for the project coordinator were completely unknown to any of the SDGEAUP or Mid Central staff.** The fact that we have not a hired project evaluator for SD GEARUP will have an adverse effect on the APR and this will be listed as another significant deficiency of the project.
7. Out of \$3,484,736 SDGEARUP grant funds for project year 1, as of Thursday April 5, 2012, only \$300,000 has been authorized for reimbursements, and potentially another \$200,000 is under review. **Seven months into the SD GEARUP project we have over 85% of the year 1 grant funds that are unspent.**
8. **There have been no meetings between the SDGEARUP Project Director and the SDGEARUP grant staff.** The SDGEARUP project staff is attempting to implement the work plan that was submitted to the US Dept of Ed on November 1, 2011, but all requests and suggestions for project meetings have been disregarded.
9. **We need to have a clear understanding for what documentation is needed from partner schools.** <sup>OK</sup> We currently contract with schools to provide a site coordinator and a summer program. We ask for a workplan so that we can see what they plan to implement. We need to have an understanding if we are going to make all schools send in everything that they expend money on or if we are paying them to provide a service. We rely upon the established school-level fiduciary policies, safeguards, and personnel to manage, document, and account for the SDGEARUP mini-grants that are provided to schools.
10. There was a review of the grant evaluation and Final APR for SDGEARUP grant 2005-2011 in which it appears that BIE Tribal School data was accessed and reviewed under the pretenses of this review. The SDGEARUP project staff has a deep appreciation for the fragile relationship that have been initiated between the State Department of Education and Tribal grant schools and their corresponding Tribes. **SDGEARUP staff developed a proposal with no direct intent of overstepping**

**the fragile boundaries that exist between BIE Tribal Grant schools and the State Dept. of Education.**

**11. It appears there is a desire by the Project Director of SDGEARUP to use school wide test data as a form of evaluation of the SDGEARUP program.** It should be stated that the new SDGEARUP grant has an evaluation plan that received a perfect score in the proposal review process does not require the grant to collect school-wide data. This is a very drastic change in scope in regards to the evaluation plan and what the schools are expecting. If the State intends to require the schools that are participating in SDGEARUP (including BIE Tribal schools) to turnover data use and access, then a transparent data use plan should be presented to each of the local school administrators and school boards so they can make an informed decision to participate in the program.

**12. The Project Director has now initiated a process to gain access to BIE Tribal School data.** I believe that if we wanted to do this as a project the more cordial thing to do would have been to approach each of the schools individually and request this. It would be difficult to do so, as the new GEARUP grant does not specify that this is required. The new evaluation plan states that the individual partner schools will provide or upload their students' data. This will avoid the challenging data access issues.

**13. The SDCACG program did not identify over \$226,000 (approximately \$139,000 from Career and Technical Education Contract and approximately \$88,000 from Office of Indian education budget) in unspent carryover funds from year 1.** It seems as if there is an extended time line to spend these funds, however since they are grant funds they can only be spent on one of 5 authorized grant activities. It was agreed upon that we would allocate any and all carryover from the grant to need based scholarships for the students from the partner schools. The Project Director's latest decision to allocate \$100,000 of the over \$226,000 to scholarships. **It is not certain what the rest of the SDCACG carryover funds are being earmarked for. Moreover, did the Project Officer approve an official carryover request that SDCACG made regarding these funds?**



Close



OMB Approval No: 1840-0777  
ExpirationDate: 2/28/2010

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Program**  
**(GEAR UP)**  
**Annual Performance Report for Partnership and State Projects**

Cover Sheet

<b>1. PR/Award Number:</b>	P334S110022
<b>2. Name of Grantee</b>	South Dakota Department of Education
<b>3. Address:</b>	800 Governors Drive Pierre, SD 57501
<b>4. Name of Project Director/Contact Person:</b>	Roger Campbell
<b>Phone Number:</b>	( 605 ) 773 - 3783
<b>Fax Number:</b>	( 605 ) 773 - 3783
<b>E-Mail Address:</b>	Roger.Campbell@state.sd.us
<b>5. Name of Certifying Official:</b>	Melody Schopp
<b>Phone Number:</b>	( 605 ) 773 - 3134
<b>E-Mail Address:</b>	melody.schopp@state.sd.us
<b>6. Reporting Period:</b>	09/20/2011 to 03/31/2012

We certify that to the best of our knowledge, the information reported herein is accurate and complete.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Project Director (Print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Certifying Official (Print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature and Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature and Date

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1840-0777. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 35 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data sources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. **If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to:** U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651. **If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of the form, write directly to:** The GEAR UP Program, U.S. Department of Education, 1990 K Street, N.W., Suite 6101, Washington, DC 20006-8524.

## **SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. Please provide a brief description (1-2 pages) of the current status of your project. Describe the extent to which you have implemented all program activities and components planned for this reporting period. Highlight your major outcomes, successes, and concerns.

The overarching goal of the South Dakota GEAR UP program (SDGU) is to significantly increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education. Over a 7-year period, SDGU will offer (A) foundational services to students in all grade levels (6<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade), (B) grade-specific enhancements in middle school, (C) middle to high school transition enhancements, (D) high school enhancements, (E) grade-specific enhancements for the high school to post-secondary transition, (F) professional development services, and (G) services for parents.

In its first year, SDGU laid the groundwork to bring these services to our priority students. The program successfully recruited and hired 13 staff members, providing them with introductory training on program goals, objectives, and services. A resource guide and activities manual was distributed. Participating school superintendents/principals have been contacted and sent partner agreements.

Overall, SDGU activities are partially implemented, with implementation levels varying between schools. IHE representatives/recruiters from schools such as South Dakota State (SDSU), Black Hills State (BHSU), Northern State (NSU), and Mitchell Technical Institute (MTI) have given presentations and spoken with high school students, and students have also traveled to campuses at SDSU, BHSU, NSU, Lake Area Technical Institute, Haskell Indian Nations University, and Bismarck State College. Other highlights during year 1 included presentations at St. Francis Indian School by professionals from the engineering, education, trade, and other fields; the development of a drug free ad by students at Takini Middle School (who then visited KGFX radio in Pierre to record the announcement); and student participation in a NASA Star Lab activity and completion of rocketry projects at Takini High School. SDGU has reached into the community, providing talk radio show broadcasts on KILI radio—The Voice of Lakota Nation. These broadcasts include information on the benefits of college and interviews with current college students and alumni of the GEAR UP Honors program. In addition, SDGU hosted a booth and provided an interactive panel discussion at the Lakota Nation Invitational Tournament called “Beyond the Game.” The two-week middle school summer program and six-week GEAR UP Honors summer residential program will be held this upcoming summer.

The GEAR UP partnership continues to be strong, and the program is collaborating with several initiatives that focus on serving students in Indian Country. These include the South Dakota College Access Challenge Grant, *Wakan Gli*, and *Woonspe Tiospaye* programs. Together, these programs offer a set of complimentary services that focus on developing the academic skills and knowledge of our secondary students.

In terms of program evaluation, the South Dakota Department of Education released a request for proposal to the public for the independent external evaluator position in March of 2012. The application closing date was in April 2012, and the Department is currently reviewing submissions. A contract with Xcalibur, Inc.—the vendor who will provide the online longitudinal data system for SDGU schools—was signed in March, and the program is currently making preparations to begin implementing the system in schools.

## Successes

**Challenges** Several factors have presented challenges to the SDGU project, including the institutional diversity of participating schools (public, parochial, Tribally administered, and Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) administered) and geographic distance between them and program partners. **Others?**

## SECTION II: NARRATIVE INFORMATION

1. The mission of the GEAR UP program is to significantly increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education. Briefly describe how your project is furthering the mission of the GEAR UP program. Specifically, address how your project is: a) improving academic performance of students in the GEAR UP cohort; b) increasing educational expectations of participating students and their parents; c) improving student and family knowledge regarding postsecondary education preparation and financing; and d) working to improve high school graduation and college enrollment rates.

The goal of the SDGU program is to significantly increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education. SDGU follows 3 objectives, which directly address the 4 items listed above. Objective 1 is to increase the academic performance and preparation for post-secondary education of GEAR UP students. This addresses item a). Objective 2 is to increase the rate of high school graduation and participation in post-secondary education for GEAR UP students. This addresses item d). Objective 3 is to increase the educational expectations of GEAR UP students, and increase student and family knowledge of post-secondary education options, preparation, and financing. This addresses items b) and c). To achieve its objectives, SDGU is implementing (A) foundational services to all grade levels, (B) grade-specific enhancements in middle school, (C) middle to high school transition enhancements, (D) high school enhancements, (E) grade-specific enhancements for the high school to post-secondary transition, (F) professional development services, and (G) services for parents.

A significant portion of SDGU's efforts in year 1 has been directed towards building the foundation for and capacity to begin implementing these services. SDGU has, for example, successfully recruited and hired the Assistant Project Coordinator, 5 Regional Coordinators, the Partner Coordinator, the Dissemination and Community Coordinator, and the Budget Specialist. A training session was held in October 2011 (in Rapid City, SD) for all new staff members, covering program goals and objectives, program services, and the software packages utilized. In terms of stakeholder meetings, SDGU hosted a kick off event in November 2011 (in Chamberlain, SD) that brought together all staff and stakeholders, informing them of program goals, activity implementation, and other program requirements. The first semi-annual site team meeting was also held at this time, and staff were provided with a resource guide and activities manual. Participating school superintendents/principals have been contacted and sent partner agreements to solidify their participation in the program.

Overall, SDGU activities are partially implemented, with implementation levels varying between schools. Progress within each of the categories outlined above is as follows:

### A. Foundational Services (grades 6-12)

#### A1. Advanced curriculum (grades 6-12) [Obj. 1, 2].

Description. The existing curriculum at participating schools is being enhanced, offering participants in grades 6-12 rigorous acceleration-based college preparatory coursework.

Status. Activities are ongoing, with implementation levels varying between schools. Curriculum binders have been deployed to participating schools.

#### A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (grades 6-12) [Obj. 1, 2].

Description. Academic support is offered through tutoring before or after school at least twice a week during the school year.

Status. Activities are ongoing, with implementation levels varying between schools. Tutoring services have, for example, been offered at Cheyenne-Eagle Butte School, St. Francis Indian School, Takini High School, Tiospa Zina Tribal School, Todd County High School, and Wakpala High School.

A3. Mentoring and advising (grades 6-12) [Obj. 1, 2, 3].

Description. Middle school mentoring is offered to grades 6-8, transition mentoring to grade 9, Graduation Coaches during high school, and additional mentoring from the program's returning Scholars.

Status. Activities are ongoing, with implementation levels varying between schools. Comprehensive mentoring activities have been offered at Cheyenne-Eagle Butte School, Lower Brule Day School, Takini High School, and Todd County High School.

A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (grades 6-12) [Obj. 1, 2].

Description. Prescriptive catch-up services are provided to academically struggling students after school or during the summer through applications such as CGI and Reading Plus.

Status. Activities are ongoing, with implementation levels varying between schools.

B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School (grades 6-8)

B1. Counseling, advising, academic, and career planning (grade 8) [Obj. 1, 2, 3].

Description. Students utilize the online software package Career Cruising or SDMyLife and meet with counselors one-on-one each semester to review grades and assessment scores and make adjustments to their personal learning plans.

Status. Activities are ongoing, with implementation levels varying between schools. Students have been introduced to and begun utilizing the Career Cruising application, and are creating personal learning plans with the assistance of counselors.

B2. Two-week middle school summer program (grades 6-8) [Obj. 1, 2].

Description. SDGU youth will engage in and reexamine their coursework from multiple perspectives via field trips, hands on activities, and other techniques during the summer program.

Status. This activity will be held in the summer of 2012.

C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements (grades 8-9).

C1. Middle to high school transition program (grade 9) [Obj. 1, 2].

Description. This transition program utilizes roaming teachers to offer a high school experience within the middle school. It will be pilot-tested in up to 4 of the SDGU schools.

Status. This activity is currently in the planning stage. It is anticipated that the activity will begin implementation in the fall of 2012.

D. High School Enhancements (grades 9-12).

D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (grades 9-12) [Obj. 1, 2].

Description. Eligible students will have the opportunity to participate in the summer 6-week GEAR UP Honors Program, immersing them in a rigorous acceleration-based college preparatory curriculum. The program includes a science fair, Academic Olympics, SEMAA (Science, Engineering, Mathematics, and Aerospace Academy), a daily seminar, field trips, etc.



Status. This activity was hosted at the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology under the previous GUSD program. All planning is complete and ready for implementation in June 2012.

D2. Graduation Coaches (grades 9-12) [Obj. 1, 2, 3].

Description. Graduation Coaches supply or supervise the majority of high school services, including mentoring, tutoring, career exploration and planning, college planning, financial aid workshops, etc. It is estimated that Coaches will be assigned to small groups of students of 40 or less.

Status. SDGU is in the process of identifying and hiring Graduation Coaches

D3. ACT/SAT preparation (grades 9-12) [Obj. 1, 2].

Description. The DIAL Virtual School provides ACT and SAT preparation through a virtual high school.

Status. This activity is ongoing, with implementation levels varying between schools. ACT preparation courses were offered at St. Francis Indian School, Wakpala High School, and Tiospa Zina Tribal School. The Digital Dakota Network (DDN) and South Dakota Virtual High School (SDVHS) systems are available in all participating schools, providing both technological tools and course content for distance learning.

D4. Career exploration and planning (grades 9-12) [Obj. 1, 2, 3].

Description. High school students continue to utilize the Career Cruising (now called SDMyLife) application, as well as participate in career and college fairs, visit local businesses, and attend professional guest lectures.

Status. The SDMyLife software is available in all participating schools, and students have been introduced to the package. Students also participated in job shadowing activities. Students from Takini High School, for example, volunteered at local/school sporting events, where they worked at the concession stand, assisted coaches, and took photos for the yearbook. In terms of presentations, SDGU hosted an interactive panel discussion at the Lakota Nation Invitational Tournament called "Beyond the Game," which brought various speakers in (including Director of the BIE, Mr. Keith Moore) to encourage high expectations in academics and athletics and discuss how they can benefit one another. SDGU also offers talk radio show broadcasts on KILI radio that cover topics applicable to many SDGU activities (e.g., interviewing State educational administrators, former students, counselors on topics such as scholarships, FAFSA, programming, etc.).

D5. College planning (grades 9-12) [Obj. 1, 2, 3].

Description. With the support of Graduation Coaches, students address educational pathways to specific careers, college admission requirements, financial requirements, college curriculums, and course planning.

Status. Activities are ongoing, with implementation levels varying between schools. For example, students from St. Francis Indian School participated in both a college action planning workshop and State webinar on college planning, and students from Todd County High School participated in career/college planning days event in Pierre, SD.

D6. Financial aid workshops, opportunities for Federal financial aid (grades 9-12) [Obj. 2, 3].

Description. SDGU works with the South Dakota College Access Challenge Grant to provide financial aid workshops. Lakota Funds also offers Individual Development Accounts (IDA).

Status. Workshops addressing financial aid have been held at Crazy Horse MS, Crow Creek Sioux Tribal High School, Enemy Swim Day School, Lower Brule Day School, Marty Indian School, St. Francis High School, Tiospa Zina Tribal School, Todd County High School, and Wakpala High School. In collaboration with the South Dakota College Access Challenge Grant (SDCAC) program, 719 seniors have completed the Free Application for Federal Student Aid application. Lakota Funds activities are anticipated to start in the 2012-2013 academic year.

D7. College visits and student shadowing (grades 11-12) [Obj. 2, 3].

Description. Students have the opportunity to experience college life first-hand, receive academic advising and financial aid planning services, meet with college advisors and mentors, and shadow college students.

Status. IHE representatives/recruiters from schools such as South Dakota State (SDSU), Black Hills State (BHSU), Northern State (NSU), and Mitchell Technical Institute (MTI) gave presentations and spoke with high school students, and students also traveled to campuses at SDSU, BHSU, NSU, Lake Area Technical Institute, Haskell Indian Nations University, and Bismarck State College.

D8. 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholar Certificates (grade 12).

Description. Certificates will be presented to each student, disclosing all Federal financial aid that the student has qualified for as well as the estimated amount of any scholarship provided.

Status. Certificates will be presented when students from the first group graduate from high school in May of this year.

E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition (grade 12-freshman)

E1. Dual/concurrent enrollment program (grade 12) [Obj. 1, 2].

Description. In cooperation with IHE partners, high school seniors have the opportunity to complete college coursework.

Status. The dual enrollment program is in the planning stages. College coursework is currently available in all participating schools via the SDVHS.

E2. College orientation and transition (Pre-Freshman year) [Obj. 2].

Description. College orientation activities will be offered at participating IHEs to help incoming freshman transition to college life, familiarizing students with institutional support services and policies, campus facilities, etc.

Status. Post-secondary SDGU services have not been provided to students. It is anticipated that these will be offered in the upcoming year, once SDGU students graduate from high school.

E3. First-year college services (Freshman year) [Obj. 2, 3].

Description. Graduation Coaches will host GEAR UP sponsored events at partner IHE campuses and will meet with students one-on-one and assist them with finding individualized supports.

Status. As noted, post-secondary SDGU services have not been provided to students.

F. Professional Development

F1. Teachers (grades 6-12).

Description. Teachers are provided with professional development services in a number of areas, including improving classroom management skills, learning to teach to different learning styles, motivating and engaging students, assessing student

performance, developing organizational and time management skills, and connecting academic theories and teaching methods to classroom practice.

Status. Professional Development sessions for teachers have been held Lower Brule Day School and included classroom management, teaching low-income, high-need students, and differentiated learning.

F2. Graduation Coaches (grades 9-12).

Description. Professional development is offered to Graduation Coaches in the areas of rural education, college planning, and one-on-one counseling.

Status. Graduation Coach training session will be held in the early fall of 2012.

G. Parents

G1. Workshops, meetings, and mailings (grades 6-12) [Obj. 1, 3].

Description. Counselors and Graduation Coaches make contact with parents at least twice a semester, as well as disseminate monthly newsletters and other college, career, and financial aid materials.

Status. Activities are ongoing, with implementation levels varying between schools. Family events included a NASA Star Lab activity and hoop dance exhibition at Takini High School; a Family Fun Night at Takini Middle School; and a Parent Night at Crow Creek Sioux Tribal High School, featuring guest speaker Frances Bullshoe.

2. What aspects of your program do you think are most successful (have the greatest impact)? Why?

add

3. What barriers or problems have you encountered in planning, developing, implementing, and/or administering your grant? How have you addressed these problems?

Add

4. Describe briefly the progress that you have made during this reporting period in implementing your evaluation plan as described in your approved application for GEAR UP funding.

SDGU has developed and distributed the first wave of data collection instruments for the program. Baseline data has been collected for several of the performance indicators. SDGU has also identified the online data collection system that will be utilized in participating schools—Scribe for GEAR UP by Xcalibur, Inc.—and has been consulting with company staff on the implementation process. A contract with Xcalibur, initiating services, was signed in March of 2012. Efforts are also currently underway to recruit and hire an external evaluator, and the South Dakota Department of Education released a request for proposal to the public for this position in March of 2012. The application closing date was in April 2012, and the Department is currently reviewing submissions. Once hired, the evaluator will identify key research questions and specific experimental techniques to be utilized, facilitate the implementation of the online database, recommend revising program indicators if necessary, and begin developing additional data collection instruments. Site visit protocols and scheduling will also be addressed.

5. Describe how your project's activities and outcomes are likely to be sustained over time. What systemic changes have occurred in your school(s)?

The GEAR UP South Dakota program, having operated in a majority of SDGU schools from 2005-2011, critically provided a strong foundation for SDGU by 1) developing, implementing, and refining educational practices that work for South Dakota students, and 2) establishing and maintaining relationships with participating schools and local communities—essential for success. The latter is significant, considering relations between the State, schools, Tribes, and Bureau of Indian Education are exceedingly complex (at the program's outset, there was no existing framework for inter-organizational cooperation between the state and most non-public schools). The SDGU program will build upon these accomplishments, increasing collaboration between partners and the breadth of institutionalized services, and continuing to prepare students to enter and succeed in post-secondary education. As an example, GUSD helped schools transfer from a remedial to accelerated program, and implemented an advanced summer program curriculum based on the successful GU Honors program. This programming was so well received by participants that some modules were offered during the school year in select schools. SDGU is enhancing the existing curriculum at all participating schools with this rigorous acceleration-based college preparatory model, building a repository of lesson plans and other classroom resources and bolstering the knowledge and skills of teachers who will teach these courses. Additional sustainable components will become more evident as the program moves forward.

The State of South Dakota has demonstrated a commitment to early intervention leading to college access through multiple initiatives currently in place, including the South Dakota College Access Challenge grant (SDCACG), *Wakan Gli*, and *Woonspe Tiospaye* programs. These programs offer educational support services in some SDGU participating schools, and therefore each program is able to leverage services from one another. This will help pave the way for the program to continue even after the funding period of this grant expires.

6. Please provide any additional information about your project that you think would be helpful to the Department of Education in evaluating your performance or understanding the contents of your annual report.

The SDGU program is gaining momentum, and it is anticipated that services will see a surge in the coming months, once school participation agreements have been solidified and summer programming begins. Based on communication with program staff, who report add something?, it is likely that participation numbers are significantly higher than reported in this APR.

7. Describe the progress that your project has made towards accomplishing the objectives of your project for this reporting period as outlined in your grant application or work plan. Please list your objectives in the table below, and indicate what activities have taken place, the quantitative results of those activities, and actions required (what, if any, changes do you intend to make in response to the results that you have seen). You may extend this table on to another page as needed.

Objectives: List the approved objectives from your grant application or work plan. Where applicable, provide baseline data.	Activities: List the activities that have been conducted to meet the objective.	Results: Has the objective been met? If not, what progress have you made in reaching the objective?	Actions required: Are you planning to make changes to the grant in response to the results?
<b>Objective 1: Increase the academic performance and preparation for postsecondary education of GEAR UP students.</b>			
<p>1.1: The average daily attendance of SDGU students will exceed that of non-SDGU students each year.</p> <p>Baseline 2012: 28%*</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services</p> <p>A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12)</p> <p>A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12)</p> <p>A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12)</p> <p>A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12)</p> <p>B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School</p> <p>B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8)</p> <p>C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements</p> <p>C1. Middle to high school transition program (9)</p> <p>D. High School Enhancements</p> <p>D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12)</p>	<p>In 2011-2012, 28% (252/895) of SDGU students had 5 or more unexcused absences during the first 2 quarters of the school year. Data was reported by the following schools: American Horse, Crazy Horse MS, Crow Creek HS, Enemy Swim Day School, Loneman MS, Marty MS, Porcupine DS, St. Francis MS, St. Francis HS, Takini MS, Takini HS, And Tiospa Zina MS. It is anticipated that this indicator will be fully reported on in 2013, once 1) data from a greater number of participating schools is available, and 2) comparison data can be collected from representative non-SDGU schools.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>
<p>1.2: 85% of SDGU</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p>students will be promoted to the next grade level on time each year.</p> <p>Annual Target: 85%</p>	<p>A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12)</p> <p>A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12)</p> <p>A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12)</p> <p>A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12)</p> <p>B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School</p> <p>B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8)</p> <p>B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8)</p> <p>C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements</p> <p>C1. Middle to high school transition program (9)</p> <p>D. High School Enhancements</p> <p>D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12)</p>	<p>in 2013, as APR data regarding student promotion is collected for students from the end of the prior school year.</p>	<p>is planned at this time.</p>
<p>1.3: The percentage of SDGU students who pass Pre-algebra by the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade will increase by 10% over the baseline.</p> <p>Baseline 2013: TBD</p> <p>Target: +10%</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services</p> <p>A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12)</p> <p>A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12)</p> <p>A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12)</p> <p>A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12)</p> <p>B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School</p> <p>B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8)</p> <p>B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8)</p>	<p>The baseline for this indicator will be reported on in 2013, once 1) course completion data is available for year 1 students.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>
<p>1.4: The percentage of SDGU students who pass Algebra 1 by the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> grade will increase by 10% over the baseline.</p> <p>Baseline 2013: TBD</p> <p>Target: +10%</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services</p> <p>A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12)</p> <p>A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12)</p> <p>A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12)</p> <p>A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12)</p> <p>B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School</p> <p>B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8)</p> <p>B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8)</p> <p>C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements</p> <p>C1. Middle to high school transition program (9)</p> <p>D. High School Enhancements</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported in the same manner as 1.3.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>

	D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12)		
<p>1.5: The percentage of SDGU students who complete the PLAN or PSAT by the end of 10<sup>th</sup> grade will increase by 10% over the baseline.</p> <p>Baseline 2013: TBD Target 2015: +10%</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services</p> <p>A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12)</p> <p>A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12)</p> <p>A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12)</p> <p>A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12)</p> <p>B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School</p> <p>B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8)</p> <p>B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8)</p> <p>C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements</p> <p>C1. Middle to high school transition program (9)</p> <p>D. High School Enhancements</p> <p>D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12)</p> <p>D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12)</p> <p>D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12)</p> <p>D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12)</p> <p>D5. College planning (9-12)</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on in 2013. In 2011-2012, no SDGU students had taken the PSAT. Data was only available, however, for 3 schools that serve the 10<sup>th</sup> grade level—Crow Creek HS, St. Francis HS, and Takini HS.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>
<p>1.6: The percentage of SDGU students who complete the SAT or ACT by the end of 11<sup>th</sup> grade will increase by 10% over the baseline.</p> <p>Baseline 2012: 57%* Target: +10%</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services</p> <p>A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12)</p> <p>A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12)</p> <p>A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12)</p> <p>A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12)</p> <p>B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School</p> <p>B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8)</p> <p>B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8)</p> <p>C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements</p> <p>C1. Middle to high school transition program (9)</p> <p>D. High School Enhancements</p> <p>D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12)</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on in 2013. In 2011-2012, 57% (52/92) of 11<sup>th</sup> grade students (from the aforementioned 3 high schools) had taken the SAT or ACT.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>

	D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12)		
1.7: The percentage of SDGU students who have an un-weighted GPA of at least 3.0 on a 4-point scale by the end of 11 <sup>th</sup> grade will increase by 10% over the baseline.  Baseline 2012: 22%* Target: +10%	A. Foundational Services A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12) A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12) A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8) C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements C1. Middle to high school transition program (9) D. High School Enhancements D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12) D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12)	This indicator will be reported on in 2013. In 2011-2012, 22% (200/895) of SDGU students at all grade levels, and 2% (16/92) of 11 <sup>th</sup> graders, had a GPA of 3.0 or higher. Data was reported by American Horse, Crazy Horse MS, Crow Creek HS, Enemy Swim Day School, Loneman MS, Marty MS, Porcupine DS, St. Francis MS, St. Francis HS, Takini MS, Takini HS, And Tiospa Zina MS.	No change is planned at this time.
1.8: The percentage of SDGU students who take two years of mathematics beyond Algebra 1 by 12 <sup>th</sup> grade will increase by 10% over the baseline.  Baseline 2013: TBD Target 2017: +10%	A. Foundational Services A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12) A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12) A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8) C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements C1. Middle to high school transition program (9)	This indicator will be reported on in 2015. Preliminary data will be available in 2013, as per indicators 1.3 and 1.4.	No change is planned at this time.



	D. High School Enhancements D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12) D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12) E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition E1. Dual/concurrent enrollment program (12)		
1.9: The percentage of SDGU students in grades 6, 7, 8, & 11 performing at or above proficiency in math on the state assessment test will increase by 10% each year.  Baseline 2011: 6 <sup>th</sup> & 7 <sup>th</sup> —TBD. 8 <sup>th</sup> —31%. 11 <sup>th</sup> —33%. Target 2013: +10%	A. Foundational Services A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12) A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12) A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8) C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements C1. Middle to high school transition program (9) D. High School Enhancements D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12) D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12)	This indicator will be reported on in 2013. The data collection and calculation method will need to be clarified, including the differentiation between public and Tribal/BIE schools (especially if report card data will be utilized, as proficiency data is not publicly available by grade level for Tribal/BIE schools). <sup>1</sup> The number of students on the 2012-2013 APR performing at or above grade level may be utilized for this indicator, with the full year 1 enrollment numbers from participating schools.	No change is planned at this time.
1.10: The percentage of SDGU students in grades	A. Foundational Services A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12)	This indicator will be reported on in 2013. The data collection and	No change is planned at

<sup>1</sup> The baseline data for 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> graders in reading and math for 2010-2011 is for public schools that participated in the previous GUSD grant.

<p>6, 7, 8, &amp; 11 performing at or above proficiency in reading on the state assessment test will increase by 10% each year.</p> <p>Baseline 2011: 6<sup>th</sup> &amp; 7<sup>th</sup>—TBD. 8<sup>th</sup>—48%. 11<sup>th</sup>—53%. Target 2013: +10%</p>	<p>A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12) A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8) C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements C1. Middle to high school transition program (9) D. High School Enhancements D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12) D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12)</p>	<p>calculation method will need to be clarified in the same manner as with indicator 1.9.</p>	<p>this time.</p>
<p>1.11: The percentage of SDGU parents who actively engage in activities associated with assisting students in their academic preparation for college will increase by 10% each year.</p> <p>Baseline 2012: 107* Target 2013: +10%</p>	<p>G. Parents G1. Workshops, meetings, and mailings (6-12)</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on in 2013. Currently 107 parents have participated in activities.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>
<p><b>Objective 2: Increase the rate of high school graduation and participation in postsecondary education for GEAR UP students.</b></p>			
<p>2.1: Increase the percentage of SDGU students who graduate high school, compared to</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12) A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12) A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12)</p>	<p>From 2009-2010 to 2010-2011, the percentage of high school graduates at SDGU schools was 86% (161/186). The State public</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>

<p>the state average, by 2018. Baseline 2012: 86%* Target 2018: TBD</p>	<p>A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8) C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements C1. Middle to high school transition program (9) D. High School Enhancements D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12) D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12) D6. Financial aid workshops, opportunities for Federal financial aid (9-12) D7. College visits and student shadowing (11-12) E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition E1. Dual/concurrent enrollment program (12)</p>	<p>school average was 83.4% and the BIE system average was 59.1% in 2010-2011. This baseline data was, however, only available from 2 high schools—Crow Creek HS, St. Francis HS and Takini HS (All Tribally operated/BIE Grant Day schools). A more representative baseline measurement will be made once data from a greater number of participating schools is available.</p>	
<p>2.2: 50% of SDGU students will be enrolled in a postsecondary educational institution by 2018. Baseline 2012: 26%* Target 2018: 50%</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12) A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12) A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8) C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements C1. Middle to high school transition program (9) D. High School Enhancements D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12)</p>	<p>From 2009-2010 to 2010-2011, 26% (48/186, from 3 high schools—see 2.1) of students at SDGU schools enrolled in a post-secondary educational institution. As with indicator 2.1, a more representative percentage can be ascertained once data is available from a greater number of participating schools.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>

	D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12) D6. Financial aid workshops, opportunities for Federal financial aid (9-12) D7. College visits and student shadowing (11-12) E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition E1. Dual/concurrent enrollment program (12) E2. College orientation and transition (Pre-Freshman year) E3. First-year college services (Freshman year)		
2.3: 50% of SDGU students who enroll in postsecondary education will place into college-level math without need for remediation by 2018. Target 2018: 50%	A. Foundational Services A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12) A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12) A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8) C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements C1. Middle to high school transition program (9) D. High School Enhancements D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12) D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12) E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition E1. Dual/concurrent enrollment program (12)	This indicator will be reported on in 2014. Post-secondary SDGU services will be offered in the upcoming year.	No change is planned at this time.

	E2. College orientation and transition (Pre-Freshman year) E3. First-year college services (Freshman year)		
2.4: 50% of SDGU students who enroll in postsecondary education will place into college-level English without need for remediation by 2018. Target 2018: 50%	A. Foundational Services A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12) A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12) A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8) C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements C1. Middle to high school transition program (9) D. High School Enhancements D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12) D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12) E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition E1. Dual/concurrent enrollment program (12) E2. College orientation and transition (Pre-Freshman year) E3. First-year college services (Freshman year)	This indicator will be reported on in 2014. Post-secondary SDGU services will be offered in the upcoming year.	No change is planned at this time.
2.5: 50% of former SDGU students will be enrolled in a postsecondary educational institution by 2019.	A. Foundational Services A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12) A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12) A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School	This indicator will be reported on in 2015. It is anticipated that 2013-2014 will be the first year that SDGU students could be former SDGU students.	No change is planned at this time.

Target 2019: 50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8)</li> <li>B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8)</li> <li>C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C1. Middle to high school transition program (9)</li> </ul> </li> <li>D. High School Enhancements               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12)</li> <li>D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12)</li> <li>D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12)</li> <li>D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12)</li> <li>D5. College planning (9-12)</li> <li>D6. Financial aid workshops, opportunities for Federal financial aid (9-12)</li> <li>D7. College visits and student shadowing (11-12)</li> </ul> </li> <li>E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E1. Dual/concurrent enrollment program (12)</li> <li>E2. College orientation and transition (Pre-Freshman year)</li> <li>E3. First-year college services (Freshman year)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p>2.6: 55% of SDGU students will have accumulated the expected number of credit hours for their chosen degree in their first year attending a postsecondary educational institution.</p> <p>Target 2019: 55%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Foundational Services               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12)</li> <li>A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12)</li> <li>A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12)</li> <li>A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12)</li> </ul> </li> <li>B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8)</li> <li>B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8)</li> </ul> </li> <li>C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C1. Middle to high school transition program (9)</li> </ul> </li> <li>D. High School Enhancements               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>D1. Six-week high school residential summer program</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	This indicator will be reported on in 2015. Post-secondary SDGU services will be offered in the upcoming year.	No change is planned at this time.

	(9-12) D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12) E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition E1. Dual/concurrent enrollment program (12) E2. College orientation and transition (Pre-Freshman year) E3. First-year college services (Freshman year)		
2.7: 55% of former SDGU students will have accumulated the expected number of credit hours for their chosen degree each year starting in 2019. Target 2019: 55%	A. Foundational Services A1. Advanced curriculum (6-12) A2. Tutoring and homework assistance (6-12) A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) A4. Prescriptive catch-up services (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) B2. Two-week middle school summer program (6-8) C. Middle to High School Transition Enhancements C1. Middle to high school transition program (9) D. High School Enhancements D1. Six-week high school residential summer program (9-12) D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D3. ACT/SAT preparation (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12) E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition E1. Dual/concurrent enrollment program (12) E2. College orientation and transition (Pre-Freshman year)	This indicator will be reported on in 2016. It is anticipated that 2013-2014 will be the first year that SDGU students could be former SDGU students.	No change is planned at this time.

	E3. First-year college services (Freshman year)		
<b>Objective 3: Increase the educational expectations of GEAR UP students, and increase student and family knowledge of postsecondary education options, preparation, and financing.</b>			
<p>3.1: The percentage of SDGU students who demonstrate knowledge on the benefits of pursuing a postsecondary education will increase by 10% each year.</p> <p>Baseline 2013: TBD Target 2014: +10%</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) D. High School Enhancements D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12) D7. College visits and student shadowing (11-12) E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition E3. First-year college services (Freshman year) G. Parents G1. Workshops, meetings, and mailings (6-12)</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on in 2014. This question will be included on the 2012-2013 Student Survey.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>
<p>3.2: The percentage of SDGU students who demonstrate knowledge of the academic preparation necessary for postsecondary education will increase by 10% each year.</p> <p>Baseline 2012: 85%* Target 2013: +10%</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12) B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8) D. High School Enhancements D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12) D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12) D5. College planning (9-12) D7. College visits and student shadowing (11-12) E. Grade-specific Enhancements, High School to Post-secondary Transition E3. First-year college services (Freshman year) G. Parents</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on in 2013. A supporting survey question from the 2011-2012 APR indicates that 85% of students reported that someone from their school or GEAR UP had spoken with them about college entrance requirements. A more representative percentage for this survey question can be ascertained once data is available from a greater number of participating schools.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>



	G1. Workshops, meetings, and mailings (6-12)		
<p>3.3a: The percentage of SDGU students who demonstrate knowledge on the costs of pursuing postsecondary education will increase by 10% each year.</p> <p>Baseline 2012: 67%* Target 2013: +10%</p>	<p>D. High School Enhancements</p> <p>D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12)</p> <p>D5. College planning (9-12)</p> <p>D6. Financial aid workshops, opportunities for Federal financial aid (9-12)</p> <p>D7. College visits and student shadowing (11-12)</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on in 2013. A supporting survey question from the 2011-2012 APR indicates that 67% of students reported that they definitely or probably could afford to attend a public 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, and their family's resources, and 5% were not sure if they could afford the same. A more representative percentage for this survey question can be ascertained once data is available from a greater number of participating schools.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>
<p>3.3b: The percentage of SDGU students who demonstrate knowledge on the availability of financial aid will increase by 10% each year (this includes FAFSA completion).</p> <p>Baseline 2012: 79.5%* Target 2013: +10%</p>	<p>D. High School Enhancements</p> <p>D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12)</p> <p>D5. College planning (9-12)</p> <p>D6. Financial aid workshops, opportunities for Federal financial aid (9-12)</p> <p>D7. College visits and student shadowing (11-12)</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on in 2013. A supporting survey question from the 2011-2012 APR indicates that 79.5% of students reported that someone from their school or GEAR UP had spoken with them about the availability of financial aid to help pay for college. A more representative percentage for this survey question can be ascertained once data is available from a greater number of participating schools.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>
<p>3.4: 65% of SDGU students will aspire to continue their education</p>	<p>A. Foundational Services</p> <p>A3. Mentoring and advising (6-12)</p> <p>B. Grade-specific Enhancements, Middle School</p>	<p>In 2011-2012, 90% of students reported on the APR survey that they expect to complete some</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>

<p>after high school each year.</p> <p>Baseline 2012: 90%*</p> <p>Annual Target: 65%</p>	<p>B1. Counseling, advising, academic and career planning (8)</p> <p>D. High School Enhancements</p> <p>D2. Graduation Coaches (9-12)</p> <p>D4. Career exploration and planning (9-12)</p> <p>D5. College planning (9-12)</p> <p>D7. College visits and student shadowing (11-12)</p> <p>G. Parents</p> <p>G1. Workshops, meetings, and mailings (6-12)</p>	<p>college, a 4-year college degree, or higher. A more representative percentage for this indicator can be ascertained once data is available from a greater number of participating schools.</p>	
<p>3.5: The percentage of SDGU parents who demonstrate knowledge on the benefits of pursuing a postsecondary education will increase by 10% each year starting in 2016.</p> <p>Baseline 2015: 54%*</p> <p>Target 2016: +10%</p>	<p>G. Parents</p> <p>G1. Workshops, meetings, and mailings (6-12)</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on in 2013. A supporting survey question from the 2011-2012 APR indicates that 54% of parents reported that someone from their school or GEAR UP had spoken with them about college entrance requirements. A more representative percentage for this survey question can be ascertained once data is available from a greater number of participating schools.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>
<p>3.6a: The percentage of SDGU parents who demonstrate knowledge on the costs of pursuing postsecondary education will increase by 10% each year starting in 2016.</p> <p>Baseline 2012: 68%*</p> <p>Target 2016: +10%</p>	<p>G. Parents</p> <p>G1. Workshops, meetings, and mailings (6-12)</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on in 2013. A supporting survey question from the 2011-2012 APR indicates that 68% of parents reported that their child definitely or probably could afford to attend a public 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, and their family's resources, and 28% were not sure if their child could afford to do the same. A more</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>

		representative percentage for this survey question can be ascertained once data is available from a greater number of participating schools.	
<p>3.6b: The percentage of SDGU parents who demonstrate knowledge on the availability of financial aid will increase by 10% each year starting in 2016.</p> <p>Baseline 2012: 53%*</p> <p>Target 2016: +10%</p>	<p>G. Parents</p> <p>G1. Workshops, meetings, and mailings (6-12)</p>	<p>This indicator will be reported on in 2013. A supporting survey question from the 2011-2012 APR indicates that 53% of parents reported that someone from their school or GEAR UP had spoken with them about the availability of financial aid to help pay for college. A more representative percentage for this survey question can be ascertained once data is available from a greater number of participating schools.</p>	<p>No change is planned at this time.</p>

## Section III: Grant Administration and Budget Information

**1. Federal Budget Summary**

In the following table, please provide information about your actual and anticipated Federal expenditures for the **current budget period**. The current budget period can be found in Section 6 of your current Grant Award Notification (GAN). You do not need to fill in the shaded boxes, but please indicate total amounts in line E for all columns. ***\*If this is the first award year of your grant, the reporting period includes the time period from the beginning of your grant through March 31st of this year.***

	Total Federal Funds Awarded for Current Budget Period (See Current Grant Award Notification (GAN))	Carryover Funds Available (Include Funds Carried Over from Previous Budget Period(s))	Actual Federal Expenditures from Current Budget Period (GAN Start Date) thru March of APR Submission Year	Anticipated Federal Expenditures from April to Current Budget Period End Date	Anticipated Carryover to Next Budget Period (if applicable)
1. Salaries and Wages	0.00		0.00	0.00	
2. Employee Benefits	0.00		0.00	0.00	
3. Travel	0.00		0.00	0.00	
4. Materials and Supplies	0.00		0.00	0.00	
5. Consultants and Contracts	0.00		0.00	0.00	
6. Other	0.00		0.00	0.00	
A. Total Direct Cost (1-6) (Read Only)	0.00		0.00	0.00	
B. Total Indirect Costs (less than 8% of A)	0.00		0.00	0.00	
C. Equipment	0.00		0.00	0.00	
D. Scholarships/Tuition Assistance	0.00		0.00	0.00	
E. Total Costs (A+B+C+D) (Read Only)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**2. Non-Federal Matching Budget Summary**

In the following table, please provide information about your actual and anticipated non-Federal matching contributions for the **current budget period**. **Current budget period can be found in Section 6 of your current Grant Award Notification (GAN).**

	Matching Contributions Proposed for Current Budget Period (See Current GAN)	Actual Matching Contributions from Current Budget Period (GAN Start Date) thru March of APR Submission Year	Anticipated Matching Contributions from April to Current Budget Period End Date
1. Salaries and Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00

2. Employee Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Travel	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Materials and Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Consultants and Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00
6. Other	0.00	0.00	0.00
A. Total Direct Cost (1-6) (Read Only)	0.00	0.00	0.00
B. Total Indirect Costs (less than 8% of A)	0.00	0.00	0.00
C. Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00
D. Scholarships/Tuition Assistance	0.00	0.00	0.00
E. Total Costs (A+B+C+D) (Read Only)	0.00	0.00	0.00

Note: You have requested a match reduction in your original application.

P334S110022 - Section III

### 3. Actual Federal Expenditures and Matching Contribution for 5 Years

In the following table, please provide information about your actual Federal and matching expenditures for **previous, completed budget periods**. For example, for grants that began in Fiscal Year 2011, the Year 1 budget period would be July 2011 through June 2012. **If you are in the first year of your grant, you do not need to fill out this table.** If you are in the second through sixth years of your grant, fill out information only for completed budget period(s).

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
	Actual Federal Expenditures	Actual Matching Contributions	Actual Federal Expenditures	Actual Matching Contributions	Actual Federal Expenditures	Actual Matching Contributions
1. Salaries and Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Employee Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Materials and Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Consultants and Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6. Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
A. Total Direct Cost (1-6) (Read Only)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
B. Total Indirect Costs (less than 8% of A)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
C. Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
D. Scholarships/Tuition Assistance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
E. Total Costs (A+B+C+D) (Read Only)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

	Year 4	Year 5
--	--------	--------

	Actual Federal Expenditures	Actual Matching Contributions	Actual Federal Expenditures	Actual Matching Contributions
1. Salaries and Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2. Employee Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4. Materials and Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5. Consultants and Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6. Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
A. Total Direct Cost (1-6) (Read Only)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
B. Total Indirect Costs (less than 8% of A)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
C. Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
D. Scholarships/Tuition Assistance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
E. Total Costs (A+B+C+D) (Read Only)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Total Actual Federal Expenditures : \$ 0.00 dollars

Total Actual Matching Contributions : \$ 0.00 dollars

P334S110022 - Section III

#### Section III - Budget Questions

4. If you are not expending Federal or matching funds as originally budgeted, please provide an explanation for the change. Please describe how you plan to expend carryover funds and/or how you plan to meet your matching requirements.
5. Describe any significant changes in your project design since the approval of your grant application (e.g., changing from individual tutoring to group tutoring or placing more emphasis on enrichment activities rather than remediation). Do you anticipate making changes to your project design in the coming year? If so, please describe. How have any changes or anticipated changes affected your budget? How will these changes impact quantitative outcomes and your ability to meet the project's goals?
6. Please list the names and titles of key personnel paid by GEAR UP Federal or matching funds, and indicate the percentage of time each individual spends working on the GEAR UP grant.

No	Name	Title	Time on Grant (%)	Individual Paid By	
				Fed. Funds	Match
1	Roger Campbell	Project Director	25.0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	Stacy Phelps	Project Coordinator	100.0	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7. Describe any changes to key personnel of this grant that have come about over the past year, including changes in titles, changes in percentage of time that a person is devoting to the project, hiring of a key staff person, departure of a key staff person, or addition or elimination of a position. Discuss any significant changes to key personnel proposed or anticipated for the coming reporting period. (Do not request replacement of key personnel or the addition / elimination of position(s) here. That type of request is a change that requires an administrative action and must be addressed separate from this report. Your response should be a summary of approved and completed

changes that have take place during this reporting period.)

No changes in key personnel have occurred during this reporting period.

- 8. Describe any changes to the roles of your partners during the past year. Have any partners been added to your grant? Have any partners discontinued their participation in your grant? Has the role of any existing partner changed significantly?**

Relationships and contracts are currently being signed by partners would were written into the proposal. We do not anticipate any changes at this time.

- 9. Describe briefly your project's record keeping system for collecting and reporting student outcome/achievement data and participation in GEAR UP activities. Specifically, how frequently is data collected, and what method(s) does your project use to collect and maintain data regarding student, parent and teacher participation in GEAR UP activities?**

Student and parent participation data were collected via activity sheets, which were distributed beginning in the fall of 2011. These sheets were completed for each event, and included a brief description of activities and list of attendees. This method was also utilized to track teacher participation in professional development activities. Student demographic and academic performance data (e.g., course enrollment, completion, etc.) and student and parent survey data were collected through a set of data collection documents distributed to each participating school. All documents were returned in an ongoing manner. Activity, demographic, and performance data was entered into a database, and survey data was entered into an online system called surveymethods. Additional survey questions will be developed by the external evaluator and administered to SDGU students and parents to provide more in-depth feedback (and clarify student outcomes where necessary).

- 10. How do you link student outcome/achievement data with student participation? How does your project use the data collected to evaluate and guide the project?**

SDGU management reviews program data, as it is becoming available, at monthly staff meetings designed to identify and discuss obstacles, review grant progress, and make recommendations for program improvement. Progress reports are being submitted to management by the data collection coordinator, and the data pool will expand to include APR, formative, and site visit reports. Management is establishing relationships with superintendents and principals at participating schools. The external evaluator will implement an online data collection system in participating schools to collect demographic, academic performance, and activity participation data for SDGU students. The database will enable the program to perform rapid and accurate correlations between these parameters. The evaluator will collect control data for non-participating schools from the South Dakota Department of Education and will utilize quasi-experimental techniques to interpret the body of data.

- 11. Describe your record-keeping system for maintaining source documentation for all federal and non-federal expenditures (e.g., time and effort record (which include percentage of time spent on grant activities), transportation cost, equipment, supplies, college field trips, and other GEAR UP expenditures. Who is responsible for maintaining the documentation?**

Documentation for all federal and non-federal expenditures is kept at the headquarters of the Mid-Central Education Cooperative. Mid-Central utilizes the State approved accounting system Software Unlimited, which enables the program to accurately and safely maintain records and delineate expenditures through separate function numbers. Time and effort, as well as travel expenses are kept. The SDGU Budget Specialist is responsible for managing all grant fiscal components including expenditures, contracts, draw-downs, monthly reconciliations, audits, and match accountability. This includes maintaining the documentation.

- 12. If your project has a scholarship component for postsecondary education, please provide: a) information about the amount of scholarship money (Federal and non-Federal matching funds) that has been reserved and/or obligated; b) information regarding where scholarship funds are held pending distribution to former GEAR UP students (e.g., are the funds in a trust account?); and c) how the funds will be disbursed and to whom. If you have already disbursed scholarship money to students, please indicate the amount of money disbursed, the number of students who received scholarships, and the average amount of the scholarships awarded. NOTE: Scholarship funds are subject to audits or monitoring by authorized representatives of the Secretary throughout the life of the funds.**

The SDGU program does not have a scholarship component as significant scholarship opportunities currently exist for Native American students in South Dakota.

13. Please indicate the number of GEAR UP students who have completed the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA): 719

14. Please complete the following table. List all partners and click on the radio button whether they are original partners listed in the application or new partners added during implementation. If any of these partners have become inactive and are no longer participating in the grant, please indicate this by checking in the column provided. If a partner is new, indicate with a check if you have provided the program office with a Partner Identification Form and Cost Share Worksheet to update the application.

Please indicate the type of partner from the following options and enter the letter in the column provided:  
C = Community Organization, F = Faith-based Organization, B = Historically Black College and University (HBCU), H = Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), O = Other Type of Organization, P = Other Postsecondary Institute, and S = School/District.

15. Indirect Cost Agreement (check one of three options)

Indirect cost reimbursement on a training grant is limited to the recipient's actual indirect costs, as determined by its negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, or eight percent of the modified total cost base, whichever amount is less. In order to claim an indirect cost on next year's budget, the grantee must provide information on their current agreement.

☐ Current Indirect Cost Agreement

Effective dates of the agreement: Beginning date: Ending date:  
Current rate : 0.0 %

☐ Requesting Indirect Cost Agreement

If you've requested an indirect cost rate agreement but have not received one, you should provide your program officer with evidence of your contact with the cognizant agency and their response. If a negotiated indirect cost rate agreement was not awarded, a grantee using the training rate of eight percent is required to have documentation available for audit that shows that its indirect rate equals or exceeds the eight percent.

Please indicate whether your program officer has documentation of your attempt to secure an indirect cost rate agreement. ☐ Yes ☐ No

☒ Do not claim Indirect Cost

P334S110022 - Section IV

#### SECTION IV: Demographic Data and Data Regarding Services Provided

##### 1. Demographic Data

Please complete the following tables requesting demographic data on GEAR UP students.

###### A. Students Served:

Please complete the following table indicating the number of students served by your project.

	Number of
--	-----------



	Students
Number of students you proposed to serve during the reporting period (obtain from your grant application)	0
Actual number of students in your cohort(s) during the reporting period (i.e., number of students served)	895

**State grants only:** If you are serving students through a statewide initiative please indicate that number here. These numbers are beyond those students stated on the Student Served Form in your proposal and reported in the actual students served count shown above.

(An example of this may be a state-wide homework hotline where students can call in and receive assistance with their assignments.)

	Number of Students
Students served under statewide initiatives	0

**B. Participant Distribution by Ethnic Background:**

The following table regarding the ethnicity/race background of GEAR UP students is mandatory and will be used by the Department of Education in reporting on the ethnicity/race characteristics of students served by the program. The ethnicity/race categories used in this section are consistent with the Department of Education's policy on the collection of racial and ethnic information.

Ethnicity	Number of GEAR UP Students
Hispanic or Latino	0
Race	
American Indian or Alaska Native	888
Asian	0
Black or African American	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0
White	3
Two or More Races	4
Race and/or Ethnicity Unknown	0
Total	895

**C. Participation by Gender:**

Complete the following table regarding the gender of GEAR UP students.

Gender:	Number of GEAR UP Students
Male	453
Female	442
Total Students Served (should equal total number of students in cohort in Section IV, 1A)	895

P334S110022 - Section IV

**D. Participant Distribution by Grade and New or Continuing Status:**

Please complete the following table indicating the number of students in each grade that are new to GEAR UP (received GEAR UP services for the first time during the reporting period) and the number of current students who are continuing

(received GEAR UP services during a prior period).

Grade Level	Number of New GEAR UP Students	Number of Continuing GEAR UP Students
K-4	0	0
5	0	0
6	118	0
7	177	0
8	167	0
9	126	0
10	119	0
11	92	0
12	96	0
Total	895	0

**E. Participants with Limited English Proficiency:**

Completion of this table is not mandatory but is extremely helpful to the Department of Education in reporting on the characteristics of students served by the GEAR UP program. If you choose to do so, please complete the following table indicating the number of GEAR UP students with Limited English Proficiency served by your project during the reporting period.

	Number of GEAR UP Students
GEAR UP students with Limited English Proficiency	0

**F. Participants with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) as required by the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act Amendment of 1997 (IDEA):**

Completion of this table is not mandatory but is extremely helpful to the Department of Education in reporting on the characteristics of students served by the GEAR UP program. If you choose to do so, please complete the following table indicating the number of GEAR UP students with Individualized Education Programs.

	Number of GEAR UP Students
GEAR UP students with Individualized Education Programs	0

**P334S110022 - Section IV**

**2. Participating Schools and Housing Projects:**

Please complete the appropriate table below indicating the schools or housing projects participating in your grant.

**A. Participating Schools:**

If your grant is a partnership grant using a cohort model, please list all of the schools participating in your GEAR UP project. A participating school is a partner school identified in your GEAR UP application or is a school in which GEAR UP services are provided. Please include all schools you identified in your application, even if they do not yet have students participating in GEAR UP (e.g., if the GEAR UP cohort consists of 7th graders, please list the GEAR UP high school(s) that the students will attend). In appropriate boxes, indicate all relevant grade levels separated by commas (e.g., 6,7,8).

**State grants and partnership grants using a public housing model do not need to complete this table.**

Name of School	Grade Levels Offered	Grade Levels Served by GEAR UP	Percentage of Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Price Lunch	City	State	Zip Code

**B. Participating Housing Projects:**

Complete this table **only if your project uses a public housing model**. If your project is serving a public housing authority, please provide the name(s) of the public housing project(s). Indicate grade levels separated by commas (e.g., 6, 7, 8).

Name of Public Housing Project	Grade Levels Served by GEAR UP	City	State	Zip Code

**C. Number of Schools Participating in State GEAR UP Projects:**

For State grants only, please indicate the number of schools participating in your GEAR UP project during the current year. **Partnership grants do not need to complete this table.**

Number of Schools Participating in the State GEAR UP Project	11
--	----

**P334S110022 - Section IV****Services Provided to Students, Parents, Teachers, Schools:****3. Services Provided to Students:**

In the following table, for the types of service provided by your project with GEAR UP Federal or matching funds, indicate the number of students who received the service during the reporting period and the average number of hours of service provided per student during the period.

Type of Service	Number of Students in the GEAR UP Cohort who Received the Service	Average Hours of Service Per Participant Receiving the Service Per Year
Tutoring/homework assistance	939	2.1
Rigorous academic curricula	168	1.2
Comprehensive mentoring	219	1.9
Financial aid counseling/advising	520	1.1
Counseling/advising/academic planning/career counseling	1123	1.0
College visit/college student shadowing	291	3.7
Job site visit/job shadowing	83	3.2
Summer programs	0	0.0
Educational field trips	70	1.8
Workshops	402	1.5
Family/cultural events	1170	2.7

**4. Services Provided to Parents:**

In the following table, for the types of service provided by your project using GEAR UP Federal or matching funds, indicate the number of parents (or guardians) who received the service during the reporting period and the average number of hours of service provided per parent during the reporting period.

	Number of Parents of Students in the GEAR	Average Hours of Service Per Participant
--	---	--

Type of Service	UP Cohort who Received the Service	Receiving the Service Per Year
Workshops on college preparation/financial aid	62	3.9
Counseling/advising	43	3.0
College visits	0	0.0
Family events	187	15.7

**P334S110022 - Section IV**

**5. Services Provided to Teachers:**

Please complete the following table indicating professional development provided to GEAR UP teachers. Include all teachers who taught GEAR UP students, irrespective of whether their salaries are paid using GEAR UP funding.

Number of Teachers who Taught GEAR UP Students during the Reporting Period	Number of Teachers of GEAR UP Students who Participated in GEAR UP Sponsored Professional Development during the Reporting Period (April through March)	Average Hours of Professional Development per Participating Teacher during the Reporting Period
83	197	8.4

**6. Services Provided to Schools:**

Please complete the following table indicating services provided to GEAR UP schools.

Click the Checkbox in this column if your project provides this type of service	Type of Service
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Curriculum development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Dual or current enrollment programs

**P334S110022 - Section V**

**SECTION V: GEAR UP STUDENT OUTCOMES**

This section of the report requests outcome information for current participants. Because GEAR UP performance reports are due in the spring of each year, it is not possible to report end of school year grades and outcomes for current students. As a result, the tables generally request projects to report on the progress of current students up to the time of the report or at the mid-point of the school year.

**1. Students Enrolled in Advanced Courses by Grade Level:**

Please complete the following tables indicating the number of current GEAR UP students enrolled in advanced courses. 'Advanced courses' are classes that are identified as above grade level by the student's school.

Current Grade Level	Number of Students Enrolled in Advanced Mathematics Courses	Number of Students Enrolled in Advanced English/Language Arts Courses	Number of Students Enrolled in Advanced Science Courses
6	2	1	0
7	7	5	3
8	9	5	4
9	0	0	0

10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	2	0	0
Total	20	11	7

P334S110022 - Section V

2. Course Completion:

Please complete the following table indicating the number of GEAR UP students who have successfully completed the courses identified. The names for math classes can vary among schools. Classify courses based on the content of the course. 'Advanced Placement' classes are courses designed to prepare students for the Advanced Placement Exams. **Grantees in their first year do not need to complete this question. Enter the figures in the grade level the cohort was in when the course was completed.**

Grade Student was in when Course was Completed	Pre-algebra	Algebra I or Equivalent	Geometry	Algebra II	Calculus	Chemistry	Physics	At Least One Advanced Placement Class
6	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	28	51	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	3	20	50	4	0	1	0	0
11	2	7	14	33	0	22	0	0
12	1	3	16	31	2	30	0	0
Total	187	81	80	68	2	53	0	0

Grade Student was in when Course was Completed	Trigonometry	Pre-Calculus	Biology	At Least One International Baccalaureate Class
6	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	3	0
8	0	0	4	0
9	0	0	4	0
10	0	0	70	0
11	0	0	12	0
12	5	4	15	0
Total	5	4	108	0

P334S110022 - Section V

3. Educational Progress by Current GEAR UP Students:

Please complete the following tables below indicating educational progress of current GEAR UP students. Where available, use standardized test scores to determine whether a student is performing at or above grade level. **New grantees in their first year of**

implementation should not complete the two columns on performance. Enter the number in the row that coincides with the grade the students are in during the current school year. (e.g. If you served sixth grade the first year of the grant and a standardized test was administered the first year to that sixth grade, you would report on results of that standardized test in the second APR placing the information in the row for 7th grade since those students would be seventh graders in the second year.)

Current Grade Level	Number of Students Performing at or above Grade Level in English/Language Arts	Number of Students Performing at or above Grade Level in Mathematics	Number of Students with 5 or More Unexcused Absences during the First 2 Quarters of the School Year	Number of Students Taking PSAT or PLAN	Number of Students Taking ACT or SAT Exam
6	27	28	35		
7	42	18	50		
8	33	22	56		
9	15	18	85		
10	17	15	7	0	
11	12	11	9	0	52
12	22	5	10	0	55
Total	168	117	252	0	107

NOTE: For the table below, please enter the number promoted at the end of the most recent school year. For this 2011-2012 APR, you would report those students promoted in June of 2011. The number promoted must be entered in the grade that they were in June 2011. For example, the 7th graders promoted to 8th grade in June 2011 would be entered in the 7th grade row.

Grade Level	Number of Students Promoted to the Next Grade Level at the End of the Prior School Year
6	91
7	88
8	95
9	111
10	61
11	38
12	42
Total	526

#### P334S110022 - Section V

#### 4. Baseline High School Graduation and College Enrollment Data:

This table will be completed **once**, at the time the students of the first cohort are 11th graders.

For each target high school, give the number of 12th graders\*, the number graduating with a high school diploma, and the number enrolled in post-secondary institutions (enrollment in less than 2yr., 2yr., and 4 yr. institutions) for the previous two years (e.g., if your first cohort are 11th graders in the current school year (2011-2012), then you would complete this table using figures from the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years).

\* 12th graders are those students who have the credits required to be considered a 12th grader/senior.

High School	School Year	Number of 12th Grade Students	Number who Graduated with High School Diploma	Number Enrolled in Post Secondary Institution

		0	0	0
Graduation Rate: 0.0% - Enrollment Rate: 0.0%				

P334S110022 - Section VI

## SECTION VI: SURVEY DATA

In order to complete the APR, you will need to administer surveys to GEAR UP students and parents at least every two years. Separate surveys should be provided to GEAR UP students and parents.

*Each survey must include certain mandatory questions.* Mandatory questions for the student survey are listed in Appendix A. Mandatory questions for the parent survey are listed in Appendix B. If desired, you may translate these questions into other languages. If you would like to add additional questions to the survey for your internal purposes, you may do so. If you are in the first award period of your grant and you have not yet conducted student and parent surveys, you may respond "N/A" to the survey description in this page.

*Please aim to give a copy of the survey to each cohort student and one of his/her parents.*

### 1. Survey Administration:

In the following box, please describe how your student and parent surveys are administered. When are the surveys distributed and how (e.g., are the surveys distributed in the classroom, at GEAR UP events, through the mail, or during home visits)? How are you ensuring an adequate response rate?

#### Describe the Administration of Your Surveys

Student surveys were administered during GEAR UP activities beginning in the Fall of 2011.

P334S110022 - Section VI

### 2. Student Survey Results:

Please complete the following tables indicating the results of your student survey.

#### A. Grade Level of Survey Respondents:

Please complete the following table indicating the number of GEAR UP students at each grade level who were given and responded to the survey.

Grade Level	Number of Students Given the Survey	Number of Students who Responded to the Survey
6	94	94
7	208	208
8	318	318
9	154	154
10	114	114
11	96	96
12	61	61
Other	2	2
Total	1047	1047

Student Response Rate:	100 %
------------------------	-------

Adequate response rates for the student survey is 80%.

If you did not meet adequate response rate of 80%, please answer the following:

Explain why the target survey response rates(s) was not met.

What steps will you take to ensure that rates will increase the next time the survey(s) is administered?

#### B. Number of Students who Have Spoken with Someone about College Entrance Requirements and Financial Aid:

Please complete the following table indicating student response to survey questions 2 and 3 in Appendix A.

Grade Level	Number of Students who have Spoken with Someone about College Entrance Requirements	Number of Students who have NOT Spoken with Someone about College Entrance Requirements	Number of Students who have Spoken with Someone about the Availability of Financial Aid	Number of Students who have NOT Spoken with Someone about the Availability of Financial Aid
6	65	28	64	30
7	165	44	152	57
8	281	38	264	48
9	133	20	120	34
10	99	15	89	24
11	86	10	83	13
12	57	4	53	8
Other	2	0	2	0
Total	888	159	827	214

P334S110022 - Section VI

#### 2. Student Survey Results:

##### C. Educational Expectations:

Please complete the following table indicating student responses to survey question number 4 in Appendix A regarding educational expectations.

Response	Total Number of Students Grades 6-8 Responding	Total Number of Students Grades 9-10 Responding	Total Number of Students Grades 11-12 Responding
High school or less	54	20	21
Some college, but less than a 4-year college degree	166	67	40
4-year college degree or higher	389	181	95

On a scale of 1 – 5, to what extent are you knowledgeable about financial aid and the cost and benefits to you in pursuing postsecondary education (1 = no knowledge to 5 = extremely knowledgeable) : 0

##### D. Perceptions of Affordability:

Please complete the following table indicating student response to question number 5 from Appendix A, "Do you think that you could afford to attend a public 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, and your family's resources?"



Response	Number of Students Responding
Definitely	231
Probably	459
Not Sure	280
Probably Not	49
Definitely Not	7

**P334S110022 - Section VI**

**3. Parent Survey Results:**

Please complete the following tables indicating the results of your parent survey.

**A. Number of Parents who Were Given and Completed the Survey:**

Please complete the following table indicating the number of parents who were given and completed the survey.

Number of Parents Given Survey	Number of Parents Who Completed Survey
107	107

Parent Response Rate:	100 %
-----------------------	-------

Adequate response rates for the parent survey is 50%.

If you did not meet adequate response rate of 50%, please answer the following:

**Explain why the target survey response rates(s) was not met.**

--

**What steps will you take to ensure that rates will increase the next time the survey(s) is administered?**

--

**B. Number of Parents who Have Spoken with Someone about College Entrance Requirements and Financial Aid:**

Please complete the following table indicating parent response to survey questions 1 and 2 from Appendix B.

Response	Total Number of Parents Responding
Question 1, Yes (have spoken with someone about college entrance requirements)	57
Question 1, No (have not spoken with someone about college entrance requirements)	48
Question 2, Yes (have spoken with someone about financial aid)	56
Question 2, No (have not spoken with someone about financial aid)	49
Question 3, On a scale of 1 – 5, to what extent are you knowledgeable about financial aid and the cost and benefits of your child pursuing postsecondary education (1 = no knowledge to 5 = extremely knowledgeable)	0

**C. Number of Parents who Have Spoken with Their Children about College:**

Please complete the following table indicating parent response to survey question number 3 from Appendix B, "Have you talked with your children about attending college?"

Response	Total Number of Parents Responding
Yes	89
No	16

**D. Educational Expectations:**

Please complete the following table indicating parent responses to survey question number 4 in Appendix B, "What is the highest level of education that you think your child will achieve?"

Response	Total Number of Parents Responding
High school or less	11
Some college, but less than a 4-year college degree	30
4-year college degree or higher	64

**P334S110022 - Section VI****E. Perceptions of Affordability:**

Please complete the following table indicating parent response to question number 5 from Appendix B, "Do you think that your child could afford to attend a public 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, and your family's resources?"

Response	Number of Parents Responding
Definitely	36
Probably	35
Not Sure	29
Probably Not	1
Definitely Not	4

**Schopp, Melody (DOE)**

---

**From:** Campbell, Roger  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 01, 2012 9:16 AM  
**To:** Schopp, Melody (DOE)  
**Subject:** draft

Melody,

If you have some time...

Take a look at let me know what you think. I certainly don't want it to be an indictment against the Department or anyone else. I also don't want to have it sound defensive either. If you would like I can also provide other documents that I have prepared for you if you think that will be useful.

I don't know how effective this format is but I know the length doesn't do the situation justice.

rc

## Background of the Office of Indian Education

In 2003 the Interim Secretary of Education, Tom Hawley, visited with me regarding a concept that he was hoping that he could begin to make a reality in the state of South Dakota. Through his association with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) he learned of certain states who had dedicated specific personnel or resources to address the challenges faced in the area of Indian Education. There was action that was initiated to bring together an informal work group to help redevelop some basic framework for the office or individual who would direct the effort of the Department of Education in the area of Indian Education. Prior to the department actually selecting someone to lead the effort the decision was made to begin or reinstitute an annual summit or conference dedicated to identifying proven models of success in the education of native students across the state. The DOE held the first Indian Education Summit later that year and the following year the Department hired a Indian Education Coordinator.

## Background of Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (Gear Up SD)

In 2005 the SD DOE became involved with the USDOE's Gear Up program through a partnership with the Oceti Sakowin Education Consortium (OSEC), who was represented by Ted Hamilton and Stacy Phelps. The competitive application for funding to the USDOE for a statewide Gear Up initiative had a focus towards focusing on an American Indian student population but it did not include significant representation from public schools rather it focused mainly on the Tribal/BIE school population. It did include some public school districts with significant native populations.

From 2005-2011, which were the dates for the first Gear Up grant, the program has been run with almost complete autonomy with Mid-Central Education Cooperative assuming the fiscal agent role and the OSEC organization working as a conduit for the Tribal/BIE schools.

When I initially took the position of Indian Ed. Director in 2011 there were a number of challenges that had been communicated to me from the DOE about Gear Up and a more recent grant, College Access Challenge. The Gear Up

grant had more history in terms of questions about accountability specifically but both grants and the management of each has been a point of contention in the department as well as certain agencies outside the department.

Because that the first Gear Up Grant had seen three DOE Secretaries and four OIE Directors I didn't feel it prudent to proceed with implementing any changes to fiscal policies and certainly not the programmatic make-up of Gear UP or College Access Challenge.

In September of 2011 the SD DOE was awarded a new GU Grant in the amount of approximately \$24 million dollars for seven years. Prior to the notification of award I had informed the Gear Up Project Coordinator and contractors of pending changes in terms of establishing accountability. There was a delay in the contracting process.

In 2011, on at least two separate occasions, I had approached both AIII and MCEC staff/leadership regarding changes to fiscal reporting due to some of the concerns that had been brought forth regarding the Gear Up program. From the beginning I have been transparent with the DOE's Finance and Grants Management department as well as the department leadership in my approach. I have kept Department in the loop regarding the expectations that I have set forth for MCEC/AIII regarding fiscal reporting. At no time has the intent of my actions ever been questioned by the Department. but rather have been encouraged to continue to seek a level of accountability that has been non-existent since the inception of the first SD Gear Up Program.

**Accountability** - In terms of staff who have been paid under the grants, a detailed determination of which staff was paid by which grant and what percentage of their time was allocated to the respective grants. When this request has been made it took 2 months for one of the contractors to produce an FTE list and grant allocation for each employee and it was inconsistent with what was presented in terms of the budget. Certain individuals were not accurately defined in terms of grant responsibilities. There were also instances of certain employees being paid from both grants at amounts inconsistent with SD DOE standards. There were dollars attempted to be expended that were without grant agreement or contract and based on our agreement with the contractor were not reasonable or necessary. When the request has been made in terms of which schools are assigned to which of the seven Outreach Coordinators, there is difficulty or delay in providing the requested information. The amount and purpose of travel is also in question because travel policies were not in place or were not followed. There is question about the necessity of certain supplies and equipment expenditures. Prior to the new Gear Up grant none of the accountability measures that I am instituting had been followed. We have also communicated to the feds through the annual performance report that there were certain activities that had taken place but in fact they had not.

There has also been a lack of checks and balances with the fiscal responsibilities. The Business Manager for Mid Central Education Cooperative (MCEC) is also the CFO American Indian Institute for Innovation (AIII) who is another grant partner. He also serves in the capacity of Business Manager for the Oceti Sakowin Education Consortium (OSEC) who is another grant partner. The Assistance Business Manager for MCEC is paid at 80% FTE directly off of the Gear Up grant but is titled as Data Specialist. The Business Manager for AIII is a MCEC employee who in the past was the highest paid employee paid out of the College Access Challenge grant.

We are almost to the end of the seventh year of Gear Up in SD and to date there has never been an audit of this federal program. I have requested that the Department consider an audit of one of the previous grant years. It has been decided that the Department will move forward with increased diligence in the monitoring of both of these grants now that we have established an improved level of grant administration from MCEC but I suggest that we consider doing an audit of certain line items of the budget to include Personnel, Travel, Supplies & Equipment.

**Transparency** – In terms of the level communication from the department and the contractors about the activities of the grant and staff; I am trying to ascertain which personnel performs what function. Historically, there has been little effort by the Project Director to provide oversight of the program. Over the last six months I am attempting to gauge what activities are actually taking place and who is conducting them; the Gear Up staff, either through MCEC, AIII or the schools. I have initiated a process in which the partners of each respective grant have a copy of the plan so that they better understand their role within the framework of the grant. We are hoping to delineate between the organizational

partners. It has been determined that agreements between MCEC and other partners have been incorrect or have not been in place which is not following proper grant administration. There has not been an collective effort to effectively communicate with the SD DOE in terms of grant initiatives nor has there been attempts at building relationships to improve the data collection efforts so that we can more effectively assess and measure the program.

**Clarity** – In terms of understanding what the goals and objectives of the grants are and the determination of the effectiveness of their implementation. It is the responsibility of the DOE to ensure the oversight and integrity of the grant and its initiatives by working with the independent external evaluator to measure the effectiveness of the grant. Historically the Gear Up program has suffered from objectivity in its assessment due to the relationship between the contractor and evaluator. Currently, through a competitive bid process, the DOE has contracted with an Independent External Evaluator who will assist in providing a fair and unbiased assessment to the effectiveness and efficiency of the Gear Up program.

As the current Project Director I have certain responsibilities to both the SD Gear Up grant and SD College Access Challenge grant. I believe anecdotally I have been accused of being misguided or ill-intentioned but if you look at the collective effort of what I have tried to bring to the situation, it can be determined that I have acted in the best interests of the SD DOE in trying to manage these grants with an improved amount of accountability, transparency and clarity.

**Schopp, Melody (DOE)**

**From:** Campbell, Roger  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 01, 2012 10:56 AM  
**To:** Schopp, Melody (DOE)  
**Subject:** Additional information

This PDF is the document that Dan, Stacy and Scott came to present to you last April. I've cut and pasted rebuttal to some of those concerns.



SDGUG \_  
SDCAG.pdf

There are 13 different points that MCEC/AIII made and I'll try to limit my responses which I didn't provide at the meeting.

1. We're all partners but SD DOE is the lead partner; I feel that the other partners will provide whatever financial/programmatic information that we request
2. There have been no significant changes to programmatic issues that would warrant input
3. There is email dialogue between the partners that somewhat contradicts this statement; I received from grants management the instructions for grant request in mid-December; I requested the grant early February and we actually sent them the contract on 2.19.12; they took a month to get it back and we signed it on 3.20.12
4. Similar situation to #3; money being dispersed using their own discretion and when the school payments became an issue they blame DOE
5. They've expended the resources on staff but have not paid the schools which is a large part of the data collection needed for the APR; MCEC/AIII/BCKuhn prepared the response to the Program Officer about these concerns; in that report were inaccuracies about the actual progress of the project
6. This situation is similar to the contracting process; additionally, BCKuhn indicated on last week's call that the APR was just a report and data collection that was separate from the program evaluation that the Independent External Evaluator was going to be doing; that was her response when I asked about a possible conflict of interest because she had submitted an RFP to be the Independent External Evaluator while already contracted to do the data collection for MCEC.
7. I don't feel that they can pick and choose to independently spend money without a contract and then also use it as an excuse
8. I'm not sure when and where it has been stated to have these "Project Management Team" meetings; additionally, the Project Director has not been involved in a number of the management issues that the Work Plan requires and have apparently taken place without the oversight or inclusion of the Project Director; once again, a double-standard with the use of the Work Plan.
9. I'm not sure why this was a concern; we never indicated any changes regarding the partner schools
10. Per Jan Martin there were no boundaries crossed –The intent of the questions/observations about working with DOE to collect needed data was to assist the SDGU staff with data collection so that the data was consistent and accurate when reported for APRs, evaluations, or in other settings. A sample of the data available through SDAP was provided to illustrate how student data without names can be obtained for use in the data collection. As a person working with large amounts of secure data for both NAEP and for SD DOE, the need for protecting the rights of students is paramount in the processes used for reporting. There was never the intention to do anything with the data provided. Based on the MOU between the state and the BIE, schools must know that the DSTEP data goes through SD DOE before it goes to the BIE for determining AYP. Additionally, all the BIE/tribal/other private schools in the state have access to their school's data through SDAP/eMetric so that the data sample was provided as a way to educate project staff on what is possible.

11. The Project Director was asking questions to gauge the effectiveness and efficiency of the Gear Up Program; at no time was it suggested that we were going to make any significant programmatic changes. The statement that the project is not going to collect student achievement data seems to go against the needed data for the evaluation plan. In addition, the collecting of student data in the data system the project is implementing calls for test data among other data. The case was made in the proposal that the database was needed because the BIE/tribal schools have a different data system. On page 1:1 of the project abstract, it states that state assessment scores will be used as part of the overall evaluation. On page 8:45, objectives 1.8 and 1.9 require the collection and analysis of state assessment scores for participants/participating schools.
12. We will access any data from the BIE that is necessary and allowable to effectively and accurately measure the impact of the SD Gear Up Grant; I will go to each and every school with this message and if they don't wish to provide we can reallocate resources to other eligible schools/students. Again, there are numerous places in the grant application that indicates that assessment data are part of the overall data collection needed to satisfy federal requirements.
13. MCEC has not consulted with the SD DOE in the past regarding this financial information on the SD Gear Up funds or the SD CACG funds which they should have been doing all along; if they would have checked, SD DOE would have provided the information.

**Roger Campbell**  
**(605) 773-3783**

---

**From:** Campbell, Roger  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 01, 2012 9:16 AM  
**To:** Schopp, Melody (DOE)  
**Subject:** draft

Melody,

If you have some time...

Take a look at let me know what you think. I certainly don't want it to be an indictment against the Department or anyone else. I also don't want to have it sound defensive either. If you would like I can also provide other documents that I have prepared for you if you think that will be useful.

I don't know how effective this format is but I know the length doesn't do the situation justice.

rc

## Background of the Office of Indian Education

In 2003 the Interim Secretary of Education, Tom Hawley, visited with me regarding a concept that he was hoping that he could begin to make a reality in the state of South Dakota. Through his association with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) he learned of certain states who had dedicated specific personnel or resources to address the challenges faced in the area of Indian Education. There was action that was initiated to bring together an informal work group to help redevelop some basic framework for the office or individual who would direct the effort of the Department of Education in the area of Indian Education. Prior to the department actually selecting someone to lead the effort the decision was made to begin or reinstitute an annual summit or conference dedicated to identifying proven

models of success in the education of native students across the state. The DOE held the first Indian Education Summit later that year and the following year the Department hired a Indian Education Coordinator.

## Background of Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (Gear Up SD)

In 2005 the SD DOE became involved with the USDOE's Gear Up program through a partnership with the Oceti Sakowin Education Consortium (OSEC), who was represented by Ted Hamilton and Stacy Phelps. The competitive application for funding to the USDOE for a statewide Gear Up initiative had a focus towards focusing on an American Indian student population but it did not include significant representation from public schools rather it focused mainly on the Tribal/BIE school population. It did include some public school districts with significant native populations.

From 2005-2011, which were the dates for the first Gear Up grant, the program has been run with almost complete autonomy with Mid-Central Education Cooperative assuming the fiscal agent role and the OSEC organization working as a conduit for the Tribal/BIE schools.

When I initially took the position of Indian Ed. Director in 2011 there were a number of challenges that had been communicated to me from the DOE about Gear Up and a more recent grant, College Access Challenge. The Gear Up grant had more history in terms of questions about accountability specifically but both grants and the management of each has been a point of contention in the department as well as certain agencies outside the department.

Because that the first Gear Up Grant had seen three DOE Secretaries and four OIE Directors I didn't feel it prudent to proceed with implementing any changes to fiscal policies and certainly not the programmatic make-up of Gear UP or College Access Challenge.

In September of 2011 the SD DOE was awarded a new GU Grant in the amount of approximately \$24 million dollars for seven years. Prior to the notification of award I had informed the Gear Up Project Coordinator and contractors of pending changes in terms of establishing accountability. There was a delay in the contracting process.

In 2011, on at least two separate occasions, I had approached both AIII and MCEC staff/leadership regarding changes to fiscal reporting due to some of the concerns that had been brought forth regarding the Gear Up program. From the beginning I have been transparent with the DOE's Finance and Grants Management department as well as the department leadership in my approach. I have kept Department in the loop regarding the expectations that I have set forth for MCEC/AIII regarding fiscal reporting. At no time has the intent of my actions ever been questioned by the Department. but rather have been encouraged to continue to seek a level of accountability that has been non-existent since the inception of the first SD Gear Up Program.

**Accountability** - In terms of staff who have been paid under the grants, a detailed determination of which staff was paid by which grant and what percentage of their time was allocated to the respective grants. When this request has been made it took 2 months for one of the contractors to produce an FTE list and grant allocation for each employee and it was inconsistent with what was presented in terms of the budget. Certain individuals were not accurately defined in terms of grant responsibilities. There were also instances of certain employees being paid from both grants at amounts inconsistent with SD DOE standards. There were dollars attempted to be expended that were without grant agreement or contract and based on our agreement with the contractor were not reasonable or necessary. When the request has been made in terms of which schools are assigned to which of the seven Outreach Coordinators, there is difficulty or delay in providing the requested information. The amount and purpose of travel is also in question because travel policies were not in place or were not followed. There is question about the necessity of certain supplies and equipment expenditures. Prior to the new Gear Up grant none of the accountability measures that I am instituting had been followed. We have also communicated to the feds through the annual performance report that there were certain activities that had taken place but in fact they had not.



There has also been a lack of checks and balances with the fiscal responsibilities. The Business Manager for Mid Central Education Cooperative (MCEC) is also the CFO American Indian Institute for Innovation (AIII) who is another grant partner. He also serves in the capacity of Business Manager for the Oceti Sakowin Education Consortium (OSEC) who is another grant partner. The Assistance Business Manager for MCEC is paid at 80% FTE directly off of the Gear Up grant but is titled as Data Specialist. The Business Manager for AIII is a MCEC employee who in the past was the highest paid employee paid out of the College Access Challenge grant.

We are almost to the end of the seventh year of Gear Up in SD and to date there has never been an audit of this federal program. I have requested that the Department consider an audit of one of the previous grant years. It has been decided that the Department will move forward with increased diligence in the monitoring of both of these grants now that we have established an improved level of grant administration from MCEC but I suggest that we consider doing an audit of certain line items of the budget to include Personnel, Travel, Supplies & Equipment.

**Transparency** – In terms of the level communication from the department and the contractors about the activities of the grant and staff; I am trying to ascertain which personnel performs what function. Historically, there has been little effort by the Project Director to provide oversight of the program. Over the last six months I am attempting to gauge what activities are actually taking place and who is conducting them; the Gear Up staff, either through MCEC, AIII or the schools. I have initiated a process in which the partners of each respective grant have a copy of the plan so that they better understand their role within the framework of the grant. We are hoping to delineate between the organizational partners. It has been determined that agreements between MCEC and other partners have been incorrect or have not been in place which is not following proper grant administration. There has not been an collective effort to effectively communicate with the SD DOE in terms of grant initiatives nor has there been attempts at building relationships to improve the data collection efforts so that we can more effectively assess and measure the program.

**Clarity** – In terms of understanding what the goals and objectives of the grants are and the determination of the effectiveness of their implementation. It is the responsibility of the DOE to ensure the oversight and integrity of the grant and its initiatives by working with the independent external evaluator to measure the effectiveness of the grant. Historically the Gear Up program has suffered from objectivity in its assessment due to the relationship between the contractor and evaluator. Currently, through a competitive bid process, the DOE has contracted with an Independent External Evaluator who will assist in providing a fair and unbiased assessment to the effectiveness and efficiency of the Gear Up program.

As the current Project Director I have certain responsibilities to both the SD Gear Up grant and SD College Access Challenge grant. I believe anecdotally I have been accused of being misguided or ill-intentioned but if you look at the collective effort of what I have tried to bring to the situation, it can be determined that I have acted in the best interests of the SD DOE in trying to manage these grants with an improved amount of accountability, transparency and clarity.

**Schopp, Melody (DOE)**

---

**From:** Schopp, Melody (DOE)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 01, 2012 4:24 PM  
**To:** Campbell, Roger  
**Subject:** RE: Additional information

Roger – we need to stop doing this back and forth thing. I don't know where any of this is going and it seems all this is going to do is further the issues. This was April – it is useless at this point to address the issues again. Can we simply move forward?

*Melody*

---

**From:** Campbell, Roger  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 01, 2012 10:56 AM  
**To:** Schopp, Melody (DOE)  
**Subject:** Additional information

This PDF is the document that Dan, Stacy and Scott came to present to you last April. I've cut and pasted rebuttal to some of those concerns.

<< File: SDGUG & SDCAG.pdf >>

There are 13 different points that MCEC/AIII made and I'll try to limit my responses which I didn't provide at the meeting.

1. We're all partners but SD DOE is the lead partner; I feel that the other partners will provide whatever financial/programmatic information that we request
2. There have been no significant changes to programmatic issues that would warrant input
3. There is email dialogue between the partners that somewhat contradicts this statement; I received from grants management the instructions for grant request in mid-December; I requested the grant early February and we actually sent them the contract on 2.19.12; they took a month to get it back and we signed it on 3.20.12
4. Similar situation to #3; money being dispersed using their own discretion and when the school payments became an issue they blame DOE
5. They've expended the resources on staff but have not paid the schools which is a large part of the data collection needed for the APR; MCEC/AIII/BCKuhn prepared the response to the Program Officer about these concerns; in that report were inaccuracies about the actual progress of the project
6. This situation is similar to the contracting process; additionally, BCKuhn indicated on last week's call that the APR was just a report and data collection that was separate from the program evaluation that the Independent External Evaluator was going to be doing; that was her response when I asked about a possible conflict of interest because she had submitted an RFP to be the Independent External Evaluator while already contracted to do the data collection for MCEC.
7. I don't feel that they can pick and choose to independently spend money without a contract and then also use it as an excuse
8. I'm not sure when and where it has been stated to have these "Project Management Team" meetings; additionally, the Project Director has not been involved in a number of the management issues that the Work Plan requires and have apparently taken place without the oversight or inclusion of the Project Director; once again, a double-standard with the use of the Work Plan.
9. I'm not sure why this was a concern; we never indicated any changes regarding the partner schools

10. Per Jan Martin there were no boundaries crossed –The intent of the questions/observations about working with DOE to collect needed data was to assist the SDGU staff with data collection so that the data was consistent and accurate when reported for APRs, evaluations, or in other settings. A sample of the data available through SDAP was provided to illustrate how student data without names can be obtained for use in the data collection. As a person working with large amounts of secure data for both NAEP and for SD DOE, the need for protecting the rights of students is paramount in the processes used for reporting. There was never the intention to do anything with the data provided. Based on the MOU between the state and the BIE, schools must know that the DSTEP data goes through SD DOE before it goes to the BIE for determining AYP. Additionally, all the BIE/tribal/other private schools in the state have access to their school's data through SDAP/eMetric so that the data sample was provided as a way to educate project staff on what is possible.
11. The Project Director was asking questions to gauge the effectiveness and efficiency of the Gear Up Program; at no time was it suggested that we were going to make any significant programmatic changes. The statement that the project is not going to collect student achievement data seems to go against the needed data for the evaluation plan. In addition, the collecting of student data in the data system the project is implementing calls for test data among other data. The case was made in the proposal that the database was needed because the BIE/tribal schools have a different data system. On page 1:1 of the project abstract, it states that state assessment scores will be used as part of the overall evaluation. On page 8:45, objectives 1.8 and 1.9 require the collection and analysis of state assessment scores for participants/participating schools.
12. We will access any data from the BIE that is necessary and allowable to effectively and accurately measure the impact of the SD Gear Up Grant; I will go to each and every school with this message and if they don't wish to provide we can reallocate resources to other eligible schools/students. Again, there are numerous places in the grant application that indicates that assessment data are part of the overall data collection needed to satisfy federal requirements.
13. MCEC has not consulted with the SD DOE in the past regarding this financial information on the SD Gear Up funds or the SD CACG funds which they should have been doing all along; if they would have checked, SD DOE would have provided the information.

***Roger Campbell***  
***(605) 773-3783***

---

**From:** Campbell, Roger  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 01, 2012 9:16 AM  
**To:** Schopp, Melody (DOE)  
**Subject:** draft

Melody,

If you have some time...

Take a look at let me know what you think. I certainly don't want it to be an indictment against the Department or anyone else. I also don't want to have it sound defensive either. If you would like I can also provide other documents that I have prepared for you if you think that will be useful.

I don't know how effective this format is but I know the length doesn't do the situation justice.

rc

## Background of the Office of Indian Education

In 2003 the Interim Secretary of Education, Tom Hawley, visited with me regarding a concept that he was hoping that he could begin to make a reality in the state of South Dakota. Through his association with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) he learned of certain states who had dedicated specific personnel or resources to address the challenges faced in the area of Indian Education. There was action that was initiated to bring together an informal work group to help redevelop some basic framework for the office or individual who would direct the effort of the Department of Education in the area of Indian Education. Prior to the department actually selecting someone to lead the effort the decision was made to begin or reinstitute an annual summit or conference dedicated to identifying proven models of success in the education of native students across the state. The DOE held the first Indian Education Summit later that year and the following year the Department hired a Indian Education Coordinator.

## Background of Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (Gear Up SD)

In 2005 the SD DOE became involved with the USDOE's Gear Up program through a partnership with the Oceti Sakowin Education Consortium (OSEC), who was represented by Ted Hamilton and Stacy Phelps. The competitive application for funding to the USDOE for a statewide Gear Up initiative had a focus towards focusing on an American Indian student population but it did not include significant representation from public schools rather it focused mainly on the Tribal/BIE school population. It did include some public school districts with significant native populations.

From 2005-2011, which were the dates for the first Gear Up grant, the program has been run with almost complete autonomy with Mid-Central Education Cooperative assuming the fiscal agent role and the OSEC organization working as a conduit for the Tribal/BIE schools.

When I initially took the position of Indian Ed. Director in 2011 there were a number of challenges that had been communicated to me from the DOE about Gear Up and a more recent grant, College Access Challenge. The Gear Up grant had more history in terms of questions about accountability specifically but both grants and the management of each has been a point of contention in the department as well as certain agencies outside the department.

Because that the first Gear Up Grant had seen three DOE Secretaries and four OIE Directors I didn't feel it prudent to proceed with implementing any changes to fiscal policies and certainly not the programmatic make-up of Gear UP or College Access Challenge.

In September of 2011 the SD DOE was awarded a new GU Grant in the amount of approximately \$24 million dollars for seven years. Prior to the notification of award I had informed the Gear Up Project Coordinator and contractors of pending changes in terms of establishing accountability. There was a delay in the contracting process.

In 2011, on at least two separate occasions, I had approached both AIII and MCEC staff/leadership regarding changes to fiscal reporting due to some of the concerns that had been brought forth regarding the Gear Up program. From the beginning I have been transparent with the DOE's Finance and Grants Management department as well as the department leadership in my approach. I have kept Department in the loop regarding the expectations that I have set forth for MCEC/AIII regarding fiscal reporting. At no time has the intent of my actions ever been questioned by the Department. but rather have been encouraged to continue to seek a level of accountability that has been non-existent since the inception of the first SD Gear Up Program.

**Accountability** - In terms of staff who have been paid under the grants, a detailed determination of which staff was paid by which grant and what percentage of their time was allocated to the respective grants. When this request has been made it took 2 months for one of the contractors to produce an FTE list and grant allocation for each employee and it was inconsistent with what was presented in terms of the budget. Certain individuals were not accurately defined

in terms of grant responsibilities. There were also instances of certain employees being paid from both grants at amounts inconsistent with SD DOE standards. There were dollars attempted to be expended that were without grant agreement or contract and based on our agreement with the contractor were not reasonable or necessary. When the request has been made in terms of which schools are assigned to which of the seven Outreach Coordinators, there is difficulty or delay in providing the requested information. The amount and purpose of travel is also in question because travel policies were not in place or were not followed. There is question about the necessity of certain supplies and equipment expenditures. Prior to the new Gear Up grant none of the accountability measures that I am instituting had been followed. We have also communicated to the feds through the annual performance report that there were certain activities that had taken place but in fact they had not.

There has also been a lack of checks and balances with the fiscal responsibilities. The Business Manager for Mid Central Education Cooperative (MCEC) is also the CFO American Indian Institute for Innovation (AIII) who is another grant partner. He also serves in the capacity of Business Manager for the Oceti Sakowin Education Consortium (OSEC) who is another grant partner. The Assistance Business Manager for MCEC is paid at 80% FTE directly off of the Gear Up grant but is titled as Data Specialist. The Business Manager for AIII is a MCEC employee who in the past was the highest paid employee paid out of the College Access Challenge grant.

We are almost to the end of the seventh year of Gear Up in SD and to date there has never been an audit of this federal program. I have requested that the Department consider an audit of one of the previous grant years. It has been decided that the Department will move forward with increased diligence in the monitoring of both of these grants now that we have established an improved level of grant administration from MCEC but I suggest that we consider doing an audit of certain line items of the budget to include Personnel, Travel, Supplies & Equipment.

**Transparency** – In terms of the level communication from the department and the contractors about the activities of the grant and staff; I am trying to ascertain which personnel performs what function. Historically, there has been little effort by the Project Director to provide oversight of the program. Over the last six months I am attempting to gauge what activities are actually taking place and who is conducting them; the Gear Up staff, either through MCEC, AIII or the schools. I have initiated a process in which the partners of each respective grant have a copy of the plan so that they better understand their role within the framework of the grant. We are hoping to delineate between the organizational partners. It has been determined that agreements between MCEC and other partners have been incorrect or have not been in place which is not following proper grant administration. There has not been an collective effort to effectively communicate with the SD DOE in terms of grant initiatives nor has there been attempts at building relationships to improve the data collection efforts so that we can more effectively assess and measure the program.

**Clarity** – In terms of understanding what the goals and objectives of the grants are and the determination of the effectiveness of their implementation. It is the responsibility of the DOE to ensure the oversight and integrity of the grant and its initiatives by working with the independent external evaluator to measure the effectiveness of the grant. Historically the Gear Up program has suffered from objectivity in its assessment due to the relationship between the contractor and evaluator. Currently, through a competitive bid process, the DOE has contracted with an Independent External Evaluator who will assist in providing a fair and unbiased assessment to the effectiveness and efficiency of the Gear Up program.

As the current Project Director I have certain responsibilities to both the SD Gear Up grant and SD College Access Challenge grant. I believe anecdotally I have been accused of being misguided or ill-intentioned but if you look at the collective effort of what I have tried to bring to the situation, it can be determined that I have acted in the best interests of the SD DOE in trying to manage these grants with an improved amount of accountability, transparency and clarity.