

MONTANA

SY 2011-2012

**Request for Applications
for LEA School Improvement Grants**

**Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act**

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A

Mandatory Letter of Intent to Apply for Tier I Schools Due June 30, 2011

Applications for Tier I Schools Due July 22, 2011

Montana Office of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

June 2011

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

GENERAL INFORMATION

DEADLINES FOR APPLICATION SUBMISSION

Mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply for Tier I Schools..... June 30, 2011

LEA SIG Application and Supplements for Tier I Schools July 22, 2011

NOTE: The Mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply may be submitted by fax or email. Applications may be submitted by email no later than the due date, with an original signed Cover Page and Assurances & Waivers page submitted by mail. The signature pages must be postmarked no later than the due dates specified above. Late applications will not be reviewed.

Submit applications electronically to: bgranbery@mt.gov

For more information, contact:

BJ Granbery
Title I Director/Division Administrator
Montana Office of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501
Phone: 406-444-4420
Fax: 406-444-3924
bgranbery@mt.gov

All applicants submitting applications in a timely manner will receive a Grant Application Receipt Acknowledgment by email.

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

Contents

I. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG) REQUEST for APPLICATIONS SUMMARY

A. Purpose of the Program.....	2
B. Final Requirements and Guidance	2
C. Availability of Funds and Related Conditions	2
D. Mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply Required	4
E. Eligible LEAs and Schools	4
F. Required School Improvement Models for Tier I Schools	5
G. Services for Tier III Schools	6
H. Evaluation Criteria and Review Process	6
I. Priority for Funding	7
J. Reporting Requirements	7
K. Assurances and Waivers	7
L. Conditions of Grant award.....	7
M. Appeals Process	8
N. Technical Assistance.....	8
O. Timeline for Applications	8
P. Submission of Application.....	9

II. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG) INSTRUCTIONS & EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. Directions & Checklist.....	11
B. LEA Application Evaluation Criteria	11
C. School Level Application Criteria – Transformation Model	14
D. School Level Application Criteria – Turnaround Model	17
E. School Level Application Criteria – Restart Model.....	20
F. School Level Application Criteria – Closure Model.....	22
G. School Level Application Criteria – Tier III School.....	24

III. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG) REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS NOTICE & FORMS

A. Mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply.....	25
B. Application Cover Sheet	27
C. Application Elements.....	30
D. Assurances & Waivers	35

IV. APPENDICES

A. Federal Regulations.....	
B. Montana’s Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools.....	
C. Montana’s List of Eligible Schools in Tier I and III.....	

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

I. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG) REQUEST for APPLICATIONS SUMMARY Under 1003(g) of the ESEA

A. Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. Under the final requirements, published in the Federal Register in October 2010 (final requirements, attached as Appendix A), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are a State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools. Tier II schools are a State's persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. Montana has no Tier II schools. An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools ("Tier III schools"). (See the Appendix for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) In the Tier I schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

B. Final Requirements and Guidance

The *Final Requirements* that govern the SIG grants and the US Department of Education *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under 1003(g) of the ESEA, Revised November 1, 2010* and published by the US Department of Education provide complete information about the program and provides answers to frequently asked questions. These documents are posted on the department website at www.ed.gov. References will be made to the "requirements" and to the "guidance" that will provide assistance in completing the grant application. Applicants are strongly encouraged to print and review these documents carefully in addition to this application packet prior to submitting a Notice of Intent to Apply for any funds under this application.

C. Availability of Funds and Related Conditions

- 1. Projected Total Available for Awards:** For state fiscal year (FY) 2012, there is up to \$1,682,039 available for one year under the School Improvement Grants to LEAs under section 1003(g).

These funds are being awarded to LEAs with eligible schools by the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) through a competitive grant process as described in this Request for Applications. The LEA's total grant may not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2,000,000 per year for each Tier I and Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve, but the individual budgets for each school may

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

vary within the total grant to the LEA. The range of grant awards will vary depending on the number of schools served, the type of intervention models chosen for Tier I schools, and the services provided to Tier III schools. Schools may need more or less funding depending on the size or the costs of the strategies to be implemented in the chosen model.

- Approximately \$250,000 to \$500,000 per year for 3 years for each Tier I school site with an enrollment of 100 students to implement a turnaround, transformation, or restart model.
- Approximately \$50,000 for one year to close a Tier I school with an enrollment of 100 students.
- Approximately \$100,000 to \$150,000 per year for 3 years to provide significant services to a Tier III school.

The State reserves the right to award a smaller or larger amount of grant funds than requested based upon available funding and the recommendations of the review panel.

Grant Period: The grant period will be for one school year of full implementation (2011-2012). Initial grant awards will be for the 2011-2012 school year. The grant award will begin as soon as the grants are approved, and funds may be used prior to the 2011-2012 school year for certain approved activities in the pre-implementation period, if approved. Federal FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012. These funds must cover the preimplementation activities plus the full implementation during the 2011-2012 school year. Funding for subsequent school years is expected to be of similar size, but is always dependent upon future Congressional funding. Continued funding is also dependent on the school's meeting or making progress toward the annual goals specified in the LEA's application for the school and in the leading indicators as defined in the reporting metrics in III.A.3 of the final requirements.

- 1. Supplement, Not Supplant Conditions:** Federal funds received under SIG 1003(g) must be used to supplement, not supplant state and local funding. The implementation of the supplement, not supplant requirement varies depending on what type of Title I program is operated in the school. In a Title I school operating a schoolwide (SWP) program, the funding must be supplemental to funding provided through state and local sources. In a Title I school operating a targeted assistance (TA) program, the LEA must ensure that the Title I, Part A funds the school receives are used only for activities that supplement those that would be available from non-Federal funds for Title I participating students in the absence of the Title I, Part A funds. In order to implement one of the required school improvement models schoolwide in a Tier I Title I school that has less than 40% poverty, it will be necessary for LEAs to apply for a waiver to operate a schoolwide program in the school. See question F-4 in the guidance for more information.

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

D. Mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply Required

In order to determine the expected applications and amount of funding that LEAs will be requesting, the OPI is requiring a mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply to be submitted by June 30, 2011. This notice requires an LEA with Tier I schools and Tier III schools that feed into the Tier I schools, to list the Tier I and III schools that it commits to serve, if funding is available. The OPI will use that information to determine how many Tier I schools may be able to be served and the amount of funding, if any, that will be available to serve Tier III schools in those districts. The OPI will provide additional guidance to districts related to the possible amounts of funding available prior to submission of final applications.

E. Eligible LEAs and Schools

An LEA is eligible to receive a SIG grant if it has at least one school on the list of eligible schools. Schools that are eligible for funding are those listed on the list of Tier I and Tier III schools as determined by the state according to the final requirements of the SIG grants. There are no Tier II schools in Montana. Priority for funding must go to Tier I schools. LEAs with Tier I schools must commit to serve at least one Tier I school before applying to serve a Tier III school. The OPI must ensure that all Tier I schools that LEAs commit to serve are funded before awarding any funds to Tier III schools. (See questions H-5 through H-13 in the guidance.) The following chart summarizes the requirements.

If an LEA has one or more	In order to get SIG funds, the LEA <u>must</u> commit to serve
Tier I and Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier I schools, but no Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier I and III schools, but no Tier II schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier III schools, but no Tier I schools	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier III schools as it wishes
Tier I schools only	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve
Tier III schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier III schools as it wishes

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

Required School Improvement Models for Tier I Schools

To receive SIG funding, a Tier I school *must* implement one of four intervention models – Turnaround, Transformation, Restart, or Closure. An overview of each model is provided here, but the applicant is strongly encouraged to carefully read the final requirements and the guidance for specific requirements of each model before submitting a Notice of Intent to Apply.

Turnaround Model Overview

- **Teachers & Leader**
 - Replace principal
 - Use locally adopted “turnaround” competencies to review and select staff for school (rehire no more than 50% of existing staff)
 - Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff
- **Instructional and Support Strategies**
 - Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs
 - Provide job-embedded PD designed to build capacity and support staff
 - Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction
- **Time and Support**
 - Provide *increased learning time* (for staff and students)
 - Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports
- **Governance**
 - New governance structure
 - Grant operating flexibility to school leader

Transformation Model Overview

- **Teachers and Leaders**
 - Replace principal
 - Implement new evaluation system
 - Developed with staff
 - Uses student growth as a significant factor
 - Identify and reward staff who are increasing student outcomes; support and then remove those who are not
 - Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff
- **Instructional and Support Strategies**
 - Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs
 - Provide job-embedded professional development designed to build capacity and support staff
 - Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction
- **Time and Support**
 - Provide *increased learning time* (for staff and students)
 - Provide ongoing mechanism for community and family engagement
 - Partner to provide social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports
- **Governance**
 - Provide sufficient operating flexibility to implement reform
 - Ensure ongoing technical assistance

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

Restart Model Overview

Restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected **through a rigorous review process**.

- A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.
- A rigorous review process could take such things into consideration as an applicant's team, track record, instructional program, model's theory of action, sustainability.
- As part of this model, a State must review the process the LEA will use/has used to select the partner.
- The LEA must seek charter school status through the process required by the Montana Board of Public Education in ARM 10.55.604 (charter school rule in the Standards of Accreditation).

Closure Model Overview

School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are **higher achieving**.

- These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.
- Office for Civil Rights Technical Assistance Module--Struggling Schools and School Closure Issues: *An Overview of Civil Rights Considerations*

Note: A Tier I school that implements either the Turnaround Model or the Restart Model may also receive a waiver to “start over” in the AYP school improvement timeline. A school that “starts over” will not be identified with an AYP level for the 2011-2012 school year. If it misses AYP based on the spring 2012 CRTs, it will be considered to be at AYP Year 1 (Yr1 or Watch List) for 2012-2013. A school must make progress toward its annual goals in its SIG application and continue to receive SIG funding for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 (if funds are available) in order to remain on the “start over” AYP timeline. If the school discontinues implementing the planned model or does not continue to receive SIG funds, the school will be designated at the AYP level that it would have been in the absence of implementing the model and receiving the waiver to “start over” in the AYP timeline.

F. Services for Tier III Schools

While there are no required school improvement intervention models for Tier III schools, an LEA must choose the strategies it will implement in the Tier III schools it commits to serve that are research-based and designed to address the particular needs of the Tier III schools. The strategies chosen must address one or more of the Correlate Categories described in the Five Year Comprehensive Plan (Academic Performance, Learning Environment, or Efficiency).

G. Evaluation Criteria and Review Process

The OPI will convene a panel of reviewers to evaluate the LEA applications according to the criteria as described in the Application Instructions section. The overall LEA application will be rated on the specified criteria. Each school application supplement will be reviewed on its model-specific criteria. In order to be recommended for funding, both the overall LEA application and an individual school supplement application must receive at least 60% of the possible total points and all required elements must be addressed. ***An LEA application that receives a score of 0 on any required element will not be funded.*** The

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

panel of reviewers will make recommendations on each individual school plan as well as on the overall LEA application, and, for any elements that receive a rating of less than 3, the district must submit additional information before funding will be awarded. See Section II of this packet for the LEA and School Level Application Criteria. The panel may recommend funding any one or more individual school plans in the LEA plan, and may make recommendations on the amount of funding requested.

H. Priority for Funding

The OPI is required to give priority for funding to Tier I schools. Before determining availability of funds for any Tier III schools, the OPI will consider the number and amount of funding expected from applications for Tier I schools and their Tier III feeder schools based on the Notice of Intent to Apply (those Tier III feeder schools within the same system receive priority before other Tier III schools). If it is determined that additional funding will be available to serve other Tier III schools, then the OPI will accept applications for additional Tier III schools as well. Tier III schools from other school systems that feed into a Tier I school will receive priority among the other Tier III schools.

I. Reporting Requirements

Data will be collected for the US Department of Education on each school that receives a SIG grant. The state will report a list of all LEAs that received a SIG grant and the amount of the grant. It will also report the list of schools in each LEA that were served, and the amount of funds or value of services received. Additional reporting metrics are required and will be reported for each Tier I school that is served. Most of the data is already collected and reported by the state, but the following reporting metrics are new for the SIG program and must be annually reported by schools receiving a SIG grant:

- 1) Which intervention the school used (*i.e.*, turnaround, restart, school closure, or transformation);
- 2) Number of minutes within the school year (based on the actual time school is in session);
- 3) Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup;
- 4) Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (*e.g.*, AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes (high school only); and
- 5) Teacher attendance rate.

See the complete list of reporting metrics, both for achievement indicators and leading indicators, in III.A.3. of the final requirements.

J. Assurances and Waivers

The LEA must sign the Assurances and Waivers Signature Page of the application and indicate which waivers, if any, will be implemented.

K. Conditions of Grant award

Evaluation of Grantee performance / continuation of funding:

Entities receiving federal funds are required to meet all necessary reporting requirements of the grant. In awarding the grant, the state expects the grantees to conduct all activities and evaluation measures as written or negotiated in the approved grant proposal. Failure to provide the requested performance reports; report and evaluate on all activities as proposed; and implement the grant as written; could result in the loss of

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

funding. Any changes to the original funded proposal (including modifications to goals and/or objectives) must receive prior approval by the state.

The state reserves the rights to withhold funding, reduce funding, or terminate funding if the proposal is not meeting program reporting requirements, making substantial progress toward meeting identified performance goals and measures; or does not demonstrate a clear need for the allotted level of grant support. This includes access to unexpended funds at the end of each fiscal year.

After it has been awarded, the OPI may terminate a grant by giving the grantee written notice of termination. In the event of termination after award, the OPI shall reimburse the grantee for approved grant expenses incurred up to the notification of termination. This grant is subject to federal appropriations and may be reduced or terminated based on federal appropriated funds in any given fiscal year.

The state retains the right to refrain from making any awards if it determines that to be in its best interest. This RFA does not, by itself, obligate the state.

The state reserves the right to add terms and conditions during grant negotiations. These terms and conditions will be within the scope of the RFA and will not affect the proposal reviews.

After the completion of grant negotiations, the state will issue a written Notice of Intent to Award (NIA) and send copies to all applicants. The NIA will set out the names of all applicants and identify the proposal(s) selected for award.

The state reserves the right to modify annual awards based on the actual amount of congressional appropriation towards this grant program.

L. Appeals Process

Any appeals must be filed no later than 30 calendar days after receiving Notice of Intent to Award. The appeals process is outlined in the State and Federal Grants Handbook that is located on the OPI web site at www.opi.mt.gov.

M. Technical Assistance

Documents and resources to assist districts in submitting a SIG application will be found on the OPI website at www.opi.mt.gov under Title I Programs. In addition to the requirements and guidance from the US Department of Education, the following resources will be helpful:

- *Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants* from the Center on Innovation and Improvement at www.cii.org
- Montana Correlates and Indicators of Effective Schools
http://www.opi.mt.gov/Programs/TitlePrgms/ssos.html#gpm1_3

N. Timeline for Applications

Final RFA Released June 15, 2011
Notice of Intent to Apply for Tier I Schools (and their Tier III Feeder Schools) .. Due June 30, 2011
LEA Application for Tier I and their Tier III Feeder Schools..... Due July 22, 2011

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

Notification to Districts of Availability of Funds for Other Tier III Schools.....	August 3, 2011
Notice of Intent to Apply for other Tier III Schools.....	August 15, 2011
LEA Application for Other Tier III Schools (depending on funding availability)Due August 31, 2011	
Grant Review Period.....	July to mid-September 2011
Notice of Intent to Award for Tier I with Tier III Feeder Schools	August 5, 2011
Notice of Intent to Award for Other Tier III Schools.....	September 15, 2011
Grant Funding Begins for Tier I and their Tier III Feeder Schools	August 15, 2011
Grant Funding Begins for Other Tier III Schools.....	October 1, 2011
Implementation of School Improvement model begins.....	Fall 2011

O. Submission of Application

Electronic Submission: The OPI strongly prefers to receive an LEA's School Improvement Grant application electronically. The district should submit it to the following address:

bgranbery@mt.gov

In addition, the LEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the LEA's authorized representative to the address listed below (mailed on or before the due date of the application).

Paper Submission: In the alternative, an SEA may submit the original and two copies of its School Improvement Grant application to the following address:

BJ Granbery, Title I Director/Division Administrator

Montana Office of Public Instruction

PO Box 202501

Helena, MT 59620-2501

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

This page intentionally left blank.

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

**II. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG)
INSTRUCTIONS & EVALUATION CRITERIA**

A. Directions & Checklist

A complete LEA application consists of Section III of this application packet, a budget for the LEA that includes all school budgets, and the applicable application supplement for each school plan. The following checklist will assist the district in submitting a complete application.

*This section is for your use only. **Do not** submit this section with the application.*

- LEA SIG Application (Section III of this document, pages 25 - 32)
 - Application Cover Page, signed by the district superintendent
 - Application Required Elements
 - Assurances and Waivers Signature Page
- LEA SIG Budget (Include complete budget for 1 year for all schools the LEA commits to serve, using the Budget form provided.)
- Application Supplement for each Tier I school.
- Application Supplement for each Tier III school with the following attachment:
 - School Improvement Plan for 2011-2012

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

B. LEA Application Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria will be used by the reviewers to evaluate the LEA application as a whole. Individual school plans will each be evaluated separately according to the type of intervention planned. The quality of the individual school plan ratings will be incorporated into the first element of the overall LEA application evaluation. In order for the overall LEA application to be recommended for funding, the overall application must receive at least 60% of the total possible points and all required elements must be addressed. ***An LEA application that receives a score of 0 on any required element will not be funded.*** Depending on reviewers' recommendations and available funding, the LEA overall application may be recommended for funding, yet one or more individual school plans submitted may not be recommended for funding, or may be recommended for a different amount of funding.

LEA Overall Application	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Good (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
LEA overall application				
1. LEA has provided a complete application with all required elements addressed for each Tier I school it commits to serve. LEA has provided complete information in the Tier III supplement for each Tier III school it commits to serve. Each school supplement plan has minimum point score of 60% of the total possible points, and no required elements receiving 0 points, excluding priority points.	0	2	6	10
2. LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to provide adequate resources and support to each Tier I school in the LEA's application, addressing specifically the area of human capacity at the district level and the ability to recruit and retain qualified and effective principals and teachers.	0	1	3	5
3. LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to provide adequate resources and support to each Tier I school in the LEA's application, addressing the ability to provide direct support and to contract with external providers, as needed. It has described the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting any external providers that will be used to provide support to the schools.	0	1	3	5
4. LEA has provided reasonable assurance of its ability to overcome any barriers in implementing the selected school intervention models, including changing any policies, procedures, or negotiated agreements. Statements or evidence of support has been provided by the teachers' union, the school board, staff, or parents as applicable.	0	1	3	5
5. LEA's record of previous actions taken to improve achievement in its schools and use of federal grants awarded to the district within the past two school years support the LEA's articulated capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I school in the LEA's application.	0	1	3	5
6. LEA has sufficiently explained why it does not have the capacity to serve each of its Tier I schools, addressing all applicable areas. The explanation of lack of capacity supports the LEA's description of the capacity it does have to serve the schools that it has committed to serve.	0	1	3	5

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

7. LEA overall application and individual school plans demonstrate a likelihood that the proposed reform efforts will succeed.	0	1	3	5
8. LEA's process for recruiting, screening, and selecting any external providers that will be used to provide support to the schools ensures that external providers have the capacity and a meaningful plan for contributing to the reform efforts in the schools.	0	1	3	5
9. LEA has provided a reasonable plan for sustaining the reforms in Tier I schools after the funding period ends.	0	1	3	5
10. LEA has provided a comprehensive, realistic budget to serve all schools throughout the period of funding availability.	0	1	3	5
11. LEA provided documentation of appropriate consultation with stakeholders and has submitted a signed cover page and assurances & waivers page.	0	1	3	5
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	60			

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

C. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Transformation Model

The following criteria will be used by the reviewers to evaluate each school level Transformation Model application supplement. In order to be considered for funding, a school plan must receive at least 60% of the total possible points and all required elements must be addressed. *An LEA or school application that receives a score of 0 on any required element will not be funded.*

<i>Transformation Model Criteria</i>	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Good (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
LEA Analysis of Needs & LEA Capacity				
Analysis of all required data is provided (CRTs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment).	0	1	3	5
Additional data has been analyzed.	0	1	3	5
Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided.	0	1	3	5
Intervention model chosen shows likelihood of addressing identified needs.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to implement each component of the selected model.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome.	0	1	3	5
Pre-implementation activities, if proposed, are allowable and will support full implementation of the model.	NA	No	Yes	NA
LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends.	0	1	3	5
Timeline, Goals & Monitoring				
LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented beginning in the 2011-2012 school year. (Note: US ED Guidance, question F-2, allows that certain model components, such as job-embedded professional development or identifying and rewarding teachers and principals who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates through effective implementation of a model, will occur later in the process of implementing a model.)	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in reading/language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable).	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I schools that receive SIG funds.	0	1	3	5
Implementation of Transformation Model				
(1) Developing Teacher & Leader Effectiveness – Required Activities				
(A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model.	0	1	3	5

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

(B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable systems for evaluation of teachers and principals that take into account data on student growth and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.	0	1	3	5
(C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and /or high school graduation rates and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve, have not done so.	0	1	3	5
(D) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching & learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	0	1	3	5
(E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.	0	1	3	5
(2) Comprehensive Instructional Reform Strategies – Required Activities				
(A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards.	0	1	3	5
(B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	0	1	3	5
(3) Increasing Learning Time – Required Activities				
(A) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time that significantly increases the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects, (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities, and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development (as defined in the final regulations).	0	1	3	5
(B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.	0	1	3	5
(4) Providing Operational Flexibility and support – Required Activities				
(A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement a fully comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.	0	1	3	5
(B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).	0	1	3	5
Transformation Model – Permissible Activities				
All permissible activities have been described completely and are aligned with and enhance the model.	0	1	3	5

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

Budget & Resources				
Budget provided is within the estimated range for the transformation model, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range.	0	1	3	5
Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the transformation model for the entire grant period.	0	1	3	5
Budget clearly aligns with components of transformation model.	0	1	3	5
Funding sources and amounts are provided for all three school years.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen.	0	1	3	5
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	135			

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

D. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Turnaround Model

The following criteria will be used by the reviewers to evaluate each school level Turnaround Model application supplement. In order to be considered for funding, a school plan must receive at least 60% of the total possible points and all required elements must be addressed. *An LEA or school application that receives a score of 0 on any required element will not be funded.*

<i>Turnaround Model Criteria</i>	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Good (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
LEA Analysis of Needs & LEA Capacity				
Analysis of all required data is provided (CRTs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment).	0	1	3	5
Additional data has been analyzed.	0	1	3	5
Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided.	0	1	3	5
Intervention model chosen shows likelihood of addressing identified needs.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to implement each component of the selected model.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome.	0	1	3	5
Pre-implementation activities, if proposed, are allowable and will support full implementation of the model.	NA	No	Yes	NA
LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends.	0	1	3	5
Timeline, Goals & Monitoring				
LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented beginning in the 2011-2012 school year. (Note: US ED Guidance, question F-2, allows that certain model components, such as job-embedded professional development or identifying and rewarding teachers and principals who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates through effective implementation of a model, will occur later in the process of implementing a model.)	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in reading/language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable).	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I schools that receive SIG funds.	0	1	3	5
Implementation of Turnaround Model				
Required Activities				
(i) Replace the principal and grant sufficient operational flexibility in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting to fully implement comprehensive reform.	0	1	3	5

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

(ii) Screen existing staff, rehire no more than 50% and select new staff using locally adopted competencies to measure the staff effectiveness to work in a turnaround model.	0	1	3	5
(iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.	0	1	3	5
(iv) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching & learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	0	1	3	5
(v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.	0	1	3	5
(vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards.	0	1	3	5
(vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	0	1	3	5
(viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time that significantly increases the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects, (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities, and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development (as defined in the final regulations).	0	1	3	5
(ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.	0	1	3	5
All permissible activities have been described completely and are aligned with and enhance the model.	0	1	3	5
Budget & Resources				
Budget provided is within the estimated range for the turnaround model, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range.	0	1	3	5
Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the turnaround model for the entire grant period.	0	1	3	5
Budget clearly aligns with components of turnaround model.	0	1	3	5
Funding sources and amounts are provided for all three school years.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen.	0	1	3	5

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	125			

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

E. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Restart Model

The following criteria will be used by the reviewers to evaluate each school level Restart Model application supplement. In order to be considered for funding, a school plan must receive at least 60% of the total possible points and all required elements must be addressed. ***An LEA or school application that receives a score of 0 on any required element will not be funded. The LEA must seek charter school status through the Montana Board of Public Education as per ARM 10.55.604 (Standards of Accreditation).***

<i>Restart Model Criteria</i>	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Good (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
LEA Analysis of Needs & LEA Capacity				
Analysis of all required data is provided (CRTs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment).	0	1	3	5
Additional data has been analyzed.	0	1	3	5
Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided.	0	1	3	5
Intervention model chosen has shows likelihood of addressing identified needs.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to implement each component of the selected model.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome.	0	1	3	5
Pre-implementation activities, if proposed, are allowable and will support full implementation of the model.	NA	No	Yes	NA
LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends.	0	1	3	5
Timeline, Goals & Monitoring				
LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented beginning in the 2011-2012 school year. (Note: US ED Guidance, question F-2, allows that certain model components, such as job-embedded professional development or identifying and rewarding teachers and principals who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates through effective implementation of a model, will occur later in the process of implementing a model.)	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in reading/language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable).	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I schools that receive SIG funds.	0	1	3	5
Implementation of Restart Model LEA converts a school or closes and reopens under a charter school operator.				
Required Activities				

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

LEA has clearly described how it will engage in a rigorous process to verify the capacity of the charter school operator to provide services that reflect what is required at this school.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate that its strategies are research-based.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate that its curriculum, instruction, and assessment are aligned with the Montana essential learning expectations.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate a healthy fiscal history.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate that it has provided realistic detailed budget estimates for operating the school and implementing the school improvement services.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to insure that its instructional programs will be secular, neutral, and non-ideological.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will develop a set of non-negotiable performance-based benchmarks to serve as the basis for holding the charter school operator accountable for meeting the final requirements for SIG fund expenditures.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will ensure that the charter school operator is provided autonomy and flexibility to enact school improvement activities and to administer the entire school program.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will assure that all former students are allowed to be enrolled in the school that has selected the restart model.	0	1	3	5
Budget & Resources				
Budget provided is within the estimated range for the restart model, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range.	0	1	3	5
Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the restart model for the entire grant period.	0	1	3	5
Budget clearly aligns with components of restart model.	0	1	3	5
Funding sources and amounts are provided for all three school years.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen.	0	1	3	5
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	120			

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

F. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Closure Model

The following criteria will be used by the reviewers to evaluate each school level Closure Model application supplement. In order to be considered for funding, a school plan must receive at least 60% of the total possible points and all required elements must be addressed. *An LEA or school application that receives a score of 0 on any required element will not be funded.*

<i>Closure Model Criteria</i>	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Good (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
LEA Analysis of Needs & LEA Capacity				
Analysis of all required data is provided (CRTs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment).	0	1	3	5
Additional data has been analyzed.	0	1	3	5
Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided.	0	1	3	5
Intervention model chosen has shows likelihood of addressing identified needs.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to implement each component of the selected model.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome.	0	1	3	5
Pre-implementation activities, if proposed, are allowable and will support full implementation of the model.	NA	No	Yes	NA
LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends.	0	1	3	5
Timeline, Goals & Monitoring				
LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I schools that receive SIG funds.	0	1	3	5
Implementation of Closure Model				
LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.				
Required Activities				
LEA has described the process by which the district will close the school.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how parents and community members will be notified and involved in the decision for school closure.	0	1	3	5
LEA described how it will decide which other schools are in reasonable proximity to the closed school in order to receive its former students.	0	1	3	5
LEA described how it will decide which of the nearby schools are higher achieving than the closed school.	0	1	3	5

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

LEA described how it will assure that all former students are allowed to be enrolled in a new school.	0	1	3	5
LEA described in what ways parents will be notified of the school closure and of their children's new school destination.	0	1	3	5
Budget & Resources				
Budget provided is within the estimated range for the closure model, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range.	0	1	3	5
Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the closure model.	0	1	3	5
Budget clearly aligns with components of closure model.	0	1	3	5
Funding sources and amounts are provided for 2011-2012 (and 2012-2013, if necessary)..	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen.	0	1	3	5
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	100			

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

G. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Tier III School

The following criteria will be used by the reviewers to evaluate each school level Tier III School application supplement. In order to be considered for funding, a school plan must receive at least 60% of the total possible points before any priority points and all required elements must be addressed. *An LEA or school application that receives a score of 0 on any required element will not be funded.*

<i>Tier III School Criteria</i>	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Good (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
Strategies Address Needs				
Strategies to be implemented or services to be received address one or more of the nine Montana Correlates of Effective Schools.	0	1	3	5
Strategies to be implemented or services to be received shows likelihood of addressing identified needs in the School Improvement Plan.	0	1	3	5
Goals & Monitoring				
LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable).	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier III schools that receive SIG funds.	0	1	3	5
Budget & Resources				
Budget provided is within the estimated range for Tier III schools, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range.	0	1	3	5
Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the strategies for the entire grant period.	0	1	3	5
Budget clearly aligns with strategies or services described.	0	1	3	5
Priority Points				
School feeds into a Tier I school (within the system or from another system).				10
School was designated for any level of Restructuring for 2010-2011.				10
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE (before priority points)	35			

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

**III. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG)
REQUEST for APPLICATIONS NOTICE & FORMS**

MANDATORY NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY

**LEA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS UNDER SECTION 1003(g) ESEA
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2011-2012**

FORM DUE June 30, 2011 (FOR TIER I WITH TIER III FEEDER SCHOOLS IN SAME SYSTEM)

District: _____

District Contact: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

List each school that the LEA will commit to serve with SIG funds, if funds are available and awarded.

SCHOOL NAME	School Code (SC ####)	Tier (I or III)	Proposed Model if Tier I (Transformation, Turnaround, Restart or Closure)	Estimated Funding Total (Sum for 1 year)

If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, please explain why:

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

Districts will be notified by August 3, 2011 of the anticipated funding, if any, that will be available to serve Other Tier III schools based on the number of Tier I schools and Tier III feeder schools in the same system projected for funding. This form can be mailed, faxed or emailed to:

BJ Granbery, Title I Director/Division Administrator

Montana Office of Public Instruction

PO Box 202501

Helena, MT 59601-2501

bgranbery@mt.gov

FAX: 406-444-3924

A confirmation email will be delivered to all applicants that meet the filing deadline.

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

This page intentionally left blank.

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

**LEA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS 1003(g)
APPLICATION COVER SHEET**

District Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ **State:** MT **Zip:** _____

District Contact data for the School Improvement 1003(g) Grant

Contact Name: _____

Position: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ **State:** MT **Zip:** _____

Phone: _____ **FAX:** _____

Email: _____

District Signature

District Superintendent (Printed Name):

Telephone:

X

Signature of the Superintendent:

Date:

The district, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement 1003(g) Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the district receives through this application.

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

**LEA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS 1003(g)
APPLICATION ELEMENTS**

Section numbers may be referenced to the required element in the final requirements and USED SIG application document.

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

List each Tier I and Tier III school the district commits to serve and identify the school intervention model that the district will use in each Tier I school. Use the chart below or attach a separate chart.



SCHOOL NAME	School Code (SC####)	Tier (I or III)	INTERVENTION MODEL (TIER I ONLY)				FUNDING Total sum requested for 1 year
			Trans- formation	Turn- around	Restart	Closure	

B.1. LEA CAPACITY: LEA capacity to provide adequate resources and support to all Tier I schools that the LEA is planning to serve.

Please address the capacity of the LEA to provide adequate resources and support to all Tier I schools listed above. Address each area (text boxes expand as you type):

- a. **Human Capacity:** Describe the qualifications and staff availability at the district office to provide support to the schools and the district’s ability to recruit and retain qualified teachers and principals with the skills needed to implement the applicable model.

- b. **Capacity to provide support:** Describe the ability of the district to provide support to the schools in implementing instructional changes, providing professional development, and any other areas of assistance needed by the schools, including the ability to contract with external providers for services (as applicable). Describe the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting any external providers that will be used to provide support to the schools.

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

- c. **Policies or procedures:** Describe the need and the LEA’s ability to change any policies or procedures that may create barriers to implementation. Include evidence or a statement of support for such changes, as applicable, from the teachers’ union, school board, staff, and parents.

- d. **LEA needs:** Describe any LEA needs for additional assistance from the state.

- e. **Previous efforts:** Describe the LEA’s previous efforts and results in implementing strategies to improve student achievement and the LEA’s application for and use of other federal funds during the prior two school years.

B.2. LEA CAPACITY: Tier I School(s) that the LEA is not planning to serve.

If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, please explain why. Be specific and address each of the areas human capacity, capacity to provide support, policies or procedures, and LEA needs that are applicable to the district’s lack of capacity to serve all Tier I schools.

B.3. EXTERNAL PROVIDERS: LEA process to recruit, screen and select external providers.

Describe the district’s rigorous process for recruiting, screening, and selecting any external providers that will be used to provide support to the schools. The screening process must verify that a provider has a meaningful plan for contributing to the reform efforts in the school, will implement strategies that are research-based, has a record of success in similar schools, has a healthy fiscal history, and has the capacity to implement the strategies it is proposing. (External providers may be used to provide technical expertise in implementing various components of the intervention model such as helping a school evaluate its data and determine changes that

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

are
needed, providing job-embedded professional development, assisting in curriculum alignment, designing
teacher and principal evaluation systems that rely on student data, etc.)

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

B.4. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

For each Tier I school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must complete the LEA Application Supplement related to the specific school improvement model to be implemented in the school (Turnaround, Transformation, Restart, or Closure). The application supplement must describe:

- (1) For each Tier I school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Align other resources with the interventions;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I schools that receive school improvement funds.

For each Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must submit a Tier III Supplement along with a School Improvement Plan for 2011-2012 that highlights the services to be received with these funds. Include budget information for each Tier III school in the LEA budget for these funds. The plan must describe:

- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement, and which of the Montana Correlates of Effective Schools will be addressed by the services or activities.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

B.5. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I schools.

List each meeting or other activity held to consult with stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and the implementation of the models in the Tier I schools. Indicate the number of members present from each stakeholder group had members present, and the general discussion or feedback received at the meeting.

LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g) Request for Applications

Meeting Topic	Date & Time	Parents & Community	Teachers & Staff	School Administrators	School Board	District Staff	Other	General discussion or feedback received

B. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

Attach a complete budget for each school for 2011-2012 for which SIG funding is requested. The budget for each school served may include district level expenses that are used to support or provide services to the school. Use the Budget Form provided with this application package.

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

An LEA’s budget for the year may not exceed the number of Tier I, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000. The minimum LEA budget is \$50,000 for the year multiplied by the number of schools served.

**LEA School Improvement Grants 1003(g)
Request for Applications**

**LEA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS 1003(g)
Assurances and Waivers Signature Page**

C. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant and must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA assures that it will—

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

D. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant,

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Name & Title of Authorized Representative

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

Appendix A – No changes when published in October 2010

Note: The final requirements for the SIG program, set forth in 74 FR 65618 (Dec. 10, 2009), and amended by the interim final requirements, set forth in 75 FR 3375 (Jan. 21, 2010) (final requirements), implement both the requirements of section 1003(g) of the ESEA and the flexibilities for the SIG program provided through the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. This document combines the provisions of the two notices into one document (it also Appendix A of the SEA application). The official versions of these documents are the documents published in the Federal Register. This document was published in the Federal Register on January 21, 2010.

Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants, as Amended in January 2010

I. SEA Priorities in Awarding School Improvement Grants:

A. Defining key terms. To award School Improvement Grants to its LEAs, consistent with section 1003(g)(6) of the ESEA, an SEA must define three tiers of schools, in accordance with the requirements in paragraph 1, to enable the SEA to select those LEAs with the greatest need for such funds. From among the LEAs in greatest need, the SEA must select, in accordance with paragraph 2, those LEAs that demonstrate the strongest commitment to ensuring that the funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the accountability requirements in this notice. Accordingly, an SEA must use the following definitions to define key terms:

1. Greatest need. An LEA with the greatest need for a School Improvement Grant must have one or more schools in at least one of the following tiers:

(a) Tier I schools: (i) A Tier I school is a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(1) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”

(ii) At its option, an SEA may also identify as a Tier I school an elementary school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds that--

(A)(1) Has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; or

(2) Is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(B) Is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(1)(i) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”

(b) Tier II schools: (i) A Tier II school is a secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I, Part A funds and is identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”

(ii) At its option, an SEA may also identify as a Tier II school a secondary school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds that--

(A)(1) Has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; or

(2) Is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(B)(1) Is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(2)(i) of the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools;" or

(2) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

(c) Tier III schools: (i) A Tier III school is a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I school.

(ii) At its option, an SEA may also identify as a Tier III school a school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds that--

(A)(1) Has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two years; or

(2) Is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(B) Does not meet the requirements to be a Tier I or Tier II school.

(iii) An SEA may establish additional criteria to use in setting priorities among LEA applications for funding and to encourage LEAs to differentiate among Tier III schools in their use of school improvement funds.

2. Strongest Commitment. An LEA with the strongest commitment is an LEA that agrees to implement, and demonstrates the capacity to implement fully and effectively, one of the following rigorous interventions in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve:

(a) Turnaround model: (1) A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must--

(i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;

(ii) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,

(A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and

(B) Select new staff;

(iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;

(iv) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;

(v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;

(vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;

(vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;

(viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and

(ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

(2) A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as--

(i) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or

(ii) A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).

(b) Restart model: A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or

manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides “whole-school operation” services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

(c) School closure: School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

(d) Transformation model: A transformation model is one in which an LEA implements each of the following strategies:

(1) Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;

(B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--

(1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; and

(2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;

(C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;

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

(E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness, such as--

(A) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;

(B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or

(C) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.

(2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and

(B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--

(A) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;

(B) Implementing a schoolwide "response-to-intervention" model;

(C) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;

(D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and

(E) In secondary schools--

(1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement; International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;

(2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;

(3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or

(4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

(3) Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and

(B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--

(A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;

(B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;

(C) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or

(D) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

(4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

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

(B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

(ii) Permissible activities. The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--

(A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or

(B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

3. Definitions.

Increased learning time means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.¹

Persistently lowest-achieving schools means, as determined by the State--

(a)(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

¹ Research supports the effectiveness of well-designed programs that expand learning time by a minimum of 300 hours per school year. (See Frazier, Julie A.; Morrison, Frederick J. "The Influence of Extended-year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School." *Child Development*. Vol. 69 (2), April 1998, pp.495-497 and research done by Mass2020.) Extending learning into before- and after-school hours can be difficult to implement effectively, but is permissible under this definition with encouragement to closely integrate and coordinate academic work between in school and out of school. (See James-Burdumy, Susanne; Dynarski, Mark; Deke, John. "When Elementary Schools Stay Open Late: Results from The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 29 (4), December 2007, Document No. PP07-121.) <http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/redirect_PubsDB.asp?strSite=http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/296>

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

(b) To identify the lowest-achieving schools, a State must take into account both--

(i) The academic achievement of the “all students” group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(ii) The school’s lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the “all students” group.

Student growth means the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time.

For grades in which the State administers summative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, student growth data must be based on a student’s score on the State’s assessment under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

4. Evidence of strongest commitment. (a) In determining the strength of an LEA’s commitment to ensuring that school improvement funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable Tier I and Tier II schools to improve student achievement substantially, an SEA must consider, at a minimum, the extent to which the LEA’s application demonstrates that the LEA has taken, or will take, action to--

(i) Analyze the needs of its schools and select an intervention for each school;

(ii) Design and implement interventions consistent with these requirements;

(iii) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;

(iv) Align other resources with the interventions;

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

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

(b) The SEA must consider the LEA's capacity to implement the interventions and may approve the LEA to serve only those Tier I and Tier II schools for which the SEA determines that the LEA can implement fully and effectively one of the interventions.

B. Providing flexibility.

1. An SEA may award school improvement funds to an LEA for a Tier I or Tier II school that has implemented, in whole or in part, an intervention that meets the requirements under section I.A.2(a), 2(b), or 2(d) of these requirements within the last two years so that the LEA and school can continue or complete the intervention being implemented in that school.

2. An SEA may seek a waiver from the Secretary of the requirements in section 1116(b) of the ESEA in order to permit a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school implementing an intervention that meets the requirements under section I.A.2(a) or 2(b) of these requirements in an LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to "start over" in the school improvement timeline. Even though a school implementing the waiver would no longer be in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, it may receive school improvement funds.

3. An SEA may seek a waiver from the Secretary to enable a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that is ineligible to operate a Title I schoolwide program and is operating a Title I targeted assistance program to operate a schoolwide program in order to implement an intervention that meets the requirements under section I.A.2(a), 2(b), or 2(d) of these requirements.

4. An SEA may seek a waiver from the Secretary to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds beyond September 30, 2011 so as to make those funds available to the SEA and its LEAs for up to three years.

5. If an SEA does not seek a waiver under section I.B.2, 3, or 4, an LEA may seek a waiver.

II. Awarding School Improvement Grants to LEAs:

A. LEA requirements.

1. An LEA may apply for a School Improvement Grant if it receives Title I, Part A funds and has one or more schools that qualify under the State's definition of a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school.

2. In its application, in addition to other information that the SEA may require--

(a) The LEA must--

(i) Identify the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve;

(ii) Identify the intervention it will implement in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;

(iii) Demonstrate that it has the capacity to use the school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve in order to implement fully and effectively one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements;

(iv) Provide evidence of its strong commitment to use school improvement funds to implement the four interventions by addressing the factors in section I.A.4(a) of these requirements;

(v) Include a timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application; and

(vi) Include a budget indicating how it will allocate school improvement funds among the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve.

(b) If an LEA has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, the LEA may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

3. The LEA must serve each Tier I school unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity (which may be due, in part, to serving Tier II schools) to undertake one of these rigorous interventions in each Tier I school, in which case the LEA must indicate the Tier I schools that it can effectively serve. An LEA may not serve with school improvement funds awarded under section 1003(g) of the ESEA a Tier I or Tier II school in which it does not implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements.

4. The LEA's budget for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve must be of sufficient size and scope to ensure that the LEA can implement one of the rigorous interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements.

The LEA's budget must cover the period of availability of the school improvement funds, taking into account any waivers extending the period of availability received by the SEA or LEA.

5. The LEA's budget for each Tier III school it commits to serve must include the services it will provide the school, particularly if the school meets additional criteria established by the SEA.

6. An LEA that commits to serve one or more Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools that do not receive Title I, Part A funds must ensure that each such school it serves receives all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of the school improvement funds.

7. An LEA in which one or more Tier I schools are located and that does not apply to serve at least one of these schools may not apply for a grant to serve only Tier III schools.

8. (a) To monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives school improvement funds, an LEA must--

(i) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and

(ii) Measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of these requirements.

(b) The LEA must also meet the requirements with respect to adequate yearly progress in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA.

9. If an LEA implements a restart model, it must hold the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO accountable for meeting the final requirements.

B. SEA requirements.

1. To receive a School Improvement Grant, an SEA must submit an application to the Department at such time, and containing such information, as the Secretary shall reasonably require.

2. (a) An SEA must review and approve, consistent with these requirements, an application for a School Improvement Grant that it receives from an LEA.

(b) Before approving an LEA's application, the SEA must ensure that the application meets these requirements, particularly with respect to--

(i) Whether the LEA has agreed to implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements in each Tier I and Tier II school included in its application;

(ii) The extent to which the LEA's application shows the LEA's strong commitment to use school improvement funds to implement the four interventions by addressing the factors in section I.A.4(a) of these requirements;

(iii) Whether the LEA has the capacity to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in its application; and

(iv) Whether the LEA has submitted a budget that includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school it identifies in its application and whether the budget covers the period of availability of the funds, taking into account any waiver extending the period of availability received by either the SEA or the LEA.

(c) An SEA may, consistent with State law, take over an LEA or specific Tier I or Tier II schools in order to implement the interventions in these requirements.

(d) An SEA may not require an LEA to implement a particular model in one or more schools unless the SEA has taken over the LEA or school.

(e) To the extent that a Tier I or Tier II school implementing a restart model becomes a charter school LEA, an SEA must hold the charter school LEA accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds it accountable, for complying with these requirements.

3. An SEA must post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants to LEAs, all final LEA applications as well as a summary of those grants that includes the following information:

(a) Name and National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification number of each LEA awarded a grant.

(b) Amount of each LEA's grant.

(c) Name and NCES identification number of each school to be served.

(d) Type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.

4. If an SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to award, for up to three years, a grant to each LEA that submits an approvable application, the SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.

5. An SEA must award a School Improvement Grant to an LEA in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to support the activities required under section 1116 of the ESEA and these requirements. The LEA's total grant may not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2,000,000 per year for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve.

6. If an SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allocate to each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school an amount sufficient to enable the school to implement fully and effectively the specified intervention throughout

the period of availability, including any extension afforded through a waiver, the SEA may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.

7. An SEA must award funds to serve each Tier I and Tier II school that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have the capacity to serve, prior to awarding funds to its LEAs to serve any Tier III schools. If an SEA has awarded school improvement funds to its LEAs for each Tier I and Tier II school that its LEAs commit to serve in accordance with these requirements, the SEA may then, consistent with section II.B.9, award remaining school improvement funds to its LEAs for the Tier III schools that its LEAs commit to serve.

8. In awarding School Improvement Grants, an SEA must apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability of the funds, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.

9. (a) If not every Tier I school in a State is served with FY 2009 school improvement funds, an SEA must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with these requirements. This requirement does not apply in a State that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all the Tier I schools in the State.

(b) If each Tier I school in a State is served with FY 2009 school improvement funds, an SEA may reserve up to 25 percent of its FY 2009 allocation and award those funds in combination with its FY 2010 funds consistent with these requirements.

10. In identifying Tier I and Tier II schools in a State for purposes of allocating funds appropriated for School Improvement Grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA for any year subsequent to FY 2009, an SEA must exclude from consideration any school that was previously identified as a Tier I or Tier II school and in which an LEA is implementing one of the four interventions identified in these requirements using funds made available under section 1003(g) of the ESEA.

11. An SEA that is participating in the “differentiated accountability pilot” must ensure that its LEAs use school improvement funds available under section 1003(g) of the ESEA in a Tier I or Tier II school consistent with these requirements.

12. Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein and may consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

C. Renewal for additional one-year periods.

(a) If an SEA or an individual LEA requests and receives a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, an SEA--

(i) Must renew the School Improvement Grant for each affected LEA for additional one-year periods commensurate with the period of availability if the LEA demonstrates that its Tier I and Tier II schools are meeting the requirements in section II.A.8 and that its Tier III schools are meeting the goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA; and

(ii) May renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant if the SEA determines that the LEA is making progress toward meeting the requirements in section II.A.8 or the goals established by the LEA.

(b) If an SEA does not renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant because the LEA's participating schools are not meeting the requirements in section II.A.8 or the goals established by the LEA, the SEA may reallocate those funds to other eligible LEAs, consistent with these requirements.

D. State reservation for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

An SEA may reserve from the school improvement funds it receives under section 1003(g) of the ESEA in any given year no more than five percent for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses. An SEA must describe in its application for a School Improvement Grant how the SEA will use these funds.

E. A State Whose School Improvement Grant Exceeds the Amount the State May Award to Eligible LEAs.

In some States in which a limited number of Title I schools are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the SEA may be able to make School Improvement Grants, renewable for additional years commensurate with the period of availability of the funds, to each LEA with a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school without using the State's full allocation under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. An SEA in this situation may reserve no more than five percent of its FY 2009 allocation of school improvement funds for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses under section 1003(g)(8) of the ESEA. The SEA may retain sufficient school improvement funds to serve, for succeeding years,

each Tier I, II, and III school that generates funds for an eligible LEA. The Secretary may reallocate to other States any remaining school improvement funds from States with surplus funds.

III. Reporting and Evaluation:

A. Reporting metrics.

To inform and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions identified in these requirements, the Secretary will collect data on the metrics in the following chart. The Department already collects most of these data through EDFacts and will collect data on two metrics through SFSF reporting. Accordingly, an SEA must only report the following new data with respect to school improvement funds:

1. A list of the LEAs, including their NCES identification numbers, that received a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA and the amount of the grant.
2. For each LEA that received a School Improvement Grant, a list of the schools that were served, their NCES identification numbers, and the amount of funds or value of services each school received.
3. For any Tier I or Tier II school, school-level data on the metrics designated on the following chart as “SIG” (School Improvement Grant):

Metric	Source	Achievement Indicators	Leading Indicators
SCHOOL DATA			
Which intervention the school used (i.e., turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation)	NEW SIG		
AYP status	<u>EDFacts</u>	✓	
Which AYP targets the school met and missed	<u>EDFacts</u>	✓	
School improvement status	<u>EDFacts</u>	✓	
Number of minutes within the school year	NEW SIG		✓
STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA			
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics (e.g., Basic, Proficient, Advanced), by grade and by student subgroup	<u>EDFacts</u>	✓	

Metric	Source	Achievement Indicators	Leading Indicators
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup	EDFacts		✓
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup	NEW SIG	✓	
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	EDFacts	✓	
Graduation rate	EDFacts	✓	
Dropout rate	EDFacts		✓
Student attendance rate	EDFacts		✓
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes	NEW SIG HS only		✓
College enrollment rates	NEW SFSF Phase II HS only	✓	
STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE			
Discipline incidents	EDFacts		✓
Truants	EDFacts		✓
TALENT			
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA’s teacher evaluation system	NEW SFSF Phase II		✓
Teacher attendance rate	NEW SIG		✓

4. An SEA must report these metrics for the school year prior to implementing the intervention, if the data are available, to serve as a baseline, and for each year thereafter for which the SEA allocates school improvement funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. With respect to a school that is closed, the SEA need report only the identity of the school and the intervention taken--i.e., school closure.

B. Evaluation.

An LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant must participate in any evaluation of that grant conducted by the Secretary.

Appendix B

Montana's Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools

Resource: U.S. Department of Education's guidance document - *Frequently Asked Questions concerning Phase II of the State Fiscal State Stabilization Fund, Dated 12/1/2009*

Montana defines *Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools* as any Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that rank in the lowest five percent of these schools based on the percentage of students scoring At or Above Proficiency in Reading and Math using three years of assessment data. The following steps detail the process utilized to produce the list of *Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools*.

Step 1: Montana determined all relevant definitions. The definition of "secondary school" is any high school serving grades 9 through 12. The definition of "number of years" for purposes of determining whether a high school has a graduation rate less than 60 percent is three years. The definition of a "number of years" for purposes of determining "lack of progress" on the State's assessments is three years.

Step 2: Montana determined the number of schools that make up five percent or five schools (whichever is greater) in each of the relevant sets of schools (Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring) as the count of seven which is five percent of the total number in the set. Montana determined there are no secondary schools that are eligible for but do not receive, Title I funds.

Step 3: Montana determined the method for calculating combined English/language arts and mathematics proficiency rates for each school (see B-V-16).

The Single Percentage Method was used as defined in the U.S. Department of Education guidance.

Step 4: Montana determined the method for determining "lack of progress" by the "all students" group on the State's assessments (see B-V-17).

The Lowest Achieving Over Multiple Years was used as defined in Example 1 on page 27 of the U.S. Department of Education guidance. Using this method, Montana repeated the Single Percentage Method in Step 3 for two previous years for each school, and then selected the five percent of schools with the lowest combined percent proficient based on three years of data to define the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State.

Step 5: Montana determined that no weights would be assigned to academic achievement of the "all students" group or to lack of progress on the State's assessments.

Step 6: Montana determined that no weights would be assigned to elementary schools or secondary schools.

Step 7: Using the process identified in Step 3, Montana ranked the Title I schools in improvement, corrective actions, or restructuring from highest to lowest based on the academic achievement of the "all students" group.

Step 8: Using the process identified in Step 4, Montana applied the second factor—lack of progress—to the list identified in Step 7.

Step 9: After applying lack of progress, Montana started with the school at the bottom of the list and counted up to the number seven as determined in Step 2 to obtain the list of the lowest-achieving five percent Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Step 10: Montana examined the Title I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to determine if any had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years (as defined in Step 1) that were not captured in the list of schools identified in Step 9.

The only Title I high school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that has consistently had a graduation rate of less than 60% was already identified in Step 9.

Step 11: There were no high schools identified in Step 10 to add to the list of schools identified in Step 9.

Steps 12 - 15: There are no secondary schools in Montana that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds.

The list of schools resulting from Step 11 will constitute the Tier I schools and there are no schools resulting from Steps 12 – 15 to constitute the Tier II schools for purposes of using school improvement funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. All Title I participating schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not on the list resulting from Step 11 will constitute Tier III schools for purposes of using school improvement funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA.

In summary these are the methods that Montana used to produce its list of *Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools*.

Tier I: Lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, obtained by:

Ranking the Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring from highest to lowest based on academic achievement of the “all students” groups;

Applying lack of progress to the rank order list; and

Counting up from the bottom of the list.

Plus Title I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have had a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years (to the extent not already included).

Tier II: There are no secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds.

Montana examined the use of the flexibility (announced in the January 15, 2010 letter to Chief State School Officers from Dr. Thelma Melendez de Santa Ana) to identify newly eligible schools as Tier I, II, or III and discovered that no additional schools could be added to Montana’s lists for purposes of using school improvement funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA.

See Appendix C as separate attachment (List of Tier I and Tier III schools).