

School Improvement Grants

Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Montana



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2016

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of a State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools ("newly eligible" Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of a State's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) 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 ("newly eligible" Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools ("newly eligible" Tier III schools). In the Tier I and Tier II 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.

ESEA Flexibility

An SEA that has received ESEA flexibility no longer identifies Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; instead, it identifies priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools. Accordingly, if it chooses, an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request may select the "**priority schools list waiver**" in Section H of the SEA application for SIG funds. This waiver permits the SEA to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools.

Through its approved ESEA flexibility request, an SEA has already received a waiver that permits its LEAs to apply for SIG funds to serve priority schools that are not otherwise eligible to receive SIG funds because they are not identified as Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The waiver offered in this application goes beyond this previously granted waiver to permit the SEA to actually use its priority schools list as its SIG list.

Availability of Funds

The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, provided \$506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2013.

FY 2013 SIG funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2015.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2013 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2013 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its SIG funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

FY 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

This application is for use only by SEAs that will make new awards. New awards are defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New three-year awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any unobligated SIG funds from previous competitions not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

The Department will require those SEAs that will use FY 2013 funds solely for continuation awards to submit a SIG application. However, those SEAs using FY 2013 funds solely for continuation purposes are only required to complete the Continuation Awards Only Application for FY 2013 School Improvement Grants Program located at the end of this application.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2013 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to OESE.OST@ed.gov.

In addition, the SEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the SEA's authorized representative to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

Paper Submission:

If an SEA is not able to submit its application electronically, it may submit the original and two copies of its SIG application to the following address:

Carlas McCauley, Group Leader
Office of School Turnaround
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in government processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before November 22, 2013.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at Carlas.Mccauley@ed.gov.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant:</p> <p>Montana Office of Public Instruction</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address:</p> <p>PO Box 202501 Helena, MT 59620-2501</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: BJ Granbery</p> <p>Position and Office: Administrator, Division of Educational Opportunity and Equity</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address:</p> <p>PO Box 202501 Helena, MT 59620-2501</p> <p>Telephone: 406-444-4420</p> <p>Fax: 406-444-3924</p> <p>Email address: bgranbery@mt.gov</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):</p> <p>Denise Juneau</p>	<p>Telephone:</p> <p>406-444-5658</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p>X submitted via Fed Ex</p>	<p>Date:</p> <p>November 22, 2013</p>
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p>	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Part 1 (Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools): Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA’s definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this definition, as its methodology for identifying its priority schools has already been approved through its ESEA flexibility request. **Link to Revised Definition:**

http://opi.mt.gov/PDF/TitleI/SIP/13Def_PersistentlyLAS.pdf

Part 2 (Eligible Schools List): As part of its FY 2013 application an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State or, if it is requesting the priority schools list waiver, of each priority school in the State. (A State’s Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

Directions: SEAs that generate new lists should create this table in Excel using the format shown below. An example of the table has been provided for guidance. **Link to new lists:**

<http://opi.mt.gov/PDF/TitleI/SIP/13PersistentlyLowSchools.pdf>

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS									
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS									
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##		X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##		X				
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##				X		X

Part 3 (Terminated Awards): All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed for the 2014-2015 school year. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds.

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
NA			
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			NA

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA: An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information set forth below in an LEA’s application for a School Improvement Grant.

Part 1: The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA’s application with respect to each of the following actions:

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.

Using the capacity criteria outlined on the next page, the SEA has determined that none of the LEAs with Tier I schools have the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to Tier I schools. In priority order, these LEAs will be asked to agree to the SEA providing services directly by signing an Implementation Agreement with the SEA. The Implementation Agreement also requires that the LEA and local teachers union sign a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to amend the existing collective bargaining agreement to allow for SIG requirements to be implemented. The priority order will be the new Tier I schools in order of the lowest to highest percent proficient as shown on the submitted list of new Tier I schools until funding is exhausted (allocating reasonable amounts for services to each school to be served for two to three years). The SEA will analyze the needs of each Tier I school using the list shown below as it designs and plans for those services during the development of a District Action Plan (DAP) working collaboratively with the LEA. The analysis will be summarized in the DAP. The DAP will contain all the required elements of the Transformation Model which is the model the SEA will implement in districts agreeing to the Implementation Agreement and MOU. Districts will address all the same questions that would be contained in a regular local application supplement for the Transformation Model, including needs

assessment (see below), goals, assurances, and requests for waivers needed (none should be needed except the ability to use the funds through September 30, 2017).

Areas to Consider for Data and Need Analysis:

<p>Demographics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> enrollment <input type="checkbox"/> drop-out Rate <input type="checkbox"/> ethnicity <input type="checkbox"/> grade level <input type="checkbox"/> discipline incidents <input type="checkbox"/> other: 	<p>Curriculum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> alignment with MT Common Core Standards (MCCS) <input type="checkbox"/> research-based <input type="checkbox"/> implemented with fidelity <input type="checkbox"/> schedule for review & revision of curriculum <input type="checkbox"/> assessment data used to identify gaps <input type="checkbox"/> review process to determine if meeting needs of all students
<p>Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> effective and varied instructional strategies <input type="checkbox"/> instruction is aligned to MCCS <input type="checkbox"/> instruction is differentiated <input type="checkbox"/> system for timely & early interventions for low-performing students <input type="checkbox"/> teachers communicate high expectations to students <input type="checkbox"/> other: 	<p>Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> aligned with MCCS <input type="checkbox"/> data from classroom assessments guides instruction <input type="checkbox"/> universal screening data for all students <input type="checkbox"/> progress Monitoring data <input type="checkbox"/> other Formative Assessments <input type="checkbox"/> teacher observations <input type="checkbox"/> other:

<p>Professional Development (PD)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> student achievement data determines PD priorities <input type="checkbox"/> professional development is job embedded <input type="checkbox"/> teacher evaluation process is aligned to research-based teacher standards <input type="checkbox"/> teacher evaluation process consistently applied <input type="checkbox"/> teachers receive ongoing & systematic feedback to improve instruction <input type="checkbox"/> teacher mentoring program <input type="checkbox"/> other 	<p>Supportive Learning Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> effective classroom management strategies <input type="checkbox"/> schoolwide behavior standards <input type="checkbox"/> attendance policy <input type="checkbox"/> cultural awareness and understanding <input type="checkbox"/> extended learning opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> effective school-parent communication <input type="checkbox"/> parent & community engagement <input type="checkbox"/> Social & emotional services & supports <input type="checkbox"/> physical facilities safe & orderly <input type="checkbox"/> other:
---	--

The SEA will request that the LEA provide evidence and or documentation for each of the above items or areas. For those items that cannot be assessed through documentation, the SEA will conduct on-site visits and speak with individuals and groups (including parents) in order to draw conclusions and make an assessment of these areas.

<p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> master schedule & classroom schedules 	<p>Leadership</p>
--	--------------------------

- perception surveys of teachers, parents, or students
- implementation data for specific program or process
- administrator and teacher experience & qualifications
- policies & procedures facilitate learning
- teacher turnover & attendance rates
- School improvement plans, Title I plans, grant application plans, etc.
- other:

- facilitate development & implementation of school goals
- analyze student assessment data
- leaders assist staff in understanding & using formative & summative assessment data
- leaders monitor delivery of instruction
- leaders monitor implementation of school improvement plan
- leaders ensure staff trained in MCCS
- leaders have support from district office or others

If any LEA believes it has the capacity to provide services to its schools and declines to have the SEA provide services directly, that LEA will complete a regular local application and must provide proof that a thorough needs assessment has been conducted to determine needs so that an appropriate reform model can be selected and appropriate services can be designed. The rubric contained in the local application will be utilized to further determine capacity for an LEA that submits a local application, plus the additional supplement for each reform model chosen for Tier I schools. The LEA will be asked to provide evidence and documentation for items included in the rubric. On-site visits will be used to make assessments of areas that do not lend themselves to documents or other evidence.

(2)

Each of the districts with at least one Tier I school is also a district in the improvement status of Corrective Action Year 11 or 12. These districts (systems) have only one school per grade span and each school in the district is either Tier I or Tier III. In these situations there is no district office that has capacity beyond what is contained in the school itself. These are all very small, rural, and remote (frontier) districts located on or near American Indian reservations. Please reference the new list of eligible Tier I schools at this link:

<http://opi.mt.gov/PDF/TitleI/SIP/13PersistentlyLowSchools.pdf>

Although some positive changes have been accomplished, past school reform efforts have been largely ineffective in dramatically increasing student achievement. Some of these districts have been designated by the SEA for high-risk financial status for several years due to numerous and ongoing audit problems and lack of compliance with reporting. Others have not received high risk designation but have had some audit, fiscal, or management problems.

In order to receive the benefit of the School Improvement Grant funds administered directly by the SEA, these districts must submit an initial pre-application to the SEA, signed by both the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees and the local teachers union President, indicating their interest and that they agree with the SEA's determination of a lack of capacity. If the pre-application is submitted, then the LEAs will sign an Implementation Agreement with the SEA agreeing to have the SEA provide services directly, specifying that the Transformation Model will be implemented (and stating the requirements of the model). The district and local teachers union must also agree to a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to amend the collective bargaining agreement to ensure that SIG requirements can be implemented.

Specific criteria that are considered in capacity determinations:

- High Risk Financial Status**
- History of Financial Management Problems (but not resulting in High Risk Status)**
- Frequent Turnover in Superintendents**
- Frequent Turnover in Principals**
- Frequent Turnover in School Board Members**
- Accreditation Deficiencies**
- Self-Assessments (contained in the Montana Literacy Plan; Appendix A).**
- Continuous School Improvement Plan (last submission November 2013)**
- Academic and behavior data**
- Interviews with focus groups**

- (3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools in a State that is not requesting the priority schools list waiver, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA). **Each LEA with Tier I schools to be served will submit a DAP (or a local application) with a proposed budget that clearly details the planned activities and the costs involved. The SEA staff will compare these details and projected costs to determine adequacy of funding levels. If necessary, realistic estimations of similar interventions undertaken elsewhere will be obtained for comparison purposes. Prior to development of the DAPs (or submission of applications), SEA staff will determine estimated ranges necessary for implementation of each reform model. SEA staff will use the following criteria in evaluating the budget information submitted:**
- **Budget provided is within the estimated range for the reform model selected, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range;**
 - **Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the selected reform model for the entire grant period;**
 - **Budget narrative clearly aligns with components of the selected reform model;**
 - **LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen.**
 - **For districts signing the Implementation Agreement and MOU, the SEA will work directly with the districts to establish appropriate spending ranges to accomplish the implementation of the Transformation Model**

Part 2: The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant, but most likely will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe the criteria it will use to assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.
LEA applications will include descriptions of the design and implementation plans that will be scrutinized by the SEA review team for feasibility and evidence of thorough planning. Details of who will be responsible, by when, and what resources will be needed must be well developed with broad involvement, understanding, and buy-in by all involved parties. The extensive responses in the local application plus the supplement for the selected reform model will be utilized in this analysis. The rubric contained in the local application will be used to review the sufficiency of the LEA application. A school improvement team will be required consisting of the principal, teachers, parents, community members, and at least one district administrator. Each team member must sign off on the design and plans for interventions. The school board must review and approve the plans. Documentation that the

plans are consistent with the final requirements will be scrutinized by SEA staff in the approval process using the rubric contained in the local application and afterward through intensive monitoring. Technical assistance will be provided during the development of the application and the use of external consultants and service providers will be required. If the Transformation Model is selected, the Toolkit for Implementing the Transformation Model from <http://www.centerii.org/sig/> will be utilized.

Districts signing Implementation Agreements and MOUs will address every requirement other districts will by completing the District Action Plan (DAP) for the Transformation Model collaboratively with the SEA.

- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. Montana’s overall LEA application requires a description of the process the LEA will use to recruit, screen and select any external providers. In addition, the LEA application supplement for the Restart model requires the LEA to describe how it will engage in a rigorous process of screening and selecting charter school operators. It requires the LEA to address these elements in the description: how the provider will demonstrate that its strategies are research-based; that its curriculum, instruction, and assessment are aligned with Montana’s essential learning expectations; that it has a healthy fiscal history; that it has provided realistic detailed budgets; and that its instructional programs will be secular, neutral, and non-ideological. Each of these elements will receive a rating of 0 - 5 in the evaluation of the plan based on the strength of the descriptions provided by the LEA. See the actual scoring rubric contained in the overall LEA application.

Districts signing Implementation Agreements and MOUs will address every requirement other districts will by completing the District Action Plan for the Transformation Model collaboratively with the SEA. This includes recruiting, screening, and selecting any external providers of specific services, which will ultimately be selected by or approved by the SEA which is providing services directly.

- Align other resources with the interventions; The LEA application will require that the LEA describe how other resources will be aligned to support the reform model being implemented. Through reviewing the information provided in the LEA application and interviewing LEA and school personnel, the SEA staff will determine the sufficiency of the alignment of these other resources to ensure comprehensive interventions are effective. The MCLP Inventory and Interview questions contained in Appendix B pages 63 - 68 will be utilized. These may be viewed at http://opi.mt.gov/PDF/Instructional_Innovations/MSRP/12NovMtLiteracyPlan.pdf

Technical assistance and guidance will be provided throughout the application development period and afterward, so that LEAs keep in mind the totality of the resources available to them to implement interventions in a coordinated and integrated fashion.

Districts signing Implementation Agreements and MOUs will address every requirement other districts will by completing the District Action Plan for the Transformation Model collaboratively with the SEA.

- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and, The LEA application will be scrutinized for sound plans for making any modifications to practices and policies that may be necessary. Sound plans are those that seem reasonable and achievable and take into account adequate time for effective modeling of new practices and interventions for teachers.

During the implementation of the selected reform model and interventions, the SEA will monitor closely, evaluate, and provide technical assistance and guidance in this area as well. SEA School Improvement Consultants or SICs (formerly called School Coaches in the Statewide System of Support) will visit several times each month to ensure that no barriers to implementation go unaddressed. Implementation of the selected reform model will take place for the 2014-2015 school year.

- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
The subject of sustainability must be addressed in the LEA application and the feasibility of the LEA's proposed plans will be evaluated by the SEA review team. Additional ideas and suggestions for sustainability will be provided, if needed, during the application period and during implementation as well. Although funding is a major factor in sustainability, equally important are the structures and trainings that are put in place so that innovations can continue after the SIG funding period ends. Among the structures to be evaluated are staff hiring and retention policies; staff evaluation policies and procedures; embedded professional development; increased time for instruction and professional development in core academic subjects; and increasing graduation rates through credit recovery and the use of early warning systems. See details in the four reform model supplements of the local application for other examples. Districts must provide details about sustainability on the last page of each model supplement to the local application which will be reviewed by the SEA review team. In the scoring rubric for the overall application, points from 0 – 5 are awarded for strength of sustainability plans. See scoring rubric and the local application for details.

B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA's budget and application:

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

The SEA will require the LEA to include a proposed budget and narrative with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period to help the LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year. The budget for the pre-implementation activities will be evaluated as part of the overall budget evaluation. The budget rating scores from 0 to 5 will include the pre-implementation activities as well as the activities for the 3 full years of implementation. The scoring rubric for the overall application and for the specific reform model to be implemented includes the following criteria with respect to ensuring that the amount proposed covers both pre-implementation and full implementation: budget provided is within the estimated range for the model, budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the model for the entire grant period, budget clearly aligns with components of the model, funding sources and amounts are provided for the school years to be included, and budget clearly describes how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen.

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable?

The SEA will require the LEA to describe all pre-implementation activities in a chart within each school application supplement. The pre-implementation activities will be reviewed and evaluated by the review team for their appropriateness to the implementation model and to determine if the activities proposed are allowable. The pre-implementation activities will be evaluated as "yes" if they are determined to be allowable and appropriate, or as "no" if they are not allowable or if they could be made allowable with revisions. While they will not be a factor in the competitive scoring, if the school is awarded a SIG grant, the LEA will be required to remove or revise pre-implementation activities, as applicable, to ensure that only allowable activities will be funded. All proposed pre-implementation activities and expenses, must be (1) directly related to full and effective implementation of the selected

intervention model, (2) both reasonable and necessary for implementation, (3) address needs identified by the LEA, and (4) help improve student academic achievement.

² “Pre-implementation” enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014–2015 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

C. TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Contact LEAs with Tier I schools.....	February/March, 2014
Accept Pre-Application Agreements.....	By March 31, 2014
Finalize Implementation Agreements and MOUs.....	March/April 2014
(Alternatively, if none agree to direct services, provide local application and Intent to Apply forms to eligible districts in March, 2014; Intent to Apply due by March 31, 2014.)	
Develop District Action Plans for Direct Service Schools.....	April/May/June 2014
(Alternatively, if none agree to direct services, accept applications until May 30, 2014.)	
For districts submitting applications, approve or disapprove applications.....	By June 30, 2014
Begin Pre-Implementation.....	July 1, 2014
Begin Full Implementation.....	September 1, 2014

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth below.

(1) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or for its priority schools, as applicable, and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools, or one or more priority schools, in at LEA that is not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements. **Districts signing Implementation Agreements and MOUs will address every requirement of the Transformation model by completing the District Action Plan collaboratively with the SEA. This plan must be revisited and adjustments made in collaboration with the SEA if the LEA is not making reasonable progress on meeting the goals or is not making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.**

If any LEA applies and receives a grant award to serve a Tier II or Tier I school, the LEA's annual goals for student achievement will be reviewed and approved by SEA staff during the application review and approval process. If the LEA is not making reasonable progress on meeting those goals or is not making progress on the leading indicators in section III, funding will not be renewed unless the LEA declares lack of capacity and requests and approves the SEA to provide services directly by signing an Implementation Agreement with the SEA.

(2) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals. If an SEA is requesting

the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools. **N/A – No Tier III schools will be served as funds will only be sufficient for two to three Tier I schools.**

(3) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools, or the priority schools, as applicable, the LEA is approved to serve. **It is anticipated that only Tier I schools will be served in LEAs signing Implementation Agreements and MOUs, so the SEA will be providing services directly. The onsite SEA staff will monitor continuously. In addition, other SIG SEA staff will provide frequent site visits to check on implementation efforts, budgetary matters, and requirements. The SEA will monitor each LEA that applies for and receives a School Improvement Grant by conducting onsite reviews and evaluations monthly as well as semi-monthly desk reviews and phone interviews to ensure that the LEA is implementing the school intervention model fully and effectively in Tier I schools. SEA School Improvement Consultants (formerly called School Coaches) will be onsite at least three days per month to monitor grant activities as well. In LEAs signing Implementation Agreements and MOUs, the onsite SEA staff will monitor constantly.**

(4) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies. **N/A – The SEA will provide direct services only in the Tier I schools in those LEAs that agree to sign and Implementation Agreement and MOU for direct services. These schools will be offered this opportunity in rank order according to the new Tier I list of PLA Schools. There are no more than two very small schools in any LEA on the Tier I list (for example a small high school and the small 7-8 and/or K-6 school that feeds into that high school).**

(5) Describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools. **N/A – No Tier III schools will be served as funds will only be sufficient for two to three Tier I schools.**

(6) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, or any priority schools, as applicable, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school. **N/A – No schools will be taken over by the SEA. The Montana Constitution vests control of public schools with the local Board of Trustees. There are no provisions in the Constitution or statute for the SEA to take over local schools or districts.**

(7) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, or for priority schools, as applicable, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly. **The SEA will provide services directly (in the absence of a takeover) to the two to three Tier I schools that agree to the SEA implementing the Transformation model and sign Implementation Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding. The schools will be offered the opportunity to be provided direct services in rank order beginning with the lowest performing Tier I schools first. Signed agreements will be submitted by the LEAs to OPI by April 30, 2014.**

³ If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

E. ASSURANCES: The SEA must provide the assurances set forth below.

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, as applicable, implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school or priority school, as applicable.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION: The SEA may reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

- By checking this box, the SEA assures that it has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

H. WAIVERS: SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

Montana requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools or in its priority schools, as applicable.

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”) that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than [Please indicate number].

Assurance

The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver

In order to enable the State to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools that meet the definition of “priority schools” in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility* and that were identified in accordance with its approved request for ESEA flexibility, waive the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the SIG final requirements.

Assurance

The State assures that its methodology for identifying priority schools, approved through its ESEA flexibility request, provides an acceptable alternative methodology for identifying the State’s lowest-performing schools and thus is an appropriate replacement for the eligibility requirements and definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools in the SIG final requirements.

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2013 funds for the purpose of making three-year awards to eligible LEAs.

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2013 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2017.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Montana requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA’s application for a grant. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already received a waiver of the requirement in section 1116(b) of the ESEA to identify schools for improvement through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014 school years cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already received a waiver of the schoolwide poverty threshold through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver.

I. ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS

The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides

such notice and information to the public (e.g., by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

Here is the link to the waiver notice. No comments were received.

<http://opi.mt.gov/Programs/TitlePrgms/TitleIA/TitleIA.html>

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The LEA application form that the SEA uses must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs. **Response: See local application materials submitted.**

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.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school, or each priority school, as applicable, the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school, or in each priority school, as applicable.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II/PRIORITY ONLY)			
						turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

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

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
- (2) The LEA must ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.

- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority 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;
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - 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 and Tier II school, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that receives school improvement funds including by-
 - Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,
 - Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
- (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.
- (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.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools or in its priority schools, as applicable.

C. 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, Tier II, and Tier III school, or each priority school, it commits to serve.

- The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—
- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority 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 and Tier II schools or priority schools; and
 - Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

Note: An LEA’s budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA’s three-year budget plan.

Note
to im
serve
the L

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, or the number of priority schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 (not to exceed \$6,000,000 per school over three years).

An L
to se

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$17,880,500

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority 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 and Tier II school, or priority 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 or Tier II school, or priority 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;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,
- (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

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.

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- Implementing a school-wide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Continuation Awards Only Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program

In the table below, list the schools that will receive continuation awards using FY 2013 SIG funds:

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	COHORT #	PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 13 ALLOCATION
TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 13:			

In the table below, list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds as well as noting the explicit reason and process for reallocating those funds (e.g., reallocate to rural schools with SIG grants in cohort 2 who demonstrate a need for technology aimed at increasing student literacy interaction).

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2013 Assurances

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- Use FY 2013 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards² to its LEAs.
- Use the renewal process identified in [State]'s most recently approved SIG application to determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

By submitting the assurances and information above, [State] agrees to carry out its most recently approved SIG application and does not need to submit a new FY 2013 SIG application; however, the State must submit the signature page included in the full application package (page 3).

² A "new award" is defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any remaining SIG funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.