School Improvement Grants Application

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

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A

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

OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: XX/XX/2010

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. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. [OMB approval forthcoming]

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

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, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January 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. 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 Appendix C for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) 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.

Availability of Funds

For fiscal year (FY) 2009, there is $3.546 billion available for School Improvement Grants under section 1003(g): $546 million through the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2009; and $3 billion through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA).

FY 2009 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2011. In its application for these funds, an SEA may request a waiver of the period of availability to permit the SEA and its LEAs to obligate the funds through September 30, 2013.

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 School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas, respectively, for the fiscal year (*e.g.*, FY 2009) under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA.

An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (summarized in Appendix B). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed

five percent for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance, which the Department has awarded to each SEA.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement 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.

State Application Process

To apply for a School Improvement Grant, an SEA must submit an application to the Department. This revised School Improvement Grant application form is available on the Department's Web site at: http://www.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html.

Please note that an SEA's submission must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- A list, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.
- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

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

school.improvement.grants@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.

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

Dr. Zollie Stevenson, Jr., Director
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in processing 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 **February 8, 2010**.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Zollie Stevenson, Jr. at (202) 260-0826 or by e-mail at Zollie.Stevenson@ed.gov.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS – Utah Revised 3/17/2010

Legal Name of Applicant:	Applicant's Mailing Address:
Utah State Office of Education	250 East 500 South PO Box 144200 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200

State Contact for the School Improvement Grant

Name: Karl A. Wilson
.
Position and Office: Director, Title I

Contact's Mailing Address:

Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
PO Box 144200
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4200

Telephone: 801-538-7509

Fax: 801-538-7804

Email address: karl.wilson@schools.utah.gov

Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Larry K. Shumway, Ed.D.	801-538-7500
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X_____	Date:

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.

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: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III 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. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

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.

Utah Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools:

Tier I Schools:

- Title I Served School;
- Identified in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring under Title I; and
- Lowest 5% or 5 Schools, whichever is greater (in Utah - lowest 5 schools). Utah has no Title I high schools identified as in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring. Thus, no Title I secondary schools with a graduation rate less than 60% are included in Tier I. Utah used the reading/language arts and mathematics achievement scores combined for the "all students" group over a four year average to determine its lowest-performing schools for Tier I. The State of Utah also reviewed expected progress for each of its schools based on the Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) scores averaged for the most recent three years. None of the schools identified had achieved the minimum expected score of 180 (which is defined as one year of growth). This same process applies to the Tier I Newly Eligible Schools.

Tier I Newly Eligible Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) Elementary School;
- 4-Year Average Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency in lowest quintile [for Utah: equal to or lower than the lowest performing school in Tier 1 (Midvale Elementary at 47% proficiency)]; and
- Not making expected progress (At least 180 on U-PASS Progress Score – 3-year average). The state of Utah did not weight "all student" group compared with subgroups.

Tier II Schools:

- Title I Eligible, but not served Secondary School:
    - Lowest 5% or 5 Schools, whichever is greater (in Utah - lowest 5% schools equals seven (7) schools). Utah used the reading/language arts and mathematics achievement scores combined for the "all students" group over a four year average to determine its lowest-performing schools for Tier II. The State of Utah also reviewed expected progress for each of its schools based on the Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) scores averaged for the most recent three years. None of the schools identified had achieved the minimum expected score of 180 (which is defined as one year of growth). This same process applies to the Tier II Newly Eligible Schools.
      OR
    - Less than 60% graduation rate (Utah has no high schools identified as Tier II solely as a result of a graduation rate of less than 60%). Utah uses a cohort graduation rate for this definition. Utah reviewed the graduation data for the most recent three years in making these determinations.

Tier II Newly Eligible Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) Secondary School:
    - 4-Year Average Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency in lowest quintile [for Utah: equal to or lower than the lowest performing school in Tier I (Midvale Elementary at 47% proficiency)];
    - Not making expected progress (Utah measure of expected progress is a score of at least 180 on UPASS Progress Score – 3-year average);
      <u>OR</u>
    - Graduation Rate less than 60%. Utah uses a cohort graduation rate for this definition. Utah reviewed the graduation data for the most recent three years in making these determinations.

Tier III Schools:

- Title I Served School; and
- Identified in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring under Title I, but not in Tier I.

Tier III Newly Eligible Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) elementary school;
- 4-Year Average Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency in lowest quintile [for Utah: Higher than lowest Tier I school (Midvale Elementary at 47% proficiency) and equal to or lower than the highest performing school in Tier I (Oquirrh Hills Elementary at 56% proficiency)]; and
- Not making expected progress (At least 180 on UPASS Progress Score – 3-year average).

NOTE 1: Utah did not exclude any categories of schools in the identification of eligible schools in Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III.

NOTE 2: Utah had two schools that were considered as lowest-achieving, but in consultation with the Assessment and Accountability department, it was determined that neither of the two schools had sufficient number of students or test scores to make a valid determination of performance. These two schools were excluded because insufficient data were available to make an eligibility determination. If

Utah needs to submit a waiver request, please notify Karl Wilson, State Director of Title I.

Utah Title I ARRA School Improvement Grant

List of Lowest-performing Schools

CARBON DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900150						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[i]
Lighthouse Learning Center (ALT)	490015000378		X		87%	X

CANYONS DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900142						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[ii]
Midvale Elementary	490014200312	X				
East Midvale Elementary	490014200300			X		
Sandy Elementary	4900014200321			X		

DAVIS DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900210						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[iii]
Doxey Elementary	490021000118			X		X
Vae View Elementary	490021000149			X		X

GRANITE DISTRICT NCES ID #4900360						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[iv]
Hillsdale Elementary	490036000226	X				
Oquirrh Hills Elementary	490036000250	X				
Redwood Elementary	490036000255	X				
Arcadia	490036000198			X		X

Elementary						
Thomas W. Bacchus Elementary	**490036000755**			**X**		**X**
Jim Bridger Elementary	**490036000826**			**X**		**X**
Western Hills Elementary	**490036000723**			**X**		**X**
Fox Hills Elementary	**49003600679**			**X**		**X**
Granger High	**490036000218**		**X**		**79%**	
Kearns High	**490036000234**		**X**		**78%**	
Matheson Junior High	**49003600020**		**X**			**X**
Granite Park Junior High	**49003600215**		**X**			**X**

IRON DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900390						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID #**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE[v]**
Southwest Education Academy (Alt)	**490039000872**		**X**		**69%**	

JORDAN DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900420						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID #**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE[vi]**
Columbia Elementary	**490042000813**			**X**		**X**

LOGAN DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900510						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID #**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE[vii]**
Logan South Campus (ALT)	**490051000831**		**X**		**73%**	

NEBO DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900630						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[viii]
Orchard Hills Elementary	490063001155	X				X

OGDEN DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900720						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[ix]
James Madison Elementary	490072001194	X				X
Gramercy Elementary	490072000423	X				X
Dee Elementary	4900072000420	X				X
Odyssey Elementary	490072001201	X				X
T. O. Smith Elementary	490072000442	X				X
Bonneville Elementary	490072000418			X		X
Lincoln Elementary	490072000430			X		X
Ogden High	490072000437		X		84%	
Washington High (ALT)	490072000725		X		18%	X
Ben Lomond High	490072000417		X		81%	X

PROVO DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900810						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[x]
Farrer Elementary	490081001074			X		
Timpanogos Elementary	490081000465			X		
Independence High (ALT)	490081000836		X		45%	

SALT LAKE CITY DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900870						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[xi]
Northwest Middle	490087000512	X				
Edison Elementary	490087000487	X				X
Lincoln Elementary	490087000666	X				X
Franklin Elementary	490087000490			X		X
M. Lynn Bennion Elementary	490087000665			X		X
Parkview Elementary	490087000514			X		X
Rose Park Elementary	490087000516			X		X
Glendale Middle	490087000492		X			X
East High	490087000486		X		84%	
Highland High	490087000496		X		89%	X

SAN JUAN DISTRICT, NCES ID #4900900						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[xii]
Mexican Hat Elementary	490090000533	X				X
Bluff Elementary	490090000528	X				X
Monument Valley High	490090000802		X		79%	X
Navajo Mountain High	490090000491		X		87%	X
Whitehorse High	490090000667		X		83%	X

TOOELE DISTRICT, NCES ID #4901050						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[xiii]
Anna Smith Elementary	490105000578			X		X
Wendover High	490105000577		X		69%	X

UINTAH DISTRICT, NCES ID #4901080						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[xiv]
LaPoint Elementary	490108000804			X		
Eagle View Elementary	490108001270	X				X

WASATCH DISTRICT, NCES ID #4901110						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[xv]
Heber Valley Elementary	490111000499			X		

WASHINGTON DISTRICT, NCES ID #4901140						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[xvi]
Red Mountain Elementary	490114000570			X		

WEBER DISTRICT, NCES ID #4901200						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[xvii]
Roy Elementary	490120000636			X		X

PINNACLE CANYON ACADEMY, NCES ID #4900008						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[xviii]
Pinnacle Canyon Academy	**490000800629**			**X**		**X**

GUADALUPE SCHOOL, NCES ID #4900072						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[xix]
Guadalupe School	**490007201174**	**X**				**X**

DUAL IMMERSION ACADEMY, NCES ID #4900073						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[xx]
Dual Immersion Academy	**490007301187**	**X**				**X**

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 identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

The state of Utah requires that any LEA making application for the ARRA School Improvement Grants 1003g must analyze the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school for which it applies that appears on the state's identified Tier I and Tier II list. Included in the analysis of each school, the LEA must consider the following:

- The percent of students scoring proficient in Reading/ Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs are to consider both overall school and subgroup achievement);
- Trend data for both Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs are to consider overall

school and subgroup achievement);

- Demographic information relevant to the school's achievement in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics;
- Contextual data for the school (attendance, graduation and dropout rates, discipline reports, parent and community surveys);
- Teacher information (teacher attendance, turnover rates, teaching assignments aligned with highly qualified teacher status, teacher education, experience, and performance evaluations);
- Administrator information (how long the administrator has been at the building, or the replacement of the principal as required in the Turnaround or Transformation models, administrator education, experience, and performance evaluations); and
- Effectiveness of prior school reform efforts.

Based on a thorough analysis of the data sources listed above, the LEA must:

- Identify the intervention model chosen for each school; and
- Provide the rationale for the model chosen for each school.

In reviewing LEA SIG applications, the USOE will use the Utah LEA SIG Grant Review Checklist Section B Part 1 #1 (page 1). Only those LEA SIG applications that have combined multiple relevant data sources into a thoughtful analysis to **specifically and conclusively** justify the fit between the needs of the school and the intervention model chosen will be approvable.

(2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

The LEA has identified how it will provide leadership and support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application. The description must include the following information on how the LEA will successfully implement the school intervention model:

- Identify the LEA staff assigned to support implementation of the school intervention model;
- Identify the qualifications and relevant experience of the assigned LEA staff related to prior successful school improvement efforts;
- Describe how the LEA will provide ongoing technical assistance to make sure each school is successful;
- Identify the fiscal resources (state and federal) that the LEA will commit to implementation;
- Identify the process through which the LEA will involve the school/community;
- Describe how the local school board will be engaged to ensure successful implementation (including the prioritization or revision of appropriate board policies and allocation of resources);
- Describe how the LEA will evaluate the effectiveness of the reform strategies;
- Describe how the LEA will monitor student achievement by individual teacher/classrooms; and
- If student achievement results do not meet expected goals, describe how the LEA will assist in necessary plan revisions.

In reviewing LEA SIG applications, the USOE will use the Utah LEA SIG Grant Review Checklist Section B Part 1 #2 (page 2). Only those LEA SIG applications that provide thorough and specific descriptions of ALL of the LEA capacity criteria listed above will be approvable.

(3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and

effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

The LEA budget included in the SIG application demonstrates that the LEA has allocated a reasonable amount for LEA support and school intervention model strategies. Quality budgets include the following:

- The LEA provides a budget for each of the three years of the grant;
- For each school included in the SIG application, the budget provides reasonable costs associated with the successful implementation of the intervention model selected (e.g. extended learning time, professional development, teacher recruitment and retention);
- If the LEA plans to apply for SIG funds to support LEA efforts, the budget includes adequate and reasonable costs associated with LEA leadership and support of the school intervention models;
- The LEA budget includes reasonable costs for purchased professional services to ensure quality consultants to facilitate research-based reform;
- The budget detail provides sufficient information to support budget requests; and
- The LEA has considered any costs associated with program evaluation.

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.

In reviewing the LEA applications, the SEA will use a detailed checklist based on the information requested in Part 2 of the application to determine LEA commitment to implementing SIG requirements.

(1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

The LEA must include in its SIG application information that describes how it will implement with fidelity each of the requirements associated with the intervention model(s) selected for its eligible schools. This information includes the following:

- Identification of the school(s) for which the LEA is making application;
- Identification of the intervention model for each participating school;
- Sufficient information describing how the LEA will successfully implement each requirement;
- Any steps already taken by the LEA to initiate school improvement efforts that align with SIG intervention models; and
- The LEA includes a timeline for implementation of the school intervention model.

(2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

The LEA must include in its SIG application sufficient information describing how it will select and contract with proven external providers to support the LEA and the school(s) in the implementation of the intervention model(s). This includes the following:

- The LEA will declare whether it intends to contract with an external provider.

    - <u>Chooses to contract with external providers:</u>

        - A description of how the LEA will contract with an external provider, including a description of how the LEA will recruit, screen, and select external providers;
        - If the LEA has already selected an external provider, the LEA must provide evidence that the external provider has a demonstrated record of success; and
        - A narrative description and budget to support external provider contracts, if applicable.

    - <u>Chooses not to contract with external providers:</u>

        - If the LEA has chosen not to contract with an external provider, the LEA must provide documentation that it has sufficient internal capacity to conduct a research-based school appraisal and facilitate the implementation of the intervention model.

In reviewing LEA SIG applications, the USOE will use the Utah LEA SIG Grant Review Checklist Section B Part 2 #2 & #2a (pages 5-6) to evaluate the LEA's commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable. Only those LEA SIG applications that meet the external provider selection process criteria described below will be approvable:

- Detailed and relevant criteria for determining need for external provider contract and selecting external providers that take into account the specific needs of the Tier I and/or Tier II schools to be served by external providers. These criteria must include, but are not limited to:
    - Analysis of the LEA's capacity and operational needs.
    - Researching and prioritizing the external providers available to serve the school:
        - Available providers have been **thoroughly** researched.
        - Contact other LEAs currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding their experience and effectiveness.
        - The provider identified has a proven track record of success in working with **similar schools and/or student populations.** For example, success in working with high schools or English Language Learners.
    - Alignment between external provider services and existing LEA services:
        - The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are **clearly defined** and aligned.
    - The LEA has **specifically** planned how it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards.
    - The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has been **clearly demonstrated**.
- LEA provides a description of the reasonable and timely steps it will take to recruit and screen providers to be in place by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

The LEA SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has committed appropriate other state and federal resources to support successful implementation of the intervention model. A competitive LEA SIG application must include the following information:

- A description of how LEA program personnel will collaborate to support student achievement and school reform;
- A list of the financial resources that will support the intervention model (e.g. local, state, federal funds, and other private grants, as appropriate); and
- A description of how each of the financial resources listed above will support the goals of the school reform effort.

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

The LEA SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has identified potential practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation of intervention strategies. Competitive applications must include the following:

- A list of practices and/or policies that may serve as barriers to successful implementation;
- Proposed steps to modify identified practices and/or policies to minimize barriers;
- A procedure in place to identify and resolve future issues related to practices and/or policies; and
- Description of how the LEA will collaborate with key stakeholders to implement necessary changes (e.g. associations, administrators, local board of education).

In reviewing LEA SIG applications, the USOE will evaluate the LEA's commitment to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively. Only those LEA SIG applications that provide a thorough description of how the LEA will identify and address potential barriers will be approved. USOE will use the Utah LEA SIG Grant Review Checklist Section B Part 2 #4 (page 8) to evaluate the **LEA's commitment to identify and modify its practices and policies**.

Approvable applications must address the following:

- The barriers to successful implementation of interventions are **clearly defined**.
- The plan to address the identified barriers is **clearly defined**.
- The LEA description **demonstrates** sufficient commitment to work with **key stakeholder groups** to modify practices and policies, as necessary.
- A procedure is in place to identify and resolve future issues related to practices and/or policies.

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

The LEA SIG application must demonstrate that the LEA has a reasonable plan to sustain the improvements achieved through the SIG process when the funding period ends. Competitive applications include the following:

- A list of the ongoing supports needed to sustain school improvement after the funding period ends;
- A description of the anticipated resources that will be committed to meet the needs identified above; and
- The written assurance that it will provide continued support.

C. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school. The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

In reviewing the LEA applications, the SEA will use a detailed checklist based on the information requested in Part C of the application to determine LEA capacity to serve eligible Tier I schools.

The SEA will determine the LEA's capacity to serve all Tier I schools based on the following factors:

- Size of the LEA;
- Number of schools in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III;
- Analysis of the achievement data in the individual schools for which the LEA is making application (extremely low performing schools may require additional support and resources);
- Location of the LEA and/or school(s) (e.g. remote rural locations);
- Number and expertise of LEA personnel available to provide technical assistance;
- Ability of the LEA to recruit and retain teachers and administrators;
- Established partnerships with outside consultants;
- Availability and willingness to commit additional funds to interventions models; and
- Ability of the LEA to ensure that quality interventions can be effectively and fully implemented.

If an LEA does not apply on behalf of all eligible Tier I schools, the LEA must justify in its SIG application the reasons why the LEA lacks capacity to serve all Tier I schools. An LEA's capacity to support intervention models for Tier I and Tier II schools will be considered in the LEA SIG application approval process. Based on the information included in this section by the LEA, the SEA will use the scoring checklist to prioritize those LEAs with applications that demonstrate capacity.

If the SEA determines that the LEA has greater capacity than is outlined in the SIG application, the SEA will request clarification, using the above factors, to elicit additional information about LEA capacity to implement an appropriate intervention model at each of its Tier I and Tier II schools. If approval is not appropriate, the application will be denied and the SEA will carry over the required 25% of the 2009 ARRA SIG funds. These funds will then be added to the 2010-2011 1003g application process.

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

(1) Describe the SEA's process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

The SEA has established the following timeline to disseminate information to eligible LEAs, provide training, review applications, approve LEA applications, and award ARRA SIG 2009 funds:

- Identify the roles of the individuals who will be asked to serve on the Review Panel by Feb. 19, 2010
- Develop the online application process February/March 2010
- Identify a five member Review Panel by March 12, 2010
- Convene a bidders' conference March 19, 2010
- Train Review Panel March 19, 2010
- Applications available from March 19, 2010 to May 7, 2010
- Applications due May 7, 2010
- Review SIG applications May 10-20, 2010
- Notify SIG award recipients May 21, 2010
- LEAs with approved Title I ARRA SIG applications will implement the selected implementation model(s) in the fall of 2010.

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

During the annual progress review process, the SEA will analyze the student achievement goals set by the LEA for each Tier I or Tier II school(s) according to the following process:

- Annually review school achievement data to determine if the participating school(s) are achieving expected improvement aligned with goals;
- Require a full school appraisal using USOE Title I school improvement appraisal tools in the first year of the intervention (if one has not been completed within the last two years); and
- Require detailed school improvement plan using the school improvement plan template formulated with results from the school appraisal (if one has not been completed within the last two years).

If participating school(s) is not meeting achievement goals after the first year, the following procedure will be followed:

- The SEA will support the LEA in conducting a more thorough review of student achievement data;
- An instructional audit will be conducted by external consultant(s) in consultation with USOE to focus on the quality of instruction and the fidelity of the implemented curriculum aligned to the Utah State Core Curriculum;
- The LEA will hire external consultant(s) in consultation with USOE to assist the LEA

and school to revise goals, plans, and strategies to address increased student achievement;

- Quarterly reports on the implementation of the school improvement plan strategies/activities will be submitted by the external consultant to support, monitor, and report the progress being made in the implementation of the intervention model; and
- If the SEA determines that the LEA and school are not making adequate progress in the implementation of the intervention model, the SIG grant for the subsequent year may be reduced or eliminated.

(3) 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 if one or more Tier III schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals.

During the annual progress review process, the SEA will analyze the student achievement goals set by the LEA for each Tier III school(s) according to the following process:

- Annually review school achievement data to determine if the participating school(s) are achieving expected improvement aligned with goals;
- Require a full school appraisal using USOE Title I school improvement appraisal tools in the first year of the intervention (if one has not been completed within the last two years); and
- Require detailed school improvement plan using the school improvement plan template formulated with results from the school appraisal (if one has not been completed within the last two years).

If the school is not meeting goals after the first year the following procedure will be followed:

- The SEA will support the LEA in conducting a more thorough review of student achievement data;
- An instructional audit will be conducted by external consultant(s) in consultation with USOE to focus on the quality of instruction and the fidelity of the implemented curriculum aligned to the Utah State Core Curriculum;
- The LEA will hire external consultant(s) in consultation with USOE to assist the LEA and school to revise goals, plans, and strategies to address increased student achievement;
- Quarterly reports on the implementation of the school improvement plan strategies/activities will be submitted by the external consultant to support, monitor, and report the progress being made in the implementation of the intervention model; and
- If the SEA determines that the LEA and school are not making adequate progress in the implementation of the intervention model, the SIG grant for the subsequent year may be reduced or eliminated.

(4) 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 the LEA is approved to serve.

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 the LEA is approved to serve. The following procedure will be followed:

- SEA Title I Instructional Improvement Team will conduct site visits with a monitoring tool designed to measure effectiveness of implementation of the selected intervention model;
- Review documentation of the LEA technical assistance provided to the schools that receive SIG funds (e.g. timelines, agendas, activities, professional development);
- Review budget reimbursement requests to make sure the funds are being used in a fiscally appropriate manner tied to the school improvement plan; and
- Review the quarterly report(s) to determine progress on the plan implementation.

(5) 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.

The SEA commits to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools for which the LEA has submitted an approvable application before consideration of extending funding to Tier III schools. The SEA will utilize the scoring rubrics to evaluate the following elements in the application approval process:

- Prioritize those LEA SIG applications that have the greatest promise of success in improving low-performing schools based on commitment, capacity, and well-defined plans with reasonable budgets;
- Prioritize those schools with the greatest need based on student achievement over a four year time frame;
- Prioritize those schools and LEAs with the greatest commitment to fully implement the selected intervention models as defined by the LEA application;
- The amount of the SIG award will be adjusted based on school population; part of the funding formula will account for the number of students in the school;
- Prioritize those schools that reflect the largest gap between the whole school and subgroup achievement; and
- Commitment of the LEA to serve, provide technical assistance, and monitor the schools for which it applies.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

If the SEA has sufficient funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools, the remaining funds may be awarded to LEAs with approvable applications that apply on behalf of its Tier III schools. The SEA will utilize the scoring rubrics to evaluate the following elements in the application approval process:

- Those LEAs that have and apply for Tier I and/or Tier II schools and also apply for eligible Tier III school(s), will receive a higher priority than LEAs that apply only for Tier III schools;
- Prioritize those schools with the greatest need based on student achievement over a four year period;
- If an LEA submits a SIG application on behalf of a school(s) that was not included in Tier I or Tier II eligibility as a result of small "n" size, those applications will be given additional priority;
- Although Tier III schools are not required to implement one of the four intervention models, priority may be given to those LEAs with the greatest commitment to fully implement one of the four intervention models;
- The amount of the SIG award will be adjusted based on school population; part of the funding formula will account for the number of students in the school;
- Prioritize those LEAs with eligible schools that reflect the largest gap between the whole school and subgroup achievement;
- Commitment of the LEA to serve, provide technical assistance, and monitor the schools for which it applies; and
- Prioritize those LEAs that have already implemented research-based school improvement efforts.

(7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

The state of Utah does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools.

(8) 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, 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 state of Utah does not intend to provide services directly to any Tier I or Tier II schools in the absence of a takeover.

[*] 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:

- ✓ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- ✓ 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 that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- ✓ 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, 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.
- ✓ Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the State receives FY 2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the State).

N/A Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.

- ✓ Monitor each LEA's implementation of the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- ✓ To the extent 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.
- ✓ 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; amount of the grant; 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.
- ✓ Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION: An 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 the State-level funds it has received from its School Improvement Grant.

The SEA will:

- Provide state level technical assistance to LEAs including:
  - Training for the application process,
  - Training for the implementation phase, and
  - Conduct Leadership Institutes (e.g. LEA and school administrators, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, special educators);
- Review school improvement plans;
- Monitor the budgets and reimbursement requests;
- Conduct site visits to participating schools; and
- Conduct a comprehensive program evaluation of the ARRA SIG 2009 sub-grant recipients; recruit, screen, and contract with a qualified external evaluator.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: An SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

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.

- ✓ The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application (February 3, 2010)

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

- ✓ The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including: LEA Title I directors with low-performing schools (January 23-February 10, 2010), Education Appropriations Committee of the Utah State Legislature (February 10, 2010), Utah School Superintendents Association (February 19, 2010)

H. WAIVERS: The final requirements invite an SEA to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must list in its application those requirements for which it is seeking a waiver.

Utah requests a waiver of the requirements it has listed 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, and 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 or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

- ✓ Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

- ✓ 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 or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

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

The State assures that, prior to submitting this request in 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 this request 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 this waiver request 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.

The State assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, 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, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application 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. Utah's definition of low-performing schools includes:

Utah Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools:

Tier I Schools:

- Title I Served School;
- Identified in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring under Title I; and
- Lowest 5% or 5 Schools, whichever is greater (in Utah - lowest 5 schools). Utah has no Title I high schools identified as in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring. Thus, no Title I secondary schools with a graduation rate less than 60% are included in Tier I.

Tier I Newly Eligible Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) Elementary School;
- 4-Year Average Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency in lowest quintile [for Utah: equal to or lower than the lowest performing school in Tier 1 (Midvale Elementary at 47% proficiency)]; and
- Not making expected progress (At least 180 on UPASS Progress Score – 3-year average). The state of Utah did not weight "all student" group compared with subgroups.

Tier II Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) Secondary School:
  - Lowest 5% or 5 Schools, whichever is greater (in Utah - lowest 5% schools equals seven (7) schools);
    OR
  - Less than 60% graduation rate (Utah has no high schools identified as Tier II solely as a result of a graduation rate of less than 60%). Utah uses a cohort graduation rate for this definition.

Tier II Newly Eligible Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) Secondary School:
  - 4-Year Average Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency in lowest quintile [for Utah: equal to or lower than the lowest performing school in Tier I (Midvale Elementary at 47% proficiency)];
  - Not making expected progress (Utah measure of expected progress is a score of at least 180 on UPASS Progress Score – 3-year average);
    OR
  - Graduation Rate less than 60%.

Tier III Schools:

- Title I Served School; and
- Identified in Need of Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring under Title I, but not in Tier I.

Tier III Newly Eligible Schools:

- Title I Eligible (Served or Not) elementary school;
- 4-Year Average Reading/Language Arts and Math Proficiency in lowest quintile [for Utah: Higher than lowest Tier I school (Midvale Elementary at 47% proficiency) and equal to or lower than the highest performing school in Tier I (Oquirrh Hills Elementary at 56% proficiency)]; and
- Not making expected progress (At least 180 on UPASS Progress Score – 3-year average).

The SEA must attach its LEA application form to its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. All content will be the same, but since it will be submitted electronically, the final application may have a different format.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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 the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

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

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 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 and Tier II 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.

Any LEA making application for the ARRA School Improvement Grants 1003g must analyze the needs

of each Tier I and Tier II school for which it applies that appears on the state's identified Tier I and Tier II list. Included in the analysis of each school, the LEA should consider the following:

- The percent of students scoring proficient for Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs are to consider overall school and subgroup achievement);
- Trend data for both Language Arts and Mathematics (LEAs are to consider overall school and subgroup achievement);
- Demographic information relevant to the school's achievement in Language Arts and Mathematics;
- Contextual data of the school (attendance, graduation and dropout rates, discipline reports, parent and community surveys);
- Teacher information (teacher attendance, turnover rates, teaching assignments aligned with highly qualified teacher status, teacher education, experience, and performance evaluations);
- Administrator information (how long the administrator has been at the building, or the replacement of the principal as required in the Turnaround or Transformation models, administrator education, experience, and performance evaluation); and
- Effectiveness of prior school reform efforts.

Based on the analysis of the above data:

- Identify the intervention model chosen for each school;
- Provide the rationale for the model chosen for each school; and
- Implement the selected model(s) in the fall of 2010.

(2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

The LEA must provide leadership and support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEAs application. Describe, in detail, why the LEA believes it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school identified by the SEA. The LEA must do the following:

- Consult with the SEA to clarify the reasons why the LEA indicated that it lacked capacity to serve all Tier I schools
- Determine eligible schools for which to apply
- Modify the application if necessary

In reviewing the LEA applications, the SEA will use a detailed checklist based on the information requested in Part C of the application to determine LEA capacity to serve eligible Tier I schools.

The SEA will determine the LEA's capacity to serve all Tier I schools based on the following factors:

- Size of the LEA;
- Number of schools in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III;
- Analysis of the achievement data in the individual schools for which the LEA is making application (extremely low performing schools may require additional support and resources);
- Location of the LEA and/or school(s) (e.g. remote rural locations);
- Number and expertise of LEA personnel available to provide technical assistance;
- Ability of the LEA to recruit and retain teachers and administrators;
- Established partnerships with outside consultants;
- Availability and willingness to commit additional funds to interventions models; and

- Ability of the LEA to ensure that quality interventions can be effectively and fully implemented.

(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 and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application to ensure that implementation of the model(s) is in the fall of 2010.

(5) The LEA must describe the annual goals (Goals must be specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-based (SMART) 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 and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.

(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.

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 it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a <u>three year budget</u> that demonstrates the LEA has allocated a reasonable amount for LEA support and school intervention model strategies. Quality budgets include the following:

- Adequate resources to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Adequate and reasonable costs associated with LEA leadership and support of the school intervention models for the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools;
- School improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application;
- Reasonable costs associated with the successful implementation of the intervention model selected at each school (e.g. extended learning time, professional development, teacher recruitment and retention);
- Reasonable costs for purchased professional services to ensure quality consultants to facilitate

research-based reform;

- Budget details provide sufficient information to support budget requests; and
- The LEA has considered any costs associated with program evaluation.

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 and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by $2,000,000.

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

☐ Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;

☐ Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;

☐ If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and

☐ 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.

☐ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

> Note: If an SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in the State.

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

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

> Note: If an SEA has not requested and received a waiver of any of these requirements, an LEA may submit a request to the Secretary.

APPENDIX A

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.[2]

[2] 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),

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

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

(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.

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>

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	EDFacts	✓	
Which AYP targets the school met and missed	EDFacts	✓	

Metric	Source	Achievement Indicators	Leading Indicators
School improvement status	EDFacts	✓	
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	EDFacts	✓	
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		✓

Metric	Source	Achievement Indicators	Leading Indicators
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

LEA BUDGETS AND SEA ALLOCATIONS

School Improvement Grant funding totals $3.5 billion in FY 2009: $3 billion from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and $546 million from the regular FY 2009 appropriation. This means that, for the first time, the program can provide the substantial funding, over a multi-year period, necessary for the successful implementation of school intervention models. While the authorizing statute (section 1003(g)(5) of the ESEA) sets a $500,000 limit on the amount of funding that may be awarded for each participating school under the School Improvement Grants program, Congress recently enacted appropriations language allowing an SEA to award up to $2 million for each participating school. This higher limit will permit an SEA to award directly the amount that the Department believes typically would be required for the successful implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model in a Tier I or Tier II school (*e.g.*, a school of 500 students might require $1 million annually, whereas a large, comprehensive high school might require the full $2 million annually). The Department believes that the new award limit should encourage LEAs to focus more closely on turning around their Tier I and Tier II schools and to serve Tier III schools only when the district has the capacity to serve and is prepared to implement thoughtful interventions and supports in those schools.

In awarding school improvement funds, an SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools. In addition, an SEA must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve, are awarded sufficient school improvement funding to fully and effectively implement the selected school intervention models over the period of availability of the funds before the SEA awards any funds for Tier III schools.

The following describes the requirements and priorities that apply to LEA budgets and SEA allocations.

LEA Budgets

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period (if the SEA or LEA has applied for a waiver to extend the period of availability of funds) and should take into account the following:

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.

2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.

3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.

4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.

6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve by $2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

7. If the SEA does not request a waiver from the Secretary to extend the availability of school improvement funds to permit three-year awards, the LEA may request such a waiver.

SEA Allocations to LEAs

An SEA must allocate the LEA share of school improvement funds (*i.e.*, 95 percent of the SEA's allocation from the Department) in accordance with the following requirements:

1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.

2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve fully, throughout the period of availability, all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.

3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.

4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.

5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models 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.

6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.

7. An SEA that has served each of its Tier I schools with FY 2009 school improvement funds may reserve up to 25 percent of its FY 2009 allocation and award those funds in combination with its FY 2010 funds consistent with the final requirements.

8. An SEA that has not served each of its Tier I schools with FY 2009 school improvement funds 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 the final requirements. This requirement does not apply to an SEA that does not receive sufficient school improvement funds to serve all of its Tier I schools.

An SEA's School Improvement Grant award to an LEA must:

1. Include not less than $50,000 or more than $2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).

2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An SEA may reduce an LEA's requested budget by any amounts proposed for interventions in one or more schools that the SEA does not approve the LEA to serve (*i.e.*, because the LEA does not have the capacity to serve the school or because the SEA is approving only a portion of Tier I and Tier II schools in certain LEAs in order to serve Tier I and Tier II schools across the State). An SEA also may reduce award amounts if it determines that an LEA can implement its planned interventions with less than the amount of funding requested in its budget.

3. Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.

4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.

5. Apportion FY 2009 school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability beyond September 30, 2011).

Appendix C

	Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier	Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier
Tier I	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools."[1]	Title I eligible[2] elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" and that are: • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; or • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier II	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools."	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years and that are: • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; or • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier III	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I.[3]	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II and that are: • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; or • have not made AYP for two years.

[1] "Persistently lowest-achieving schools" means, as determined by the State--

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

(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.

[2] For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, "Title I eligible" schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

[3] Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.