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

Under 1003(g) of the ESEA

1. 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 published in the Federal Register on October 28, 1010 (“final requirements”, attached as Appendix C), 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. Tier II schools are a State’s persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, and may or may not receive, Title I, Part A funds. 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 (“Tier III schools”) if funds are still available after the state has awarded grants to all Tier I or II schools that LEAs have committed to serve. (See Appendix B 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.

1. Final Requirements and Guidance

The *Final Requirements of October 28, 2010* that govern the SIG grants and the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under 1003(g) of the ESEA, November 1, 2010* published by the US Department of Education provide complete information about the program and provide answers to frequently asked questions. These documents are posted on the department website at <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/stim/home.html> under the heading “ARRA Title I School Improvement Grants.” References will be made to the “final requirements” and to the “guidance” that will provide assistance in completing the grant application. Applicants are strongly encouraged to print and review these documents carefully in addition to this application packet prior to submitting an application for funds.

1. Availability of Funds and Related Conditions
   1. **Projected Total Available for Awards:** Alaska has $1,554,991 available from Federal FY2010 funds to award for the first year of three-year School Improvement Grants to LEAs under section 1003(g). The department anticipates funding three or four Tier I and/or Tier II schools through this competition.

These funds are being awarded to LEAs with eligible schools by the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development (the department) through a competitive grant process as described in this Request for Applications.

*Minimum and maximum awards:* 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, but the individual budgets for each school may vary within the total grant to the LEA.

*Estimated funding ranges:* The range of grant awards will vary depending on the number of schools served, the type of intervention models chosen for Tier I and Tier II schools, and the services provided to Tier III schools. LEAs can use the guidelines below to estimate typical costs of services per model for a school of 100 students. Schools may need more or less funding depending on the size or the costs of the strategies to be implemented in the chosen model.

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

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

* 1. **Grant Period:** The grant period will be for three school years of full implementation (2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014) plus the pre-implementation phase prior to the initial school year.

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

* 1. **Supplement, Not Supplant Conditions:** Federal funds received under SIG 1003(g) must be used to supplement, not supplant state and local funding. The implementation of the supplement, not supplant requirement varies depending on whether the school receives Title I, Part A funding, and, if so, what type of Title I program is operated in the school. In a non-Title I school, item II.A.6 of the final requirements stipulates that each school receiving SIG funds must also receive all state and local funding it would have received in the absence of SIG funding. In a Title I school operating a schoolwide (SW) program, the funding must be supplemental to funding provided through state and local sources. In a Title I school operating a targeted assistance (TA) program, the LEA must ensure that the Title I, Part A funds the school receives are used only for activities that supplement those that would be available from non-Federal funds for Title I participating students in the absence of the Title I, Part A funds. *Due to the comprehensive nature of the implementation models required by these SIG funds, a Title I school must operate a schoolwide program (SW) as a condition of receiving a SIG grant.* In order to implement one of the required school improvement models schoolwide in a Tier I or Tier II Title I school that has less than 40% poverty, it will be necessary for LEAs to apply for a waiver to operate a schoolwide program in the school. See question F-4 in the guidance for more information.

1. Application Rounds for Tier I, II, and III Schools

The department will hold one or two rounds of applications for the SIG funds, depending on the following conditions.

Applications from LEAs for serving Tier I and/or Tier II schools will be due March 30, 2011. It is anticipated that awards from the first round of applications will be made in early April.

Due to the number of Tier I & II schools eligible for funding, it is anticipated that all available funds will be used to serve Tier I and/or Tier II schools. However, if funds remain available after all applications for Tier I and II schools have been reviewed and awards have been made, the department will conduct a second round of applications for LEAs to apply to serve Tier III schools. If the department holds a second round of applications, the LEAs with eligible schools will be notified of the application deadlines at that time.

1. Eligible LEAs and Schools

An LEA is eligible to receive a SIG grant if it has at least one school on the list of eligible schools. Schools that are eligible for funding are those listed on the list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools as determined by the state according to the final requirements of the SIG grants. Priority for funding must go to Tier I and Tier II schools. LEAs with Tier I and/or Tier II schools must commit to serve at least one Tier I or Tier II school before applying to serve a Tier III school. The department must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools that LEAs commit to serve are funded before awarding any funds to Tier III schools. (See questions H-5 through H-13 in the guidance.) The following chart summarizes the requirements.

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

1. Required School Improvement Models for Tier I and Tier II Schools

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

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Restart Model Overview**  Restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected **through a rigorous review process.**   * A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school. * A rigorous review process could take such things into consideration as an applicant’s team, track record, instructional program, model’s theory of action, sustainability. * As part of this model, a State must review the process the LEA will use/has used to select the partner. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Closure Model Overview**  School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are **higher achieving**.   * These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available. * Office for Civil Rights Technical Assistance Module‐‐Struggling Schools and School Closure Issues: *An Overview of Civil Rights Considerations* |

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

1. Services for Tier III Schools

While there are no required school improvement intervention models for Tier III schools, an LEA must choose the strategies it will implement in the Tier III schools it commits to serve that are research-based and designed to address the particular needs of the Tier III schools. The strategies chosen must address one or more of the domains described in the Self-Study Tool for Alaska Schools (curriculum, assessment, instruction, supportive learning environment, professional development, and leadership).

1. Evaluation Criteria and Review Process

The department will convene a panel of reviewers to evaluate the LEA applications according to the criteria as described in the Application Instructions section. The overall LEA application will be rated on the specified criteria. Each school application supplement will be reviewed on its model-specific criteria. In order to be recommended for funding, both the overall LEA application and an individual school supplement application must receive at least 60% of the possible total points and all required elements must be addressed. ***An LEA application that receives a score of 0 on any required element will not be funded.*** The panel of reviewers will make recommendations on each individual school plan as well as on the overall LEA application, and, for any elements that receive a rating of less than 3, the district must submit additional information before funding will be awarded. See Section II of this packet for the LEA and School Level Application Criteria. The panel may recommend funding any one or more individual school plans in the LEA plan, and may make recommendations on the amount of funding requested.

1. Priority for Funding

The department is required to give priority for funding to Tier I and Tier II schools. Before determining availability of funds for any Tier III schools, the department will accept applications for Tier I and Tier II schools in the first round of applications. If, after the first round of applications have been reviewed and grants have been awarded it is determined that additional funding is available to serve Tier III schools, then the department will accept applications for Tier III schools in a second round of applications.

Within the applications for Tier I and Tier II schools, each Tier I or Tier II school with a school index value of less than 90 that is proposing to implement a transformation, turnaround, or restart model will receive two additional percentage points after the percentage of total possible points for the selected intervention model has been calculated. Within Tier III, each school that did not have more than 25 FAY students and therefore did not qualify for Tier I and each school at AYP Level 4 or 5 will receive two additional percentage points after the percentage of total possible points has been calculated.

1. Reporting Requirements

Data will be collected for the US Department of Education on each school that receives a SIG grant. The state will report a list of all LEAs that received a SIG grant and the amount of the grant, and will post all applications received for SIG grants, including those that are not funded. It will also report the list of schools in each LEA that were served, and the amount of funds or value of services received. Additional reporting metrics are required and will be reported for each Tier I or Tier II school that is served. Most of the data is already collected and reported by the state, but the following reporting metrics are new for the SIG program and must be annually reported by schools receiving a SIG grant:

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

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

1. Assurances and Waivers

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

1. Conditions of Grant award

Evaluation of Grantee performance / continuation of funding:

Entities receiving federal funds are required to meet all necessary reporting requirements of the grant. In awarding the grant, the state expects the grantees to conduct all activities and evaluation measures as written or negotiated in the approved grant proposal. Failure to provide the requested performance reports; report and evaluate on all activities as proposed; and implement the grant as written; could result in the loss of funding. Any changes to the original funded proposal (including modifications to goals and/or objectives) must receive prior approval by the state.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Appeals Process

Any appeals must be filed no later than 30 calendar days after receiving Notice of Intent to Award. The appeals process is outlined on the legislative website at

1. Go to: <http://www.legis.state.ak.us/cgi-bin/folioisa.dll/aac>
2. Select TITLE 4 Education and Early Development
3. Scroll down to 40. Appeals of Decisions to Deny or Withhold Funding. (4 AAC 40.010 – 4 AAC 40.050)
4. Technical Assistance

Documents and resources to assist districts in submitting a SIG application will be found on the department website at <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/stim/home.html> under “ARRA Title I School Improvement 1003(g) Grants.” In addition to the final requirements and the guidance from the US Department of Education, the following resources are posted and other will be posted as they become available:

* *Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants* from the Center on Innovation and Improvement
* *Self-Study Tool for* Alaska *Schools: Evaluating Instructional Effectiveness through Six Domains* prepared in collaboration with the department, Education Northwest, and the Alaska Comprehensive Center
* *Selecting the Intervention Model and Partners/Providers for a Low-Achieving School,* a decision-making and planning tool from the Center on Innovation & Improvement
* *Turnaround Teacher and Leader Competencies and Selection Toolkits,* from the Chicago Public Education Fund
* Links to the Alaska Parent Information and Resource Center (AKPIRC) at [www.akpirc.org](http://www.akpirc.org)

A series of audio conferences have been scheduled to provide information and assistance in developing applications for SIG 1003(g) grants. The SIG Overview Audio Conference will include the definition for the persistently lowest-achieving schools, the priorities for funding, and the overview of the 4 required intervention models. Each district intending to submit an application must attend at least one technical assistance SIG overview audio conference prior to submitting an application. Districts are strongly encouraged to also attend the audio conference specific to each intervention model for Tier I or Tier II schools that they are planning to serve. See the timeline for the schedule of audio conferences. The call in information for each audio conference is **1-800-315-6338, passcode 2970#.**

1. Timeline for Applications

RFA Released (tentative date, dependent upon US ED approval) January 24, 2011

SIG Overview Audio Conference January 24, 2011, 3:30 PM

SIG Transformation & Turnaround Model Audio Conference January 25, 2011, 10:30 AM

SIG Restart & Closure Model Audio Conference scheduled upon request

SIG Q&A Audio Conference February 8, 2011, 10:30 AM

**Round 1: LEA Application for Tier I and Tier II Schools** **Due March 30, 2011**

Grant Review Period April 1-8, 2011

Notice of Intent to Award April 15, 2011

Grant Funding Begins May 15, 2011

**Round 2: LEA Application for Tier III Schools (depending on funding availability)** **TBD**

Full Implementation of School Improvement model begins for Tier I and II Fall, 2011

1. Submission of Application

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

[**Lauri.Bates@alaska.gov**](mailto:Lauri.Bates@alaska.gov)

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

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

Lauri Bates, Education Program Assistant

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

801 W 10th Street, PO Box 110500, Juneau, AK 99811-0500

***This page intentionally left blank.***

1. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG)  
   INSTRUCTIONS & EVALUATION CRITERIA
2. Directions & Checklist

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

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

* LEA SIG Application (Section III of this document, pages 25-31)
* Application Cover Page, signed by the district superintendent
* Application Required Elements
* Assurances and Waivers Signature Page
* LEA SIG Budget & Budget Narrative (Include complete budget for 3 years plus pre-implementation period for all schools the LEA commits to serve, using Budget and Narrative form #05-07-071 found on the department website under Forms & Grants.)
* Application Supplement for each Tier I or Tier II school with following attachments:
* SBA Data for 2007-2008, 2008-2009, & 2009-2010 (using Report Card format from DIASA)
* School Report Card for 2009-2010 showing attendance and graduation rates
* Any completed domains from the Self Study Tool for Alaska Schools
* Any other data analyzed to determine the school’s needs (optional)
* Application Supplement for each Tier III school with the following attachment:
  + School Improvement Plan for 2011-2012

1. LEA Application Evaluation Criteria

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***LEA Overall Application*** | **Inadequate**  **(information not provided)** | **Minimal**  **(requires additional clarification)** | **Good**  **(clear and complete)** | **Excellent**  **(concise and thoroughly developed)** |
| **LEA overall application** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. LEA has provided a complete application with all required elements addressed for each Tier I or Tier II school it commits to serve (Round 1), or LEA has provided complete information in the Tier III supplement for each Tier III school it commits to serve (Round 2). Each school supplement plan has minimum point score of 60% of the total possible points, and no required elements received 0 points. | 0 | 2 | 6 | 10 |
| 1. LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to provide adequate resources and support to each Tier I and Tier II school in the LEA’s application, addressing specifically the area of human capacity at the district level and the ability to recruit and retain qualified and effective principals and teachers. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to provide adequate resources and support to each Tier I and Tier II school in the LEA’s application, addressing the ability to provide direct support and to contract with external providers, as needed. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has provided reasonable assurance of its ability to overcome any barriers in implementing the selected school intervention models, including changing any policies, procedures, or negotiated agreements. Statements or evidence of support has been provided by the teachers’ union, the school board, staff, or parents as applicable. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA’s record of previous actions taken to improve achievement in its schools and use of federal grants awarded to the district within the past two school years support the LEA’s articulated capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school in the LEA’s application. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has sufficiently explained why it does not have the capacity to serve each of its Tier I schools, addressing all applicable areas. The explanation of lack of capacity supports the LEA’s description of the capacity it does have to serve the schools that it has committed to serve. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA overall application and individual school plans demonstrate a likelihood that the proposed reform efforts will succeed. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA’s rigorous process for recruiting, screening, and selecting any external providers that will be used to provide support to the schools must verify that a provider has a meaningful plan for contributing to the reform efforts in the school, will implement strategies that are research-based, has a record of success in similar schools, has a healthy fiscal history, and has the capacity to implement the strategies it is proposing. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has provided a reasonable plan for sustaining the reforms in Tier I and Tier II schools after the funding period ends. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has provided a comprehensive, realistic budget aligned with the components of the selected intervention models to serve all schools throughout the period of funding availability. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA provided documentation of appropriate consultation with stakeholders and has submitted a signed cover page and assurances & waivers page. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE** | **60** | | | |
| **PERCENT of TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE** |  | | | |

1. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Transformation Model

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Transformation Model Criteria*** | **Inadequate**  **(information not provided)** | **Minimal**  **(requires additional clarification)** | **Good**  **(clear and complete)** | **Excellent**  **(concise and thoroughly developed)** |
| **LEA Analysis of Needs & LEA Capacity** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All required data is provided (SBAs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. School will operate a SW program in 2011-2012. | N/A | No  (needs revision) | Yes | N/A |
| 1. Additional data has been identified and analyzed. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Intervention model chosen is supported through data analysis and shows likelihood of addressing identified needs. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to implement each component of the selected model. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Pre-implementation activities, if proposed, are allowable and will support full implementation of the model. | N/A | No  (needs revision) | Yes | N/A |
| 1. LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Timeline, Goals & Monitoring** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented beginning in the 2011-2012 school year. (Note: US ED Guidance, question F-2, allows that certain model components, such as job-embedded professional development or identifying and rewarding teachers and principals who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates through effective implementation of a model, will occur later in the process of implementing a model.) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Implementation of Transformation Model** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. ***Developing Teacher & Leader Effectiveness – Required Activities*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable systems for evaluation of teachers and principals that take into account data on student growth and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and /or high school graduation rates and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve, have not done so. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching & learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. ***Comprehensive Instructional Reform Strategies – Required Activities*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Promote the continuous use of student data (such as formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. ***Increasing Learning Time – Required Activities*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time that significantly increases the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects, (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities, and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development (as defined in I.A.3 of the Final Regulations). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. ***Providing Operational Flexibility and support – Required Activities*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement a fully comprehensive approach to substantially approve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Transformation Model – Permissible Activities*** |  |  |  |  |
| All permissible activities, if proposed, have been described completely and are aligned with and enhance the model. | N/A | No  (needs revision) | Yes | N/A |
| **Budget & Resources** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Budget provided is reasonable for the transformation model activities described and the size of the school. (See Section C.1. Projected Total Available for Awards in this RFA for estimated funding ranges.) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the transformation model for the entire grant period, including any pre-implementation activities. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Budget narrative clearly aligns with components of transformation model, including any pre-implementation activities. All proposed activities and expenses, including any pre-implementation activities, are (1) directly related to full and effective implementation of the selected intervention model, (2) both reasonable and necessary for implementation, (3) address needs identified by the LEA, and (4) help improve student academic achievement. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Funding sources and amounts are provided for the baseline year and all three school years of full implementation. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Total Points Possible** | **130** | | | |
| **Percent of Total Points Possible** |  | | | |
| **Priority percentage points (2%) for school with  School Index value for 2009-2010 less than 90** |  | | | |
| **TOTAL PERCENTAGE SCORE** |  | | | |

1. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Turnaround Model

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Turnaround Model Criteria*** | **Inadequate**  **(information not provided)** | **Minimal**  **(requires additional clarification)** | **Good**  **(clear and complete)** | **Excellent**  **(concise and thoroughly developed)** |
| **LEA Analysis of Needs & LEA Capacity** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All required data is provided (SBAs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. School will operate a SW program in 2011-2012. | N/A | No  (needs revision) | Yes | N/A |
| 1. Additional data has been identified and analyzed. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Intervention model chosen is supported through data analysis and shows likelihood of addressing identified needs. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to implement each component of the selected model. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Pre-implementation activities, if proposed, are allowable and will support full implementation of the model. | N/A | No  (needs revision) | Yes | N/A |
| 1. LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Timeline, Goals & Monitoring** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented beginning in the 2011-2012 school year. (Note: US ED Guidance, question F-2, allows that certain model components, such as job-embedded professional development or identifying and rewarding teachers and principals who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates through effective implementation of a model, will occur later in the process of implementing a model.) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Implementation of Turnaround Model** |  |  |  |  |
| ***Required Activities*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Replace the principal and grant sufficient operational flexibility in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting to fully implement comprehensive reform. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Screen existing staff, rehire no more than 50% and select new staff using locally adopted competencies to measure the staff effectiveness to work in a turnaround model. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching & learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new “turnaround office” in the LEA or SEA, hire a “turnaround leader” who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time that significantly increases the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects, (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities, and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development (as defined in Appendix A). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| All permissible activities have been described completely and are aligned with and enhance the model. | N/A | No  (needs revision) | Yes | N/A |
| **Budget & Resources** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Budget provided is reasonable for the turnaround model activities described and the size of the school. (See Section C.1. Projected Total Available for Awards in this RFA for estimated funding ranges.) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the turnaround model for the entire grant period, including any pre-implementation activities. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Budget narrative clearly aligns with components of turnaround model, including any pre-implementation activities. All proposed activities and expenses, including any pre-implementation activities, are (1) directly related to full and effective implementation of the selected intervention model, (2) both reasonable and necessary for implementation, (3) address needs identified by the LEA, and (4) help improve student academic achievement. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Funding sources and amounts are provided for the baseline year and all three school years of full implementation. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Total Points Possible** | **120** | | | |
| **Percent of Total Points Possible** |  | | | |
| **Priority percentage points (2%) for school with  School Index value for 2009-2010 less than 90** |  | | | |
| **TOTAL PERCENTAGE SCORE** |  | | | |

1. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Restart Model

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Restart Model Criteria*** | **Inadequate**  **(information not provided)** | **Minimal**  **(requires additional clarification)** | **Good**  **(clear and complete)** | **Excellent**  **(concise and thoroughly developed)** |
| 1. All required data is provided (SBAs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. School will operate a SW program in 2011-2012. | N/A | No  (needs revision) | Yes | N/A |
| 1. Additional data has been identified and analyzed. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Intervention model chosen is supported through data analysis and shows likelihood of addressing identified needs. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to implement each component of the selected model. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Pre-implementation activities, if proposed, are allowable and will support full implementation of the model. | N/A | No  (needs revision) | Yes | N/A |
| 1. LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Timeline, Goals & Monitoring** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented beginning in the 2011-2012 school year. (Note: US ED Guidance, question F-2, allows that certain model components, such as job-embedded professional development or identifying and rewarding teachers and principals who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates through effective implementation of a model, will occur later in the process of implementing a model.) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Implementation of Restart Model** LEA converts a school or closes and reopens under a charter school operator. |  |  |  |  |
| ***Required Activities*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. LEA has clearly described how it will engage in a rigorous process to verify the capacity of the charter school operator to provide services that reflect what is required at this school. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate that its strategies are research-based. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate that its curriculum, instruction, and assessment are aligned with Alaska’s grade level expectations. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate a healthy fiscal history. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate that it has provided realistic detailed budget estimates for operating the school and implementing the school improvement services. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to insure that its instructional programs will be secular, neutral, and non-ideological. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has described how it will develop a set of non-negotiable performance-based benchmarks to serve as the basis for holding the charter school operator accountable for meeting the final requirements for SIG fund expenditures. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has described how it will ensure that the charter school operator is provided autonomy and flexibility to enact school improvement activities and to administer the entire school program. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has described how it will assure that all former students are allowed to be enrolled in the school that has selected the restart model. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Budget & Resources** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Budget provided is reasonable for the restart model activities described and the size of the school. (See Section C.1. Projected Total Available for Awards in this RFA for estimated funding ranges.) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the restart model for the entire grant period, including any pre-implementation activities. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Budget narrative clearly aligns with components of restart model, including any pre-implementation activities. All proposed activities and expenses, including those for pre-implementation, are (1) directly related to full and effective implementation of the selected intervention model, (2) both reasonable and necessary for implementation, (3) address needs identified by the LEA, and (4) help improve student academic achievement. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Funding sources and amounts are provided for the baseline year and all three school years of full implementation. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Total Points Possible** | **120** | | | |
| **Percent of Total Points Possible** |  | | | |
| **Priority percentage points (2%) for school with  School Index value for 2009-2010 less than 90** |  | | | |
| **TOTAL PERCENTAGE SCORE** |  | | | |

1. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Closure Model

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Closure Model Criteria*** | **Inadequate**  **(information not provided)** | **Minimal**  **(requires additional clarification)** | **Good**  **(clear and complete)** | **Excellent**  **(concise and thoroughly developed)** |
| **LEA Analysis of Needs & LEA Capacity** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All required data is provided (SBAs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Additional data has been identified and analyzed. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Intervention model chosen is supported through data analysis and shows likelihood of addressing identified needs. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to implement each component of the selected model. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Pre-implementation activities, if proposed, are allowable and will support full implementation of the model. | N/A | No  (needs revision) | Yes | N/A |
| 1. LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Timeline, Goals & Monitoring** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented beginning in the 2011-2012 school year. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Implementation of Closure Model**  LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. |  |  |  |  |
| ***Required Activities*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. LEA has described the process by which the district will close the school. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has described how parents and community members will be notified and involved in the decision for school closure. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA described how it will decide which other schools are in reasonable proximity to the closed school in order to receive its former students. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA described how it will decide which of the nearby schools are higher achieving than the closed school. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA described how it will assure that all former students are allowed to be enrolled in a new school. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA described in what ways parents will be notified of the school closure and of their children’s new school destination. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Budget & Resources** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Budget provided is reasonable for the closure model activities described and the size of the school. (See Section C.1. Projected Total Available for Awards in this RFA for estimated funding ranges.) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the closure model for the entire grant period, including any pre-implementation activities. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Budget narrative clearly aligns with components of closure model, including any pre-implementation activities. All proposed activities and expenses, including any pre-implementation activities, are (1) directly related to full and effective implementation of the selected intervention model, (2) both reasonable and necessary for implementation, (3) address needs identified by the LEA, and (4) help improve student academic achievement. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Funding sources and amounts are provided for the baseline year and the school year(s) of full implementation. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE** | **100** | | | |
| **Percent of Total Points Possible** |  | | | |

1. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Tier III School

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Tier III School Criteria*** | **Inadequate**  **(information not provided)** | **Minimal**  **(requires additional clarification)** | **Good**  **(clear and complete)** | **Excellent**  **(concise and thoroughly developed)** |
| **Strategies Address Needs** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Strategies to be implemented or services to be received address one or more of the six domains for instructional effectiveness. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Strategies to be implemented or services to be received shows likelihood of addressing identified needs in the School Improvement Plan. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Goals & Monitoring** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable). | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its schools that receive SIG funds. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Budget & Resources** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Budget provided is reasonable for the Tier III school activities described and the size of the school. (See Section C.1. Projected Total Available for Awards in this RFA for estimated funding ranges.) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the strategies for the entire grant period. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Budget narrative clearly aligns with strategies or services described. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **Total Points Possible** | **35** | | | |
| **Percent of Total Points Possible** |  | | | |
| **Priority percentage points (2%) for school not having more than 25 FAY and/or designated at AYP Level 4 or 5 for 2010-2011.** |  | | | |
| **TOTAL PERCENTAGE SCORE** |  | | | |

1. LEA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS 1003(g)

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

for 2011-2012 School Year Implementation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| District Name: |  | | | | |
| Address: |  | | | | |
| City: |  | State: | AK | Zip: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District Contact data for the School Improvement 1003(g) Grant** | | | | | |
| Contact Name: |  | | | | |
| Position |  | | | | |
| Address: |  | | | | |
| City: |  | State: | AK | Zip: |  |
| Phone: |  | FAX: |  | | |
| Email: |  | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **District Signature** | | |
|  |  |  |
| District Superintendent (Printed Name): |  | Telephone: |
| X |  |  |
| Signature of the Superintendent: |  | Date: |

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

LEA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS 1003(g)

APPLICATION ELEMENTS

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

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.** |

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCHOOL NAME** | **AK School ID Number**  **(# # # # # #)** | **Tier**  **(I, II, or III)** | **INTERVENTION MODEL (TIER I AND II ONLY)** | | | |
| **Trans- formation** | **Turn- around** | **Restart** | **Closure** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

Please address the capacity of the LEA to provide adequate resources and support to all Tier I and Tier II schools listed above. Address each area:

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Capacity to provide support:** Describe the ability of the district to provide support to the schools in implementing instructional changes, providing professional development, and any other areas of assistance needed by the schools, including the ability to contract with external providers for services (as applicable).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |

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

Describe the district’s rigorous process for recruiting, screening, and selecting any external providers that will be used to provide support to the schools. The screening process must verify that a provider has a meaningful plan for contributing to the reform efforts in the school, will implement strategies that are research-based, has a record of success in similar schools, has a healthy fiscal history, and has the capacity to implement the strategies it is proposing. (External providers may be used to provide technical expertise in implementing various components of the intervention model such as helping a school evaluate its data and determine changes that are needed, providing job-embedded professional development, assisting in curriculum alignment, designing teacher and principal evaluation systems that rely on student data, etc.)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.** |

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

1. For each Tier I 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.

1. 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 (described above in B.2).
2. 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.

1. 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.
2. The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.

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

1. For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement, and which of the six domains for instructional effectiveness will be addressed by the services or activities.
2. The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

|  |
| --- |
| **B.8. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.** |

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **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 budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

• Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;

• Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools; and

|  |
| --- |
| **NOTE: An LEA’s budget must cover all three years of the grant, 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. The minimum LEA budget is $50,000 per year multiplied by the number of schools served** |

• Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

1. **Complete the following budget overview chart**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **District SIG Budget Overview**  **School Name** | **Year 1 Budget** | | **Year 2 Budget** | **Year 3 Budget** | **Three-Year Total** |
| **Pre-Implemen-tation** | **Full Implemen-tation  School Year** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Budget** |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Attach a complete budget and narrative for each school for the any pre-implementation activities planned through June 30, 2011, plus all three years, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 for which SIG funding is requested. Please note that pre-implementation activities may continue after June 30, 2011, but those activities would be funded during the 2011-2012 fiscal year budget. The budget for each school served may include district level expenses that are used to support or provide services to the school. Use the Budget and Narrative Form #05-07-071 found on the department website under Forms & Grants:** [**http://www.eed.state.ak.us/forms/home.cfm**](http://www.eed.state.ak.us/forms/home.cfm)
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|  |
| --- |
| 1. **ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant and must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.** |

The LEA assures that it will—

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

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant:** |

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

* “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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Name & Title of Authorized Representative | |
|  | |
| Signature of Authorized Representative | Date |

***This page intentionally left blank.***

Appendix A

Alaska’s Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools

**Overview of Criteria for Tiers**

**Tier I**

*Any Title I School at Level 2 or above* *(in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring) for 2010-2011 with more than 25 FAY students tested on the SBAs in 2009-2010 and 2008-2009 that:*

* Is among the lowest-achieving 5%, or 5, whichever number is greater (6 schools in Alaska) of those schools; or,
* Is a school that includes grade 12 that has had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent for 3 years

**Tier II**

*Any secondary school with more than 25 FAY students tested on the SBAs in 2009-2010 and 2008-2009 that is either eligible for but did not receive Title I, Part A funds in 2010-2011* ***or*** *any Title I secondary school (did receive Title I, Part A funds in 2010-2011) not on the Tier I list, that is in the bottom 20% of all schools in the state based on proficiency rates or has not made AYP for two consecutive years that:*

* Is among the lowest-achieving five percent, or 5, whichever number is greater (5 schools in Alaska) of those schools; or
* Is a school that includes grade 12 that has had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent for 3 years

**Tier III**

*Any Title I school at Level 2 or above that is not a Tier I or Tier II school and any schools excluded from the Tier I or Tier II pool who had 25 or fewer FAY students.*

**Definitions of Relevant Terms**

* **Secondary school** – schools with grades 7 through 12, or any appropriate combination of grades within this range (AS 14.03.070). Secondary schools include K-12 schools, middle schools, junior high schools, and high schools. K-8 schools are designated as elementary schools.
* **Number of years for determining academic proficiency** – the state will determine academic proficiency over two years, based on test scores from 2008-2009 and 2009-2010.
* **Number of years for determining graduation rate** – the state will determine graduation rates based on three years, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010. A secondary school that includes grade 12 will be considered to be persistently low achieving when it has a graduation rate of less than 60% for all three years.
* **Full Academic Year (FAY)** – the state will include students in the academic proficiency calculations who have been enrolled in the school for the full academic year (FAY) as defined in the state’s Accountability Workbook.
* **Standards Based Assessments (SBAs)** – the state Standards Based Assessments in reading, writing, and math on which the academic proficiency and adequate yearly progress (AYP) for reading/language arts and math is based.
* **School Index Point Value –** the score given to each school in the state that reflects progress made on the SBAs by individual students in the school across a period of two test administrations. See “Lack of Progress” description for more information.

**Method used to determine academic proficiency**

The state is using the adding ranks method to determine academic proficiency on the state’s assessments (SBAs) in reading/language arts and mathematics, combined. All schools that have more than 25 FAY students in each assessment year will be ranked from highest to lowest for each year in each content area with the highest performing school in the given content area and test administration receiving a rank of 1. Those 4 ranks (2 years for each of 2 content areas) will be added to determine a combined rank. Using the combined rank, the schools will be re-ranked so the highest performing school has a rank of 1. This same method is used to rank all schools in the state to determine those in the lowest quintile (20%) of performance according to proficiency on the SBAs.

**Lack of Progress**

The state will use the school index point value to determine lack of progress. Schools that have a school index point value of less than 90 will be will be considered to be lacking in progress. The school index point value is a score that is given to each school that reflects the progress made by individual students in the school. The school index point value was originally created as a measurement of a schools’ growth in order to award financial bonuses through the Performance Incentive Program to reward staff in schools that achieved significant growth. Each student who takes the SBAs is given a point value that compares that student’s proficiency level to the proficiency level on the prior year’s test and measures the student’s growth or decline in achievement. All of the individual FAY student point values are totaled and then divided by the total number of FAY students who attempted the test during both administrations to get the school growth index score. The value table created to implement this legislation provides a range of school growth index scores from 0 to 200. Schools that receive a score of 85 or less are considered to be declining in achievement. State regulation 4 AAC 06.872 uses the school index point value of less than or equal to 85 as one measure to identify schools that are lowest performing and must receive additional analysis by the state to determine the reasons for lack of progress in the school. The school index point value is described completely in regulation 4 AAC 33.540.

**Weighting**

The state did not apply any weighting criteria in determining the list of persistently lowest achieving schools.

**Lowest 5%**

The number of Tier I schools in the lowest 5% is 6. Alaska has 122 Title I Schools in improvement, corrective action or restructuring (at AYP Level 2 or above) for 2010-2011 based on the 2009-2010 SBA results.

The number of Tier II schools in the lowest achieving 5% is 5. The number of schools in the pool for Tier II, using the wavier to allow inclusion of Title I participating secondary schools, is 100, so the minimum number of lowest achieving schools is 5. (The Tier II pool uses the waiver flexibility to include Title I secondary schools not already identified in Tier I that either have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or are in the state’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency on the state’s assessments in reading/language arts and math, combined).

**Waivers and Excluded Schools**

Alaska is using the flexibility provided by two waivers.

*Exclude Schools below a “Minimum n”*

Pursuant to the flexibility granted by this waiver, schools were excluded from the pool of potential Tier I and Tier II schools that had 25 or fewer FAY students in the “all students group” in one or both assessment years. This exclusion includes schools that did not have any test data for 2008-2009 and/or 2009-2010, very small schools that might reveal personally identifiable information if included on the list, and “feeder” schools for other schools that carry the AYP designation of the schools they feed. Any schools that were excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest achieving schools in Tier I or Tier II are included on the list of Tier III schools. The “minimum *n*” size of 25 FAY students was chosen as it is consistent with the state’s Accountability Workbook. According to the state’s Accountability Workbook, a subgroup must have more than 25 students in order to be considered for determining adequate yearly progress (AYP). The “minimum *n*” size for the subgroup is applied in order to ensure that the data on which a school’s progress is measured is valid and reliable.

*Include Title I Secondary Schools in Tier II*

Pursuant to the flexibility granted by this waiver, Alaska will include the following schools in the pool of schools under consideration for Tier II: A secondary school that is either eligible for but did not receive Title I, Part A funds in 2010-2011 **or** any Title I secondary school (did receive Title I, Part A funds in 2010-2011) not identified for Tier I that is in the bottom 20% of all schools in the state based on proficiency rates on the state’s SBAs in reading/language arts and mathematics combined or has not made AYP for two consecutive years. This waiver expands the pool of schools under consideration for Tier II from 55 to 100.

**Newly Eligible**

Alaska is not identifying any schools in any Tier through the Newly Eligible criteria authorized by Congress.

**Steps to determine the list of schools in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III**

For Tier I:

* 1. Start with the list of Title I schools at Level 2 or above for 2010-2011.
  2. Determine the total number of schools in the pool and the number that represents the lowest 5%, or 5, whichever is higher. There are 122 schools in the pool, so there will be 6 schools in the lowest 5%.
  3. Exclude schools from the ranking process that have 25 or fewer FAY students in each test year (2008-2009 and 2009-2010).
  4. Rank order the remaining schools on the percent proficient or above of the full academic year (FAY) students in the all students group for each of the following: (rank of 1 = highest percent proficient)
  + Language arts for 2010
  + Language arts for 2009
  + Math for 2010
  + Math for 2009
  1. Add the 4 ranking numbers for each school to create a combined rank.
  2. Re-rank based on the combined ranking (rank of 1 = highest rank in reading/language arts and math combined).
  3. Determine schools that showed some progress in language arts and in math from 2009 to 2010 (those that had a school index point value of greater than or equal to 90).
  4. Remove all schools from consideration for the lowest 5% of achieving schools according to proficiency for Tier I that showed progress according to Step 7.
  5. Identify the 6 schools that are the lowest 5% from the schools that remain (count up from the bottom starting with the highest number by rank). Mark these as “Low 5” schools in Tier I. (Note for 2010-2011: If any of the six lowest schools were awarded SIG grants for 2010-2011, exclude those schools from the Low 5 and continue counting up from the bottom until six schools have been identified in the Low 5%.)
  6. To complete the list of schools in Tier I add any high school from the ranked group of schools from the original list of 122 (including K-12 schools) that had a graduation rate of *less than* sixty percent for 2008, 2009 *and* 2010. Mark these as “GRAD” schools in Tier I.

For Tier II:

1. Start with the list of Title I eligible, but not participating secondary schools for 2010-2011.
2. Add any Title I participating secondary schools in 2010-2011 not identified as Tier I that are in the bottom 20% of all schools in the state based on proficiency rates on the state’s SBAs in reading/language arts and mathematics combined or who have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
3. Determine the total number of schools in the pool for potential consideration as Tier II and the number that represents the lowest 5%, or 5, whichever is higher. There are 100 schools in the Tier II pool, so there will be 5 schools in the lowest 5%.
4. Complete steps 3-8 as shown in Tier I.
5. Identify the 5 schools that are the lowest 5% from the schools that remain (count up from the bottom starting with the highest number by rank). Mark these as “Low 5” schools Tier II. (Note for 2010-2011: If any of the six lowest schools were awarded SIG grants for 2010-2011, exclude those schools from the Low 5 and continue counting up from the bottom until six schools have been identified in the Low 5%.)
6. To complete the list of schools in Tier II, add any high school from the ranked group of schools from the original Tier II pool (including K-12 schools) that had a graduation rate of less than sixty percent for 2008, 2009, *and* 2010. Mark these as “GRAD” schools in Tier II.

For Tier III

Include in Tier III all schools from the original pools of schools under consideration for Tier I that were not identified as Tier I or Tier II. Also include all schools from the original pool of schools under consideration for Tier I or Tier II that were excluded due to 25 or fewer FAY students . Mark those that were removed from consideration due to 25 or fewer FAY students as “FAY.” Mark others as “Not Tier I” or “Not Tier II” as applicable.

Appendix B

Alaska’s List of Eligible Schools in Tier I, II, and III

Schools Sorted by Tier

| District | School | School ID | Tier | Reason |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Joann A. Alexie Memorial School | 310030 | Tier I | Lowest 5% |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Nightmute School | 310040 | Tier I | Lowest 5% |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Chaputnguak School | 310080 | Tier I | Lowest 5% |
| Lower Kuskokwim | William Miller Memorial School | 310170 | Tier I | Lowest 5% |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Nelson Island Area School | 310250 | Tier I | Lowest 5% |
| Northwest Arctic | McQueen School | 370060 | Tier I | Lowest 5% |
| Anchorage | Whaley School | 57140 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Bering Strait | Aniguiin School | 70040 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Bering Strait | Shishmaref School | 70110 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Bering Strait | Tukurngailnguq School | 70120 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Iditarod | David Louis Memorial School | 210120 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Ketchikan | Fast Track | 258010 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Kuinerrarmiut Elitnaurviat | 310220 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Lower Yukon | Alakanuk School | 320010 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Lower Yukon | Hooper Bay School | 320070 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Lower Yukon | Kotlik School | 320080 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Lower Yukon | Russian Mission School | 320130 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Lower Yukon | Sheldon Point School | 320150 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Matanuska-Susitna | Valley Pathways | 337020 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| North Slope | Alak School | 360100 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Northwest Arctic | Davis-Ramoth School | 370210 | Tier I | Grad Rate |
| Fairbanks | Alternative Learning Systems | 167010 | Tier II | Lowest 5% |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Dick R Kiunya Memorial School | 310130 | Tier II | Lowest 5% |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Ket'acik/Aapalluk Memorial School | 310140 | Tier II | Lowest 5% |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Lewis Angapak Memorial School | 310200 | Tier II | Lowest 5% |
| Northwest Arctic | Shungnak School | 370110 | Tier II | Lowest 5% |
| Anchorage | McLaughlin Secondary School | 57020 | Tier II | Grad Rate |
| Anchorage | Benson Secondary/S.E.A.R.C.H. | 57100 | Tier II | Grad Rate |
| Craig | PACE Correspondence | 138010 | Tier II | Grad Rate |
| Fairbanks | Effie Kokrine Charter School | 169040 | Tier II | Grad Rate |
| Yukon-Koyukuk | Raven Correspondence School | 528010 | Tier II | Grad Rate |
| Alaska Gateway | Gateway Correspondence | 38010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Alaska Gateway | Mentasta Lake School | 30030 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Alaska Gateway | Tetlin School | 30070 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Alaska Gateway | Tok School | 30060 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Alaska Gateway | Walter Northway School | 30040 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Anchorage | Airport Heights Elementary | 50020 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | State School for the Deaf & Hard of Hearing | 57010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Anchorage | Chinook Elementary | 50120 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Clark Middle School | 50560 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Anchorage | Crossroads School | 57190 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Anchorage | Fairview Elementary | 50300 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Lake Otis Elementary | 50450 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Mountain View Elementary | 50480 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Muldoon Elementary | 50490 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | North Star Elementary | 50500 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Ptarmigan Elementary | 50580 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Russian Jack Elementary | 50620 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Spring Hill Elementary | 50890 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Taku Elementary | 50690 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | William Tyson Elementary | 51040 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Williwaw Elementary | 50750 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Willow Crest Elementary | 50760 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Anchorage | Wonder Park Elementary | 50770 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Bering Strait | Brevig Mission School | 70010 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Bering Strait | Diomede School | 70050 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Bering Strait | Wales School | 70150 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Copper River | Chistochina School | 110020 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Copper River | Slana School | 110110 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Craig | Craig Alternative High School | 136010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Delta-Greely | New Horizons High School | 147010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Dillingham | Dillingham Elementary | 150010 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Dillingham | Dillingham Middle/High School | 150020 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Fairbanks | Anne Wien Elementary | 160380 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Fairbanks | Denali Elementary | 160050 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Fairbanks | Fairbanks Youth Facility | 167020 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Fairbanks | Joy Elementary | 160200 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Fairbanks | Nordale Elementary | 160230 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Haines | Mosquito Lake Elementary | 180040 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Iditarod | Holy Cross School | 210030 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Iditarod | Top of the Kuskokwim School | 210080 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Juneau | Gastineau Elementary | 220040 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Juneau | Johnson Youth Center | 227020 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Juneau | Riverbend Elementary | 220100 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Juneau | Yaakoosge Daakahidi Alt. H.S. | 227010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kashunamiut | Chevak School | 550010 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Kenai Peninsula | Homer Flex School | 247020 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kenai Peninsula | Kenai Alternative High School | 247030 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kenai Peninsula | Kenai Peninsula Youth Facility | 247050 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kenai Peninsula | Mt. View Elementary | 240370 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Kenai Peninsula | Port Graham School | 240180 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kenai Peninsula | Razdolna School | 240070 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kenai Peninsula | Spring Creek School | 247040 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kenai Peninsula | Tebughna School | 240280 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Ketchikan | Ketchikan Regional Youth Facility | 257050 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Ketchikan | Revilla Jr/Sr High School | 257010 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Kodiak Island | Akhiok School | 280010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kodiak Island | Danger Bay School | 280150 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kodiak Island | Ouzinkie School | 280110 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kuspuk | Crow Village Sam School | 290020 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kuspuk | George Morgan Sr. H.S. | 290090 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Kuspuk | Johnnie John Sr. School | 290030 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kuspuk | Joseph S. & Olinga Gregory Elementary | 290040 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Kuspuk | Zackar Levi Elementary | 290050 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lake and Peninsula | Perryville School | 300120 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Lake and Peninsula | Nondalton School | 300100 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Akiuk Memorial School | 310240 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Akula Elitnaurvik School | 310110 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Anna Tobeluk Memorial School | 310210 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Ayaprun Elitnaurvik | 319010 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Ayaprun School | 310190 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Bethel Regional High School | 310070 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Bethel Youth Facility | 317020 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Chief Paul Memorial School | 310120 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Eek School | 310090 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Gladys Jung Elementary | 310060 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Kwigillingok School | 310150 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Mikelnguut Elitnaurviat | 310050 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Paul T. Albert Memorial School | 310320 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Qugcuun Memorial School | 310280 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Rocky Mountain School | 310100 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Kuskokwim | Z. John Williams Memorial School | 310180 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Yukon | Emmonak School | 320040 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Yukon | Ignatius Beans School | 320090 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Yukon | Marshall School | 320050 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Yukon | Pilot Station School | 320110 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Lower Yukon | Pitkas Point School | 320120 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Lower Yukon | Scammon Bay School | 320140 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Matanuska-Susitna | Matanuska-Susitna Day School | 337060 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Matanuska-Susitna | Matanuska-Susitna Youth Facility | 337030 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Matanuska-Susitna | Butte Elementary | 330350 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Matanuska-Susitna | Goose Bay Elementary | 330390 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Matanuska-Susitna | Houston Middle School | 330450 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Matanuska-Susitna | John Shaw Elementary | 330500 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Matanuska-Susitna | Knik Elementary School | 330510 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Nome | Nome Elementary | 350010 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Nome | Nome Youth Facility | 357020 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| North Slope | Kiita Learning Community | 367010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| North Slope | Meade River School | 360090 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Northwest Arctic | Aqqaluk High/Noorvik Elementary | 370100 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Northwest Arctic | Buckland School | 370020 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Northwest Arctic | Kiana School | 370040 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Northwest Arctic | Kotzebue Middle/High School | 370150 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Northwest Arctic | Napaaqtugmiut School | 370090 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Sitka | Baranof Elementary | 420010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Sitka | Blatchley Middle School | 420020 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Sitka | Keet Gooshi Heen Elementary | 420170 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Sitka | Pacific High School | 427010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Southeast Island | Naukati School | 440270 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Southwest Region | Chief Ivan Blunka School | 450080 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Southwest Region | Clarks Point School | 450030 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Southwest Region | Koliganek School | 450050 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Southwest Region | Togiak School | 450110 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Southwest Region | Twin Hills School | 450120 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Southwest Region | William "Sonny" Nelson School | 450040 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Wrangell | Alaska Virtual Academy | 498010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Yukon Flats | Arctic Village School | 510010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Yukon Flats | Circle School | 510050 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Yukon Flats | John Fredson School | 510060 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Yukon Flats | Stevens Village School | 510100 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Yukon Flats | Tsuk Taih School | 510040 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Yukon-Koyukuk | Allakaket School | 520010 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Yukon-Koyukuk | Andrew K. Demoski School | 520090 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Yukon-Koyukuk | Jimmy Huntington School | 520040 | Tier III | Not Tier I |
| Yukon-Koyukuk | Johnny Oldman School | 520030 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |
| Yukon-Koyukuk | Kaltag School | 520050 | Tier III | Waiver - FAY *n* count |

**Key to Reason Codes:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Low 5** | School is in the lowest 5% of the schools in the pool for the Tier based on academic proficiency |
| **Grad** | School is in Tier I or Tier II based on graduation rate only |
| **Not Tier I** | School was in original Tier I pool but not identified as Tier I |
| **Waiver - FAY *n* count** | School was in original Tier I or Tier II pool, but was excluded from consideration based on having 25 or fewer full academic year (FAY students) |

**Appendix C**

## Final REquirements for School Improvement Grants

as authorized under Section 1003(g) of the ESEA

published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010

The Secretary adopts as final the interim final requirements (with the technical changes described herein) published in the Federal Register on January 21, 2010 (75 FR 3375). For the ease of the user of the final requirements, the Secretary has incorporated the changes made by these final requirements into the December 10, 2009 final requirements as published at 74 FR 65618 and is publishing a combined set of SIG final requirements as follows:

**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 underparagraph (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 or a Tier II 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) Implementinga per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

3. Definitions.

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

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

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

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

Student growth means the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. For grades in which the State administers summative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, student growth data must be based on a student’s score on the State’s assessment under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

4. Evidence of strongest commitment.

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

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

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

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

(iv) Align other resources with the interventions;

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

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

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

B. Providing flexibility.

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

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

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

4. An SEA may seek a waiver from the Secretary to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds 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 Ischool 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 servein accordance with these requirements, the SEA may then, consistent with section II.B.9,award remaining school improvement funds to its LEAsfor 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.

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

(a) 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

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

2. 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 | **✓** |  |
| 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 |  | **✓** |
| 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.

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