

# School Improvement Grants

## New Awards Application

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

Fiscal Year 2011

CFDA Number: 84.377A

---

**State Name: LOUISIANA**



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

OMB Number:  
Expiration Date:

### Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

### **Purpose of the Program**

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

### **Availability of Funds**

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2011, provided \$535 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2011.

FY 2011 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2013.

### **State and LEA Allocations**

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2011 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2011 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

### **Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners**

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

# FY 2011 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

This application is for use only by SEAs that will make new awards. New awards are defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2012–2013 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2011 funds or any remaining FY 2009 or FY 2010 funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions. The U.S. Department of Education will not require those SEAs that will use FY 2011 funds solely for continuation awards to submit a SIG application. Rather, such an SEA is required to submit an assurance that it is not making new awards, as defined above, through the separate, one-page application titled, “Continuation Awards Only Application for FY 2011 SIG Program”.

An SEA that must submit a FY 2011 application will be required to update its timeline for making awards to LEAs, but may retain all other sections from its FY 2010 application, including its lists of Tier I, II, and III schools.

## SUBMISSION INFORMATION

### **Electronic Submission:**

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA’s FY 2011 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2011 application to the following address: [school.improvement.grants@ed.gov](mailto:school.improvement.grants@ed.gov)

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

### **Paper Submission:**

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

Carlas McCauley, Education Program Specialist  
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320  
Washington, DC 20202-6132

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

### **Application Deadline**

Applications are due on or before January 9, 2012.

### **For Further Information**

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at [carlas.mccauley@ed.gov](mailto:carlas.mccauley@ed.gov).

**APPLICATION COVER SHEET**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS**

Legal Name of Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: Louisiana Department of Education School Turnaround Office P.O. Box 94064 Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant  Name: Sheila Guidry  Position and Office: Executive Director, School Turnaround Office  Contact's Mailing Address: Louisiana Department of Education School Turnaround Office P.O. Box 94064 Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064  Telephone: 225-219-4573  Fax: 225-342-7367  Email address: <a href="mailto:Sheila.Guidry@la.gov">Sheila.Guidry@la.gov</a>	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Mr. John C. White	Telephone: 225-342-3607
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X	Date: January 23, 2012
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

# FY 2011 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Please use this checklist to indicate the changes the SEA elects to make to its FY 2011 application from its FY 2010 application. An SEA will be required to update Section D (Part 1): Timeline, but will have the option to retain all other sections from its FY 2010 application, including its lists of Tier I, II, and III schools.

<b>SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to keep the same definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) as FY 2010	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to revise its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) for FY 2011
	<i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects not to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools <input type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists	<i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists
<b>SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2010	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2011
<b>SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2010	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2011
<b>SECTION C: CAPACITY</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2010	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2011
<b>SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2011	
<b>SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2010	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2011
<b>SECTION E: ASSURANCES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assurances provided	
<b>SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2010	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2011
<b>SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation with stakeholders provided	
<b>SECTION H: WAIVERS</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2010	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2011

## PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its FY 2011 application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA will be required to update its timeline, but may retain all other sections from its FY 2010 application, including its lists of Tier I, II, and III schools.

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2010</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2011</b>
<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. The SEA elects not to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. The SEA does not need to submit a new list for the FY 2011 application.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.</p>	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.</p>

**Directions:** An SEA that elects to generate new lists or must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” must attach a table to its SIG application that include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for new awards.<sup>1</sup> An SEA that will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools does not need to submit a new list for the FY 2011 application.

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

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2011 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A “new award” is defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2012–2013 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2011 funds or any remaining FY 2009 or FY 2010 funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

<sup>2</sup> “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

**EXAMPLE:**

<b>SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2011 SIG FUNDS</b>								
<b>LEA NAME</b>	<b>LEA NCES ID #</b>	<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>SCHOOL NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X
LEA 2	##	WASHINGTON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	FILLMORE HS	##			X		
LEA 3	##	TYLER HS	##		X		X	
LEA 4	##	VAN BUREN MS	##	X				
LEA 4	##	POLK ES	##			X		

**Directions:** All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds (e.g., reallocate to other schools with SIG grants or retain for a future SIG competition).

<b>LEA NAME</b>	<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED</b>	<b>AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS</b>
Recovery School District	F. W. Gregory Elementary	This persistently low-performing school was closed by the LEA on June 1, 2011, so that students could transfer to higher performing schools. None of the SIG funds from this Round 1 school were expended; all of the funds (\$884,189.19) were returned to LDOE and redistributed through the Round 2 competitive award allocation process. None of the Round 2 schools were awarded more than \$2 million per year for each year of the three-year grant. The school closure process was conducted in accordance with the LDOE school closure protocol.	\$884,189.19
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:</b>			<b>\$884,189.19</b>

**Directions:** In the boxes below, provide updates to any sections, if any, the SEA elects to revise. The only section the SEA will be required to update is *Section D (Part 1): Timeline*. The SEA does not need to resubmit information for any section in which it elects to use the same criteria as its FY 2010 SIG application. See Appendix A for guidelines on the information required for revised sections.

**SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA**

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2010 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2011. Updated information listed below.

***Louisiana’s Strategy for School Improvement Grant Funds***

Effective school turnaround requires bold actions at the federal, state, district, and school levels. In order to maximize the impact of the state’s SIG funding, the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) will give priority to LEA applications that demonstrate a strong commitment, capacity, and sustainability to implement bold and aggressive reforms to turnaround the state’s persistently lowest-achieving schools. The LEAs that will receive priority are those that are:

- Aligning their central offices to effectively direct comprehensive and coordinated resources to their lowest performing schools (i.e., portfolios, focus schools, feeder patterns, district turnaround zones);
- Adopting and implementing key reform practices in Human Capital (i.e., educator effectiveness, staffing/hiring) and Instructional Improvement (i.e., using data to drive instruction, adopting rigorous district-level curricula, such as Common Core State Standards,);
- Streamlining and aligning district- and school-level functions, policies, and practices to effectively implement and sustain key reforms; and,
- Effectively communicating and partnering with parents, communities and key stakeholders to drive dramatic school improvement.

To further support its application, LEAs will be asked to explain how they are integrating and aligning this work with other resources and key reform initiatives (i.e., Race to the Top, previous SIG rounds, 1003(a), etc.) to support their lowest performing schools. LEAs already receiving SIG funds must demonstrate how they have leveraged those funds to improve student achievement and how they will integrate their proposed SIG Round III interventions as part of a broader turnaround strategy. Applicants are strongly encouraged to incorporate and leverage other LEAs, the SEA, and designated external lead partner(s) to build and sustain district wide capacity and ensure each school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support to dramatically enhance teaching and learning.

As approved by USED for previous SIG competitions, an LEA may, at its discretion, apply for one or more Tier III schools. LDOE will require any Tier III SIG applications to align to the Tier I and Tier II requirements to implement one of the four intervention models (i.e., turnaround, restart, transformation, and closure). This is a state requirement that exceeds the minimum federal requirements regarding Tier III school applications. While an LEA may apply for a grant for a Tier III school, the LEA is not required to apply for any of its Tier III schools. If an LEA has both Tier I and Tier III schools, the LEA must apply for its Tier I schools if it intends to

apply for any of its Tier III schools.

### ***Louisiana's Grant Award Process***

LDOE sets a high performance bar for SIG applicants and will only fund applications that propose bold, innovative intervention strategies and demonstrate significant capacity, commitment, and sustainability. To determine the SIG awardees, LDOE will first score and rank its Tier I and Tier II applications and prioritize funding to the Tier I and Tier II schools that meet LDOE's high standards. If an application for a Tier I or Tier II school does not meet the minimum performance bar, the applicant will not receive funding for that school; however, Louisiana will provide intensive support and feedback to applicants prior to the official application deadline in order to help eligible LEAs produce bold, actionable, and strategic intervention plans. After ranking the Tier I and Tier II applications, LDOE will then score and rank its and III schools. Of all of the applications that meet Louisiana's high performance bar, funding priority will be given to the LEA applications that demonstrate the commitment, capacity, and sustainability to implement one of the four intervention models. Funding priority will be given to the Tier I and Tier II applicants; if funding remains after grant sizes have been determined for the successful Tier I and Tier II applications, only then will LDOE determine grant allocations for the successful Tier III applications. . .

**The SEA must describe the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to the following actions:**

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.*

Conducting a thorough needs assessment is critical for assessing the school's current performance level. Each LEA is required to conduct a needs assessment of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve and then use each school's unique needs assessment to identify an appropriate intervention model. This needs assessment may be the LANA, Scholastic Audit, Quality Review, SACS, Breaking Ranks II, High Schools That Work, or another similarly accredited needs assessment.

Using the needs assessment analysis and the school's historical performance data, the LEA must set ambitious but achievable performance goals for the school on the state's reading and mathematics assessments (and state science and history or social studies assessments, when applicable) and set projected goals for the state-determined School Performance Score.

The LEA then must describe in its application the strategies the LEA will use to implement the selected intervention model in the identified schools. The selected strategies must align to the appropriate practices in the LDOE School Turnaround, Human Capital, Instructional Improvement, and/or Organizational Excellence Frameworks. (Attached)

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

Each LEA applicant will submit to the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) one LEA application and a school-level application for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve. The purpose of the LEA- application is to give applicants the opportunity to articulate LEA-wide strategies for dramatic school reform and demonstrate how district staff will support activities to implement the selected intervention

model in the identified schools. In the scoring rubric, priority is given to LEAs that demonstrate the capacity to implement their selected intervention strategies and sustain academic improvements beyond the grant period.

In order to demonstrate its capacity to implement the intervention model selected for each Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III school identified in its application, the LEA must first describe any LEA-wide improvement programs in which it participates. The LDOE will give priority to applications that focus on the implementation of proven strategies that result in increased student achievement and the transition to Common Core State Standards. The LDOE will also give priority to applications that focus on the implementation of a comprehensive teacher and leader evaluation system as part of restart or turnaround models because they do not include teacher and leader evaluation as part of federal requirements.

Each LEA applicant will also be assessed on its central office capacity to support the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve. The LEA is asked to describe its existing or future governance structure and external partnerships for providing direct and efficient support to the SIG-receiving schools (e.g., has the LEA created, or will it create, a District Turnaround Office or Turnaround Zone to provide supports and services directly to the SIG-receiving schools? Will a CMO or EMO be selected? Will external consultants provide services to schools as part of the strategy?). The LEA must also describe the credentials, roles, and responsibilities of any existing or new LEA central office personnel who are - or will be - dedicated to serving the SIG schools.

In addition to its central office capacity, the LEA is asked to identify in the application its existing efforts and/or future plans to attract and/or develop talented human capital to serve in its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools. LDOE places particular emphasis on each LEA's strategy for replacing principals in any schools adopting the turnaround and transformation models and for replacing school staff in any turnaround schools.

If an LEA submits applications for four or more schools that meet LDOE's standards for quality, LDOE will conduct an additional review to determine whether the LEA has the capacity to carry out the planned interventions not just in each school, but in all of the designated schools as a group. This additional review will focus on central office capacity, human capital development strategies and budgeting, emphasizing four questions:

1. Has the LEA established an organizational or governance structure capable of overseeing multiple intervention efforts?
2. Has the LEA staffed (or does it have plans to staff) the organizational unit responsible for turnarounds with a team that has the knowledge and capabilities needed to execute the plan? For evidence on these two questions, LDOE will examine the LEA's explanation of its organizational and governance structure in its LEA-level application.
3. Do the LEA's human capital plans have the capacity to generate enough leaders and teachers for all the schools, not just individual schools? For evidence, LDOE will examine the LEA's responses to the human capital questions in the LEA-level application.
4. Has the LEA budgeted sufficient resources to carry out LEA-level activities demanded by its plans? For evidence on that question, LDOE will examine the LEA's responses in the Budget section of both the LEA-level and school-level applications. If an application does not contain sufficient information to answer these questions, LDOE may seek additional information from the LEA. If the LDOE determines

that the LEA lacks the capacity to carry out interventions in all of the schools as a group, it may grant funding to the LEA for a subset of qualifying schools and invite the LEA to resubmit the additional schools' applications in subsequent funding competitions.

Important note: While an LEA may apply for a grant for a Tier III school, the LEA is not required to apply for any of its Tier III schools. The LEA may, at its discretion, apply for one or more Tier III schools.

*(3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).*

In the sub-grant application, the LEA will be scored on specific actions it proposes to take or has already taken to align other resources with the proposed interventions (e.g., Title I or other state and federal grant funding), as well as its plan for sustaining the reforms beyond the three-year SIG funding period, provided that Louisiana receives a waiver from USED to extend the grant period. The LEA must submit a comprehensive LEA-level budget that includes line items for salaries, employee benefits, contracted professional and technological services, other purchased services, supplies, property costs, and any other costs directly associated with implementing the schools' intervention models. The LEA must submit a budget for each of three years, with the first year of the grant period covering any pre-implementation costs, and the LEA has to provide an additional two-year budget indicating how it will sustain the reforms after the grant period ends. An LEA may request a maximum of \$2 million dollars per year totaling up to \$6 million for the three year grant period for an eligible school. LDOE is not allowed to cap these allocations.

In addition to the LEA-level budget, the applicant must also submit individual school budgets for each school it commits to serve. The school-level budget addresses the same budget categories and also gives the applicant the opportunity to include a two-year sustainability budget post the three-year grant period. The LEA also must link items in the LEA application to each school-level budget citing all critical expenditures needed to carry out human capital strategies, instructional program plans, governance changes, extended learning time and additional student support efforts, accountability system development plans, and all other relevant activities aligned to support each school's intervention strategy.

**The LEA may have taken the following actions prior to submitting its application but most likely will take them after receiving SIG funds. The SEA must describe the criteria it will use to assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:**

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

The LEA has to submit an LEA Work Plan including each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve. This implementation plan must address specific actions the LEA will take to implement each and every requirement of the selected intervention model. If any intervention requirements are not addressed in the implementation plan, the applicant will not be eligible to receive SIG funding. The language in the sub-grant application and the accompanying scoring rubric make it clear that the LEA may not pick and choose which intervention model requirements to implement: The intervention models **must** be implemented in full.

The application rubric awards more points to implementation plans that anticipate making significant progress on the intervention requirements by the beginning of the first school year of the three-year funding period. (Note: It is expected that schools implementing the closure model will spend no more than 1 year on all school

closure activities.) Each school that wins SIG funding will be monitored quarterly on its progress against its implementation plan and timeline.

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

No matter what intervention model is selected, each LEA must describe in its application if and how it will leverage external providers to manage the school's intervention effort. If an LEA contracts with an external provider to manage a school's turnaround, transformation, or closure, the LEA must describe its process for recruiting, selecting, and evaluating external partners. If the provider has already been selected, the LEA must describe the provider's roles and responsibilities at the school, as well as its performance to date. Finally, the LEA must describe how the external provider is being held or will be held accountable for producing significant growth in student achievement at the SIG-funded school.

For schools adopting the restart model, the LEA is required to select a charter school operator, a Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Education Management Organization (EMO) and answer the same external provider questions required of the schools adopting the turnaround, transformation, or closure model. Additionally, the applicant must describe the termination conditions of the contract between the operator and the LEA. The LEA must also describe the rigorous review process it used or will use for selecting a CMO or EMO, and this process must include the following elements:

- Recruiting several potential operators
- Assessing applicants' reform plans and strategies and their alignment with the restart school's needs assessment
- Assessing applicants' history with low-performing schools
- Assessing applicants' capacity to implement the restart intervention
- Assessing applicants' human capital strategies

*(3) Align other resources with the intervention.*

In the application, the LEA is asked to describe specific actions it will take or has already taken to align other resources with the proposed interventions (e.g., Title I, other state or federal grant funding), as well as its plan for sustaining the reforms after the period of SIG funding ends. The applicant must provide LEA-level and school-level budgets for three consecutive years (with pre-implementation activities taking place in year 1) and has to provide an additional 2-year budget indicating sustainability funds (i.e., Race to the Top, Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant, Teacher Incentive Funds).

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

Research on school turnaround shows that building capacity at the school level requires changing operating conditions around 4 critical areas: people, time, money, and program. In the application, the LEA is asked to describe the steps it has taken or will take to give the SIG school principals more operational autonomy over staff hiring/removals, budgeting, calendars and extended learning time, and school programs. The scoring rubric awards more points to LEAs that submit evidence to LDOE that they have already changed policies and practices giving eligible schools more operational autonomies. Examples of evidence that an LEA may submit include, but are not limited to, new or amended teacher agreements and/or new or amended principal contracts.

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

The applicant must provide LEA-level and school-level budgets for three consecutive years and may submit an additional 2-year budget indicating sustainability funds. In the sub-grant application, the LEA must describe its plan for sustaining the reforms after the period of SIG funding ends. In addition to describing local, state, and federal funding sources that will help sustain reform efforts, the LEA's proposed human capital building strategy is considered an integral aspect of sustainability

### **SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PRE-IMPLEMENTATION**

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2010 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2011. Updated information listed below.

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

In its LEA Work Plan and in both the school and district budgets, the LEA must identify pre-implementation activities it will carry out from the time it receives its grant funds to the beginning of the first school year of the three-year grant period. The budget template allows the applicant to identify pre-implementation costs associated with employee benefits, contracted professional and technological services, other purchased services, supplies, property costs, and any other costs directly associated with preparing to implement the schools' intervention models.

An applicant's proposed pre-implementation expenses must be reasonable and necessary to carry out the activities described in the applicant's budget narrative. The bulk of an applicant's SIG program budget must be devoted to implementing the intervention model by the beginning of the first school year of the three-year grant period.

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

Any proposed pre-implementation activities that do not directly address a school's intervention model requirements and implementation plan will not be approved by LDOE. Additionally, SIG funds may not be used to buy out principal or teacher contracts or to continue funding teachers who have been removed from the classroom. The applicant also may not use SIG funds to pay for activities that took place before the applicant received its grant funds; these include the costs of any school needs assessments used to select appropriate intervention models.

An applicant's proposed pre-implementation activities may include, but are not limited to:

- Family and community engagement to educate stakeholders about changes taking place at the SIG-receiving schools and to cultivate their ongoing support and involvement at the schools.
- Conducting a rigorous recruitment and evaluation process for external providers, especially those taking on school operating responsibilities.
- Recruiting, placing and training new school leaders and staff.
- Evaluating current school staff based on identified standards and competencies.
- Evaluating and improving school instructional programs, with significant input from the school's incoming principal.
- Providing job-embedded professional development for staff and school leaders that will adequately

prepare them to begin school intervention activities in the first school year of the three-year grant period.

- Developing an LEA data management and accountability system that will allow the LEA to consistently monitor school performance and provide ongoing feedback to schools that allow them to make informed mid-course corrections.

### **SECTION C: CAPACITY**

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2010 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2011. Updated information listed below.

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

The LDOE has designed a comprehensive rubric for the LEA application and budget to ensure that we are able to address capacity and adherence to the USED regulations. LEA capacity will be evaluated through the quality with which it addresses the implementation of the selected intervention model at each school in each component of the LEA application. If an LEA scores below LDOE's acceptable level on the rubric, it will be clear that the LEA does not possess the capacity to implement the intervention models at targeted schools. If an LEA scores above LDOE's acceptable level on the rubric, yet has been judged to not meet the minimum final requirements as outlined by USED, that LEA must submit an amendment to its plan that describes how it will meet that final requirement in order to receive funding.

If an LEA submits an application to serve four or more schools that meet LDOE's standards for quality, LDOE will conduct an additional review to determine whether the LEA has the capacity to carry out the planned interventions not just in each school, but in all of the designated schools as a group. This additional review will seek to answer four primary questions:

- First, has the LEA established an organizational or governance structure capable of overseeing multiple intervention efforts?
- Second, has the LEA staffed (or does it have plans to staff) the organizational unit responsible for turnarounds with a team that has the knowledge and capabilities needed to execute the plan? For evidence on those two questions, LDOE will examine the LEA's explanation of its organizational and governance structure in its application.
- Third, do the LEA's human capital plans have the capacity to generate enough leaders and teachers for all the schools, not just individual schools? For evidence, LDOE will examine the LEA's responses to the human capital questions in the application.
- Fourth, has the LEA budgeted sufficient resources to carry out activities demanded by its plans? For evidence, LDOE will examine the LEA's responses in the Budgets for both the LEA and school. If an application does not contain sufficient information to answer these questions, LDOE may seek additional information from the LEA. If the LDOE determines that the LEA lacks the capacity to carry out interventions in all of the schools as a group, it may grant funding to the LEA for a subset of

qualifying schools and invite the LEA to resubmit the additional schools' applications if subsequent funding competitions are available.

The LDOE recognizes the capacity of the RSD to implement intervention models in schools placed into the RSD. There are eligible schools that are currently under SEA-control through the Recovery School District (RSD). The RSD will make a decision about whether to submit an LEA application. The RSD will make a decision about which schools to include in the application submitted and which intervention models to implement in the chosen schools.

In its application, the LEA is required to explain why it lacks capacity to serve any eligible Tier I, Tier II or Tier III schools in its jurisdiction. If an LEA applies for both of its two Tier I schools and none of its three Tier III schools, and the LDOE can prove that the LEA does have the capacity to serve one or more Tier III schools, the LEA could receive SIG funding for its two Tier I schools, but would not receive SIG funding for its Tier III schools. If the LDOE determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates, the LDOE may contact the LEA about revising their application to address an increased capacity to implement the intervention models at targeted schools.

**SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE:** An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Dates	Activities
1/23/2012	Louisiana's School Turnaround Office (STO) submits FY11 Application to USED
4/30/2012	STO releases USED-approved application to LEAs
5/2/2012	Webinars for LEAs to learn about successful school intervention strategies and SIG application information
4/30/2012 to 5/18/2012	STO provides ongoing, technical assistance to LEA applicants
5/18/2012	Final day to submit LEA applications to STO
5/21/2012 to 5/23/2012	External reviewers read, score and rank all applications submitted
5/24/2012	STO analyzes reviewers' comments/scores and identifies list of finalists to recommend to LDOE leadership team
5/24-25/2012	LDOE leadership team reviews finalists and selects Round 3 winners to recommend to the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE)
6/19-20/2012	BESE approves Round 3 winners
6/21/2012	STO contacts Round 3 winners and non-winners
6/21/2012	STO publicly announces Round 3 winners via website, e-blast, and press release
6/21/2012	Grant Award Notifications issued to districts and allocations available to awardees for budgeting in electronics Grants Management System (eGMS).

6/30/2012

Deadline for Districts to submit budget in eGMS. Funds are substantially approved and available for implementation activities on July 1, 2012.

**SECTION D (PARTS 2-8) DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:**

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2010 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2011. Updated information listed below.

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

The monitoring, review, and renewal process will be the same for all schools, no matter the tier designation. On an annual basis, the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant by looking at each school's progress on USED's nine leading indicators, its growth in student achievement on state assessments, and its progress toward reaching Louisiana's Nine Priority Goals. *(See Addendum for LDOE's Memorandum of Understanding for LEA SIG recipients.)*

Data for the state assessment goals will be derived from the math and reading scores – as well as available science and history or social studies data – on standardized tests administered by the Louisiana Department of Education. In the sub-grant application, LEAs are required to describe additional performance goals for each school, which may be derived from Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) (including alternative standardized assessments, attendance and/or dropout rates, data on percent proficient, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Pre-K/Kindergarten screening tests, or other standardized assessments and unit assessments).

*Performance Warnings*

If a SIG school shows a downward performance trend or little to no performance progress based on the state's quarterly performance monitoring and monthly field staff site visits, LDOE's School Turnaround Office (STO) will issue at least one warning to the LEA and to the SIG school that the school is not making performance gains and is at risk of facing one of two possible consequences: 1) the LEA might have to select a more rigorous intervention model for the school; or 2) the LEA could lose its SIG funding for that particular school. When the performance warning is issued, the STO will tell the LEA to submit a revised SIG plan that will put the school in question on course to meet its annual state assessment goals and make progress on USED's 9 leading indicators.

*Grant Renewal Decisions*

Towards the end of the first grant year and again towards the end of the second grant year, the STO central office staff and field staff will convene to analyze each SIG school's implementation and performance progress

over the past year. The team will review each school's progress towards its implementation of the approved SIG application, towards its goals on USED's 9 leading indicators, and its annual State assessment goals set forth in the approved SIG application.

LEAs and schools that do not follow their implementation plans or do not make progress towards their state assessment and leading indicator goals are at risk of losing their SIG funding for those specific schools. However, if an LEA has been responsive to state support but struggles to improve a SIG school because the intervention model selected is not rigorous enough, the state will consider giving the LEA the option to select a different intervention model for the school and submit a new SIG application for LDOE's review (e.g., if the transformation model has not brought about the dramatic changes needed in a particular school, the LEA could choose to restart the school under a CMO or EMO, or select the turnaround model and replace and rehire at least 50 percent of the school's staff). If the LEA refuses to implement a different model, the state may terminate the school's SIG funding.

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

See previous question.

*(4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.*

The Louisiana Department of Education underwent a substantial internal reorganization during the summer of 2010. One of the results of this reorganization effort was the creation of a new "School Turnaround Office (STO)." The STO's mission is twofold: 1) To produce significant gains in student achievement within two years; and 2) To prepare LEAs and impacted schools for the longer process of transforming into high-performance organizations. The STO has the important responsibility of coordinating with other Department offices to measure and report academic progress on Louisiana's lowest-performing schools, to identify and disseminate best practices, and to change the organizational culture of the Department. Primarily, the STO is designed to build state and local capacity to turn around persistently low-achieving schools in Louisiana to prevent the need for state intervention.

The STO currently manages all monitoring and support of all school SIG recipients and their LEAs from all the rounds of SIG competition. It is the STO's view that "monitoring" in the traditional sense is not enough. The STO must not only ensure that LEAs receiving School Improvement Grants are meeting targets, but also provide them with the tools and knowledge necessary to do this challenging work well. STO staff both monitor and serve Tier I, II and III schools that receive SIG funds to ensure that each school is meeting annual goals for student achievement, is advancing Louisiana's Nine Priority Goals, and is making progress on USED's nine leading indicators.

Each SIG-receiving LEA is required to designate a SIG liaison to serve as the principal contact for the STO and to directly support and serve the LEA's SIG-receiving schools. These LEA liaisons work closely with the STO's field staff team, who are responsible for recommending policies that support district/school innovations and remove barriers to academic progress, facilitating Professional Learning Networks, and reviewing school performance data for the purpose of suggesting district-wide and school-based interventions. Each LEA's

assigned STO field staff person conducts regular site visits, once per quarter at minimum, to provide targeted technical assistance to the LEA and each SIG-receiving school. These site visits are also an opportunity for the field staff to report back to the STO team on the progress being made on the ground and specific barriers that the LEAs and/or schools are facing. In addition to the site visits, student achievement and formal observation data are collected on a quarterly basis and analyzed by the STO and the office's field staff team.

*(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.*

Louisiana sets a high performance bar for SIG applicants and will only fund applications that propose bold, innovative intervention strategies and demonstrate significant capacity, commitment, and sustainability. To determine the SIG awardees, Louisiana will first score and rank its Tier I and Tier II applications and prioritize funding to the Tier I and Tier II schools that meet Louisiana's high standards. If an application for a Tier I or Tier II school does not meet the minimum performance bar, the applicant will not receive funding for that school; however, Louisiana will provide intensive support and feedback to applicants prior to the official application deadline in order to help eligible LEAs produce bold, actionable, and strategic intervention plans. After ranking the Tier I applications, Louisiana will then score and rank its Tier II and III schools. Of all of the applications that meet Louisiana's high performance bar, funding priority will be given to LEAs that demonstrate the commitment, capacity, and sustainability to implement one of the four intervention models. Funding priority will be given to the Tier I applicants; if funding remains after grant sizes have been determined for the successful Tier I applications, only then will Louisiana determine grant allocations for the successful Tier II and III applications.

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

Because of Louisiana's large number of low-achieving schools, the LDOE will give priority to those Tier III schools that agree to implement one of the four intervention models required of schools in Tiers I and II. . After Tier I applications have been ranked and scored and their grant allocations determined, if funding remains LDOE will determine grant awards for the highest-ranked Tier II and then Tier III applications that meet LDOE's high performance bar.

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

Not applicable.

*(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.*

Not applicable.

## **SECTION E: ASSURANCES**

By checking this box and submitting this application, the SEA agrees to follow the assurances listed in its FY 2010 SIG application.

#### **SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION**

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2010 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2011. Updated information listed below.

It is anticipated that the Louisiana Department of Education will retain 5 percent of the total funding received for State-level activities to support SIG funded schools and districts in their improvement efforts. The LDOE has provided technical assistance on the intervention models and the application process to LEA staff and their stakeholders. The LDOE will enter into agreements with staff from institutions of higher learning, retired practitioners, business community members, and other external experts with experience intervening in persistently lowest-achieving schools. Additionally, the state's administrative funds will be used to provide ongoing field staff support to SIG-receiving LEAs in an effort to continually build their capacity to successfully implement these interventions.

#### **SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS**

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

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

**WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS**

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

**Waiver 1: Tier II waiver**

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2010 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.**

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2011 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

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

**Waiver 2: n-size waiver**

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2010 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.**

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2011 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]**.

Assurance

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

**Waiver 3: New list waiver**

Because the State does not elect to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2010 competition.

## **WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS**

Louisiana requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

### **Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver**

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2010 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2011 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

**Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 or 2011-2012 school years cannot request this waiver to "start over" their school improvement timeline again.**

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2012–2013 school year to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

#### Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

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

### **Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver**

**Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2010 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2011 competition must request the waiver again in this application.**

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

#### Assurances

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

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

## **ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS**

**(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)**

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

**PART II: LEA APPLICATION**

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

**LEA APPLICATION**

SEA is using the same FY 2010 LEA application form for FY 2011.

The SEA does not need to resubmit the LEA application.

SEA has revised its LEA application form for FY 2011.

The SEA must submit its LEA application form with its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. The SEA should attach the LEA application form in a separate document.

**LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school 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.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
  - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
  - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
  - Align other resources with the interventions;
  - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
  - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

The LEA must provide a 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
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

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

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 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

**Example:**

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school 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.

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

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

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

## APPENDIX A

### REQUIRED INFORMATION FOR REVISED SEA APPLICATION SECTIONS

#### **B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

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

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.
- (2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.
- (3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

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

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
- (3) Align other resources with the interventions.
- (4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
- (5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

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

- (1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period<sup>2</sup> to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?
- (2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? (*For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.*)

<sup>2</sup> "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2012–2013 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

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

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

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

**D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:**

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

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

(4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

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

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

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.<sup>3</sup>

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

## E. ASSURANCES

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

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- Monitor each LEA's implementation of the "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

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

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

## APPENDIX B

	<b>Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier</b>	<b>Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier</b>
<b>Tier I</b>	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” <sup>3</sup>	Title I eligible <sup>4</sup> elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier II</b>	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier III</b>	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. <sup>5</sup>	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two years.</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> “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.

<sup>4</sup> For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

<sup>5</sup> Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.

## Louisiana's Definition of "Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools"

### **PLA Definition:**

1. A school that is academically unacceptable is identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. The average of the two most recent consecutive years of combined ELA and math results on the state exam, as calculated in the state's Academic Index, define the proficiency level of each school based on the all students group.
3. A school's lack of progress is determined by the all students group wherein the group does not improve its Academic Index or graduation rate by at least 0.1 percentage points over the two most recent consecutive years (and have been identified in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for three or more years for tier 1).
4. Secondary schools that have a minimum poverty rate of 35% are Title I eligible.
5. Secondary schools are defined as any school whose configuration includes the 9-12 grade range.

### To define Tier I schools:

Louisiana identifies the lowest-achieving five or five percent (whichever is greater) Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring according to numbers one (1), two (2), three (3), and four (4) above. Then, Louisiana identifies all Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with a graduation rate less than 60% for two years according to numbers one (1), three (3), four (4), and five (5) above. Louisiana did not include any additional criteria to add Tier I schools to the list other than graduation rate data. Louisiana also did not use weighting methods to identify its Tier I schools.

### Detailed steps taken to identify Tier I schools:

#### **Step 1**

Identify all Title I schools in Louisiana that are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status.

#### **Step 2**

Of the remaining schools, rank the schools from lowest to highest based on the average of their two most recent consecutive years of academic index figures.

#### **Step 3**

Identify the bottom 5%: of schools that have the lowest average academic indices.

#### **Step 4**

Identify schools that did not improve their academic indices by at least 0.1% from year1 to year 2 of the two most recent consecutive years AND have been identified in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for three or more years.

#### **Step 5**

Of the remaining schools on the list, remove all schools that were designated Tier I and won SIG funding in previous SIG competitions.

#### **Step 6**

Keep on the list, all previous Tier III SIG-recipient schools that remain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. (Schools designated with an asterisk are not eligible for competition in round 3.)

#### **Step 7**

Add all Title I receiving secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with a graduation rate less than 60%.

### To define Tier II schools:

Louisiana identifies the lowest-achieving five or five percent (whichever is greater) Title I eligible secondary schools not receiving Title I funds according to numbers one (1), two (2), three (3), four (4), and five (5) listed above. Then, Louisiana identifies all Title I eligible secondary schools not receiving funds with a graduation rate less than 60% for

two years according to numbers one (1), three (3), four (4) and five (5) listed above. Louisiana did not include any additional criteria to add Tier II schools to the list other than graduation rate data. Louisiana also did not use weighting methods to identify its Tier II schools.

Detailed steps taken to identify Tier II schools:

**Step 1**

Identify Title I eligible-but-not receiving secondary schools.

**Step 2**

Rank the schools from lowest to highest based on their average academic indices.

**Step 3**

Identify the bottom 5%: of schools that have the lowest average academic indices.

**Step 4**

Identify schools that did not improve their academic indices by at least 0.1% from year 1 to year 2 of the two most recent consecutive years.

**Step 5**

Of the remaining schools on the list, remove all schools that were designated Tier II and won SIG funding in previous SIG competitions.

**Step 6**

Add all Title I eligible but not receiving secondary schools with a graduation rate less than 60%.

To define Tier III schools:

All schools that are in improvement, corrective action or restructuring, that aren't identified as Tier I schools will be identified.