School Improvement Grants Application

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

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A

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

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

Submitted by

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

February 18, 2010

As Amended March 30, 2010

Larry LeDoux, Commissioner

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: **Alaska Department of Education & Early Development**	Applicant's Mailing Address: **PO Box 110500** **Juneau, AK 99811-0500**
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant: Name: **Margaret MacKinnon** Position and Office: **Title I/NCLB Administrator** Contact's Mailing Address: **Alaska Department of Education & Early Development** **PO Box 110500, Juneau, AK 99811-0500** Telephone: **907-465-2970** Fax: **907-465-2989** Email address: **margaret.mackinnon@alaska.gov**	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): **Larry LeDoux**	Telephone: 907-465-2800
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X Larry LeDoux	Date: 3-30-10
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. (A State's Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA's definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition.

Link to Definition: **http://www.eed.state.ak.us/stim/home.html** The definition is available on this page under the section heading "ARRA Title I School Improvement 1003(g) Grants."

LEA NAME, NCES ID #						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[1]

An SEA should attach a table with this information to its School Improvement Grant application. If an SEA is providing the definition it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools rather than a link to its definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, it should also attach the definition to its application.

See Appendix A for Alaska's Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools
See Appendix B for the List of Eligible Schools in Tier I, II, and III

[1] As noted above, an SEA must identify newly eligible schools on its list only if it chooses to take advantage of this option.

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

Alaska will require each LEA to submit an application for SIG funding that includes a "Request for Applications for LEA School Improvement Grants" (RFA for LEA SIG) which describes the overall LEA application and a separate "LEA SIG Application Supplement" for each school to be served. The RFA for LEA SIG will require the LEA to list the schools to be served, the intervention models, and the amount of funding requested for each school for 3 years. The RFA for LEA SIG will also require the LEA to describe its overall capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school in the application; how it will provide technical assistance and support to the schools, including how it will recruit, screen, and select external providers; how it will change any policies or procedures as needed, including providing evidence of support from the teachers' union, school board, staff or parents as applicable; the consultation with stakeholders; the budgets for each school; and the signatures and assurances.

In addition, for each school to be served, the LEA must submit an "LEA SIG Application Supplement" for the specific intervention model for Tier I or Tier II or for the services to be provided to Tier III schools. The application supplement for each school requires the LEA to describe the analysis of the school's needs, the reasons the specific intervention model was chosen for the school, the annual goals for the school, the amount of SIG funding requested for the school as well as the funding provided to the school from other sources, how the other resources align with the SIG funds, and the plan for sustaining the reforms after the SIG funding ends. Each required element of the specific school intervention model will be addressed by a series of questions that will demonstrate how the interventions will be designed and implemented consistent with the final requirements.

Each individual school supplement application will be rated based on the total number of points available for that particular intervention model or Tier III services plan. All required elements will be evaluated on a scale of 0 to 5. A rating of zero indicates that the requirement was not addressed or no information was provided. The ratings of 1 to 5 are based on the reviewer's judgment of whether the information provided was minimal (requiring additional clarification), good (clear and complete), or excellent (concise and thoroughly developed). In order to be recommended for funding, both the overall LEA application and the school supplement must receive at least 60% of the total possible points, excluding 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.* If a school application supplement is recommended for funding, the district will be asked to submit additional information for any elements that received a rating of less than 3.

The chart below shows the application evaluation criteria for the RFA for LEA SIG overall application and explains how the LEA overall application may be recommended for funding with or without all schools being recommended for funding.

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				
LEA has provided a complete application with all required elements addressed for each Tier I or Tier II school it commits to serve. LEA has provided complete information in the Tier III supplement for each Tier III school it commits to serve. Each school supplement plan has minimum point score of 60% of the total possible points, and no required elements receiving 0 points, excluding priority points.	0	2	6	10
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
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. It has described the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting any external providers that will be used to provide support to the schools.	0	1	3	5
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
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
LEA has clearly described why it does not have the capacity to serve each of its Tier I schools, addressing all applicable areas.	0	1	3	5
LEA overall application and individual school plans demonstrate a likelihood that the proposed reform	0	1	3	5

efforts will succeed.				
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
LEA has provided a comprehensive, realistic budget to serve all schools throughout the period of funding availability.	0	1	3	5
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	**55**			

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.

Alaska will require an LEA to submit the following data for each Tier I and Tier II school:

- **SBA Data for 2006-2007, 2007-2008, & 2008-2009 (using Report Card format from Data Interaction for Alaska Students - DIASA)**
- **School Report Card for 2008-2009 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 such as demographic data, data or information on instruction, curriculum, assessment, professional development, supportive learning environment, leadership, or other information.**

Alaska will also require an LEA to describe the needs that were identified by the data analysis and explain how the intervention model chosen will address the needs of the school. Each of these elements will receive a rating from 0 to 5 as described above.

(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.

Alaska will require an LEA to describe for each element of the selected model what capacity it has to implement that required element and to overcome any barriers that exist to the implementation of that element. Alaska will evaluate the LEA capacity to implement the specific model for a school and its ability to overcome any barriers on a point scale from 0 to 5 as described above. It will also evaluate the overall capacity of the LEA to serve all schools by rating from 0 to 5 each of 4 elements: human capacity and the ability to recruit & retain qualified principals and teachers; the LEA capacity to provide support to schools, including through external providers; the ability to overcome barriers such as changing

policies and procedures; evidence of the LEA's previous actions taken to improve achievement in its schools, any growth in student achievement, and use of federal grants awarded to the district within the past two school years.

(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).

Alaska will require an LEA to submit a budget for all three years of the grant funding period. Each individual school budget will be rated on a scale of 0 to 5 for the following elements: the budget is within Alaska's estimated projections for the specific model and size of school; the budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the model; the budget narrative closely aligns with the components of the model; and the budget is for the period of time needed to implement the model.

Part 2

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

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

Alaska's LEA application requires the LEA to describe how it will implement, consistent with the final requirements, each required element, and any permissible elements, of the selected intervention model through the submission of an application supplement for each school for the selected model. Each element of the model will be rated on a scale from 0 to 5 as described above.

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

Alaska's overall LEA application requires a description of the process the LEA will use to recruit, screen and select any external providers as part of its description of its capacity to provide support to schools. In addition, the LEA application supplement for the Restart model requires the LEA to describe how it will engage in a rigorous process of screening and selecting charter school operators. It requires the LEA to address these elements in the description: how the provider will demonstrate that its strategies are research-based; that its curriculum, instruction, and assessment are aligned with Alaska's grade level expectations; that it has a healthy fiscal history; that it has provided realistic detailed budgets; and that its instructional programs will be secular, neutral, and non-ideological. Each of these elements will receive a rating of 0 to 5 in the evaluation of the plan.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

Alaska will require the LEA to identify all funds allocated to each Tier I and Tier II school for the base year 2009-2010 and for the next three years of the grant period. The funds must be identified from state and local sources as well as federal funding sources, including any school improvement funding under 1003(a) and 1003(g). The LEA will also be required to

describe which specific resources will be aligned with the proposed interventions. These criteria will be evaluated on a scale of 0 to 5 as described above.

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

Alaska will require an LEA to describe in each school application supplement how it will overcome any barriers that exist to the implementation of each required element in the model. These descriptions will be rated on the scale from 0 to 5. In addition, Alaska will evaluate the LEA's ability to modify any practices or policies, if necessary, in the overall LEA application by requiring a description from the LEA on the need and the LEA's ability to change any policies or procedures that may create barriers to implementation. The LEA must include evidence or a statement of support for such changes, as applicable, from the teachers' union, school board, staff, and parents. This will be assessed on a similar point scale from 0 to 5 as described above.

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

Alaska will require an LEA to describe in each school application supplement its plan for sustaining the reforms in that school after the funding period ends, including a plan for continued funding, hiring practices, professional development, and any other areas. This plan will be evaluated on a scale of 0 to 5 as described above.

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

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

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

Alaska will require the LEA to explain why it is not applying to serve all of its Tier I schools when it submits the mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply in April. At that time, if the state believes that an LEA has more capacity than it claims, it will confer with the LEA prior to submission of its final application to determine if the LEA will apply to serve more Tier I schools.

Upon submission of the final overall LEA application, the LEA will be required to state, with specificity, why it lacks capacity to serve all Tier I schools. The LEA must address each of the areas of human capacity, the capacity to provide support, changes needed in policies or procedures, and LEA needs that are applicable to the district's lack of capacity to serve all Tier I schools. The state will rate the LEA's explanation of its capacity on a scale of 0 to 5. The state will also consider evidence of the LEA's previous actions taken to improve achievement in its schools, any growth in student achievement, and use of federal grants awarded to the district within the past two school years in its evaluation of the lack of capacity of the LEA.

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

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

Upon submission of its application to the US Department of Education, Alaska will provide a draft LEA application to the districts and will begin holding technical assistance audio conferences immediately to help the districts understand the requirements of each model, the eligibility of schools, and the amount of funding available. As soon as the application is approved by USED, Alaska will post the final version of the LEA Application. The state will convene a panel of reviewers to review the applications in early May. The tentative timeline is as follows: March 1 – post the RFA; April 1 – deadline for mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply; May 3 – deadline for LEA Application for Tier I and Tier II schools; May 10 – deadline for LEA Application for Tier III schools; June 1 – Notice of Intent to Award funds; and July 1 – grant awarded for implementation at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.

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

Alaska will review the LEA's annual goals for student achievement and will award points from 0 to 5 as part of the evaluation criteria for each Tier I and Tier II school application. The state will review the school's progress toward the annual goals at the end of each school year. If the goals have not been met, but some progress has been shown, the state will also consider whether the model has been implemented fully and effectively through the analysis of the mid-year and end of year reports and the grant reimbursement requests. The state will interview (by phone or in person) the superintendent of the LEA, the district staff member responsible for the SIG grant, the principal of the school, and additional selected staff members to determine if the intervention model chosen has been implemented with fidelity and whether the LEA is willing and able to make any adjustments needed to implementation for the future year in order to receive continued funding. Based on all information available, the state will determine if the LEA should continue to receive SIG funding for the school in order to fully implement the model and be given the opportunity to show more growth in the following school year.

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

Alaska will review the LEA's annual goals for student achievement and will award points from 0 to 5 as part of the evaluation criteria for each Tier III school application. The state will review the school's progress toward the annual goals at the end of each school year. If the goals have not been met, but some progress has been shown, the state will interview (by phone or in person) the superintendent of the LEA, the district staff member responsible for the SIG grant, the principal of the school, and additional selected staff members to determine if the strategies to be implemented or services to be received have been implemented with fidelity. Based on those interviews, the state will determine if the school and LEA have made sufficient progress in implementing the strategies or services and should receive continued funding to fully implement the model and be given the opportunity to show more growth in the following school year.

(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.

Alaska will require each LEA that receives a SIG grant to serve Tier I and Tier II schools to submit a report at the midpoint and at the end of each school year to demonstrate the status of implementation of each component of the adopted intervention model. The state will also monitor the LEA's grant award reimbursement requests to determine if the funds are being spent as planned. If the mid-year status report or the reimbursement requests indicate that the intervention model is not being fully implemented according to the proposed timeline, the state will conduct interviews by phone or in person with the LEA superintendent, the district staff member responsible for the SIG grant, the principal, and selected teachers to determine whether the model is being implemented fully and effectively. The state will provide assistance or more frequent monitoring as needed to encourage the full implementation of the model during the first year.

(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.

Alaska will require each LEA to submit a mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply by April 1. This will give the state time to provide technical assistance to districts on the SIG application and funding requirements and will allow the districts time to do initial evaluation of the needs of Tier I and II schools and their capacity to implement a specific model in Tier I and Tier II schools. Based on the information received in the Notice of Intent to Apply, the state will first determine if the funding requests will allow Tier III schools to be served. If not, the state will notify districts that it will only accept applications at this time for Tier I and Tier II schools. When the applications for Tier I and Tier II schools are received, each school application will be rated separately according to the requirements of the selected intervention model. The LEA overall applications will also be rated. The school level applications with the highest points will receive priority for funding, provided the LEA overall application receives at least 60% of the total possible points. In addition, the state will evaluate the adequacy of the budgets in the attempt to provide sufficient SIG funds to serve the highest rated Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

Alaska will rate the school level applications for each Tier III school. Priority points will be given for Tier III schools that are at AYP Level 4 or 5 in 2009-2010 (in corrective action, or restructuring) and for any Tier III school that would have been a Tier I school but was excluded due to the small number of FAY students. The highest rated applications for Tier III schools will be prioritized for funding.

(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.

Alaska does not propose to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools.

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.[2]

Alaska does not intend to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover.

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

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

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following:

- ☒ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- ☒ Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- ☒ Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.
- ☒ Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the State receives FY 2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the State).
- ☐ 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. ***(Not applicable for Alaska)***
- ☒ Monitor each LEA's implementation of the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- ☒ To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- ☒ Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; amount of the grant; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- ☒ Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

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

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

Alaska will use state-level funds from the SIG 1003(g) grant to support the creation of the application documents, the review of the applications, and the general technical assistance to districts in understanding the application requirements and submitting applications for funding. This technical assistance is being provided through a series of audio conferences, slide presentations, and individual conference calls with eligible districts. Alaska will also use state-level funds to support additional data collection and analysis for evaluation of the schools implementing SIG 1003(g) grants.

The largest share of the state-level funding will be used to expand the capacity of the State System of Support (SSOS) to provide on-site support and assistance to the LEAs and schools in greatest need in the state. The SSOS services are targeted to six domains for instructional effectiveness: curriculum (aligned with the Alaska grade level expectations or GLEs); assessment (formative and summative assessments are used regularly to inform instruction); instruction (effective strategies are used to meet the needs of diverse learners); supportive learning environment (a positive school climate provides a safe, orderly environment conducive to learning); professional development (based on data, the needs of the students and schools, and aligned with academic goals); and leadership (school leadership focused on instruction and improving student achievement).

Currently, the Alaska State System of Support (SSOS) has 3 SEA employees (one administrator and two program managers). The SSOS Administrator will oversee the implementation of the SIG grants in the Tier I and Tier II schools, assisting the districts in determining the most appropriate support needed for each school. The SSOS program staff members provide on-site support to districts and coordinate training opportunities for our state defined "Tier III" districts – those high need districts in which the state is requiring specific interventions. In addition, the state provides support through the SSOS contractors. Six Technical Assistance Coaches (TACs) provide specialized support to these districts in one or domains in their area of expertise. In addition, the SSOS team includes ten contractors called Content Support Specialist (CSSs) with expertise in the areas of reading, math, science, graphic & visual arts, and performing arts. These contractors provide on-site support and training for teachers in their areas of expertise. A portion of the SIG state-level funds will be used to provide additional contract time for TACs and CSSs.

The SIG state-level funds will also be used to support specific professional development opportunities related to one or more of the six domains based on the needs identified by the schools and LEAs that receive the SIG grants. Examples of professional development provided by the SSOS in the last two years include Curriculum Alignment Institutes and School Leadership institutes. The Curriculum Alignment institutes were provided to district teams with curriculum specialists in language arts and math. During the school year 2008-09 the institute met with districts to unpack the Grade Level Expectations and create the framework for aligning district curriculum. In 2009-10, the institute continued to support the alignment process by providing two separate sessions: Curriculum Mapping with Ann Johnson from Curriculum Designers;

alignment of classroom formative assessments with Debbie Farrington from Measured Progress. The first School Leadership Institute was held in June 2009 and a second is planned for June 2010. This purpose of this five day institute, held in collaboration with the Rural Alaska Principal Preparation Project, was to learn how to lead using the strategies and actions necessary to turn-around and transform student learning and organizational performance. The learning outcomes of the institute were: 1) to promote effective collaboration based on a model of professional learning communities; 2) to assess individual leadership actions for producing second-order change; 3) to utilize strategies, protocols, and tools to analyze data at the district and school levels; and 4) to evaluate the alignment between curriculum standards, instructional practices, and assessments.

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

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

☒ The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

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

❑ The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including_____

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

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

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

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

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

☒ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

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

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

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

The State assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

The SEA must attach its LEA application form to its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant.

Alaska's LEA application forms consist of:

- **Alaska LEA SIG Request for Applications plus the applicable supplement(s) as listed below**
  - **LEA SIG Supplement – Transformation Model**
  - **LEA SIG Supplement – Turnaround Model**
  - **LEA SIG Supplement – Restart Model**
  - **LEA SIG Supplement – Closure Model**
  - **LEA SIG Supplement – Tier III School Plan**

These documents may be found on the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development website at http://www.eed.state.ak.us/stim/home.html. Scroll down to the section heading "ARRA Title I School Improvement 1003(g) Grants"

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 2009-2010 with more than 25 FAY students tested on the SBAs in 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 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 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 that is either eligible for but did not receive Title I, Part A funds in 2009-2010 ***or*** *any Title I secondary school (did receive Title I, Part A funds in 2009-2010) 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 2007-2008 and 2008-2009.
- **Number of years for determining graduation rate** – the state will determine graduation rates based on three years, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009. 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 118 Title I Schools in improvement, corrective action or restructuring (at AYP Level 2 or above) for 2009-2010 based on the 2008-2009 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 87, 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 each assessment year. This exclusion includes schools that did not have any test data for 2007-2008 and/or 2008-2009, 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 2009-2010 **or** any Title I secondary school (did receive Title I, Part A funds in 2009-2010) 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 44 to 88.

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 2009-2010.
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 118 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 (2007-2008 and 2008-2009).
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 2009
   - ✓ Language arts for 2008
   - ✓ Math for 2009
   - ✓ Math for 2008
5. Add the 4 ranking numbers for each school to create a combined rank.
6. Re-rank based on the combined ranking (rank of 1 = highest rank in reading/language arts and math combined).
7. Determine schools that showed some progress in language arts and in math from 2008 to 2009 (those that had a school index point value of greater than or equal to 90).
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. To complete the list of schools in Tier I add any high school from the ranked group of schools from the original list of 118 (including K-12 schools) that had a graduation rate of *less than* sixty percent for 2007, 2008 *and* 2009. 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 2009-2010.
2. Add any Title I participating secondary schools in 2009-2010 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 87 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.
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 2007, 2008, *and* 2009. 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, Tier II, and Tier III

Schools Sorted by Tier

District Name	School Name	Tier	Reason
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Chaputnguak School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ket'acik/Aapalluk Memorial School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Nightmute School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	William Miller Memorial School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Yukon School District	Sheldon Point School	Tier I	Low 5
Yupiit School District	Tuluksak School	Tier I	Low 5
Anchorage School District	Whaley School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Aniguiin School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Anthony A. Andrews School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Gambell School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Hogarth Kingeekuk Memorial School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Koyuk-Malemute School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Tukurngailnguq School	Tier I	Grad
Dillingham City School District	Dillingham Middle/High School	Tier I	Grad
Kashunamiut School District	Chevak School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Kuinerrarmiut Elitnaurviat	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Hooper Bay School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Kotlik School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Russian Mission School	Tier I	Grad
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Burchell High School	Tier I	Grad
Matanuska-Susitna School District	MidValley High	Tier I	Grad
Northwest Arctic School District	Davis-Ramoth School	Tier I	Grad
Yupiit School District	Akiachak School	Tier I	Grad
Yupiit School District	Akiak School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Dick R Kiunya Memorial School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Joann A. Alexie Memorial School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Nelson Island Area School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Yukon School District	Emmonak School	Tier II	Low 5
Northwest Arctic School District	McQueen School	Tier II	Low 5
Craig City School District	PACE Correspondence	Tier II	Grad
Fairbanks North Star School District	Effie Kokrine Charter School	Tier II	Grad
Alaska Gateway School District	Gateway Correspondence	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Alaska Gateway School District	Tetlin School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Alaska Gateway School District	Tok School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Alaska Gateway School District	Walter Northway School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Airport Heights Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I

Anchorage School District	AK School for Deaf & Hard of Hearing	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Avail School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Anchorage School District	Benson Secondary/S.E.A.R.C.H.	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Chinook Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Clark Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Crossroads School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Fairview Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Lake Otis Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	McLaughlin Secondary School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Mountain View Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Muldoon Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	North Star Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Nunaka Valley Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Ptarmigan Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Russian Jack Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Spring Hill Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Taku Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Tudor Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	William Tyson Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Williwaw Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Willow Crest Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Wonder Park Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Bering Strait School District	Brevig Mission School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Bering Strait School District	Diomede School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Bering Strait School District	Shishmaref School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Chatham School District	Angoon School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Copper River School District	Slana School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Craig City School District	Craig Alternative High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Delta-Greely School District	New Horizons High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Dillingham City School District	Dillingham Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Fairbanks North Star School District	Denali Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Fairbanks North Star School District	Fairbanks Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Fairbanks North Star School District	Hunter Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Fairbanks North Star School District	Nordale Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Iditarod Area School District	David-Louis School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Iditarod Area School District	Holy Cross School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Iditarod Area School District	Innoko River School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Iditarod Area School District	Top of the Kuskokwim School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Juneau Borough School District	Gastineau Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Juneau Borough School District	Riverbend Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Juneau School District	Yaakoosge Daakahidi Alt. H.S.	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool

Kenai Peninsula School District	Homer Flex School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Kenai Alternative High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Kenai Peninsula Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Port Graham School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Spring Creek School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Ketchikan Gateway School District	Ketchikan Regional Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Ketchikan Gateway School District	Revilla Jr/Sr High School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kodiak Island School District	Kodiak Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Kodiak Island School District	Larsen Bay School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	George Morgan Sr. H.S.	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Johnnie John Sr. School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Joseph S. & Olinga Gregory Elementary	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Zackar Levi Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lake and Peninsula School District	Newhalen School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lake and Peninsula School District	Nondalton School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Akiuk Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Akula Elitnaurvik School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Anna Tobeluk Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ayaprun Elitnaurvik	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ayaprun School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Bethel Regional High School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Bethel Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Chief Paul Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Gladys Jung Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Lewis Angapak Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Mikelnguut Elitnaurviat	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Paul T. Albert Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Z. John Williams Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Alakanuk School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Ignatius Beans School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Marshall School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Scammon Bay School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Goose Bay Elementary	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Houston Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	John Shaw Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Knik Elementary School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Mat-Su Day School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Mat-Su Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Nome Public Schools	Nome Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Nome Public Schools	Nome Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
North Slope Borough School District	Alak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II

North Slope Borough School District	Kiita Learning Community	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
North Slope Borough School District	Meade River School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Aqqaluk High/Noorvik Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Buckland School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	June Nelson Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Northwest Arctic School District	Kiana School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Kotzebue Middle/High School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Napaaqtugmiut School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Shungnak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Sitka School District	Blatchley Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region District	Chief Ivan Blunka School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region District	Togiak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region School District	Koliganek School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Southwest Region School District	Twin Hills School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Arctic Village School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Circle School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Fort Yukon School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Yukon Flats School District	John Fredson School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Yukon Flats School District	Stevens Village School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon-Koyukuk School District	Andrew K. Demoski School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon-Koyukuk School District	Jimmy Huntington School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II

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
Not Tier I or Tier II	School was in original Tier I pool, not identified as Tier I, qualified to be considered for Tier II, but was not identified as Tier II either
FAY Tier I Pool	School was in original Tier I pool, but was excluded from consideration based on having 25 or fewer full academic year (FAY students)
FAY Tier II Pool	School was in original Tier II pool, but was excluded from consideration based on having 25 or fewer full academic year (FAY students)

Schools Sorted by District

District Name	School Name	Tier	Reason
Alaska Gateway School District	Gateway Correspondence	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Alaska Gateway School District	Tetlin School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Alaska Gateway School District	Tok School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Alaska Gateway School District	Walter Northway School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Airport Heights Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	AK School for Deaf & Hard of Hearing	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Avail School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Anchorage School District	Benson Secondary/S.E.A.R.C.H.	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Chinook Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Clark Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Crossroads School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Fairview Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Lake Otis Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	McLaughlin Secondary School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Mountain View Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Muldoon Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	North Star Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Nunaka Valley Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Ptarmigan Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Russian Jack Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Spring Hill Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Taku Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Tudor Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Whaley School	Tier I	Grad
Anchorage School District	William Tyson Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Williwaw Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Willow Crest Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Wonder Park Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Bering Strait School District	Aniguiin School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Anthony A. Andrews School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Brevig Mission School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Bering Strait School District	Diomede School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Bering Strait School District	Gambell School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Hogarth Kingeekuk Memorial School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Koyuk-Malemute School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Shishmaref School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Bering Strait School District	Tukurngailnguq School	Tier I	Grad

Chatham School District	Angoon School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Copper River School District	Slana School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Craig City School District	Craig Alternative High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Craig City School District	PACE Correspondence	Tier II	Grad
Delta-Greely School District	New Horizons High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Dillingham City School District	Dillingham Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Dillingham City School District	Dillingham Middle/High School	Tier I	Grad
Fairbanks North Star School District	Denali Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Fairbanks North Star School District	Effie Kokrine Charter School	Tier II	Grad
Fairbanks North Star School District	Fairbanks Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Fairbanks North Star School District	Hunter Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Fairbanks North Star School District	Nordale Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Iditarod Area School District	David-Louis School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Iditarod Area School District	Holy Cross School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Iditarod Area School District	Innoko River School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Iditarod Area School District	Top of the Kuskokwim School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Juneau Borough School District	Gastineau Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Juneau Borough School District	Riverbend Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Juneau School District	Yaakoosge Daakahidi Alt. H.S.	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kashunamiut School District	Chevak School	Tier I	Grad
Kenai Peninsula School District	Homer Flex School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Kenai Alternative High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Kenai Peninsula Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Port Graham School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Spring Creek School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Ketchikan Gateway School District	Ketchikan Regional Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Ketchikan Gateway School District	Revilla Jr/Sr High School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kodiak Island School District	Kodiak Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Kodiak Island School District	Larsen Bay School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	George Morgan Sr. H.S.	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Johnnie John Sr. School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Joseph S. & Olinga Gregory Elementary	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Zackar Levi Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lake and Peninsula School District	Newhalen School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lake and Peninsula School District	Nondalton School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Akiuk Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Akula Elitnaurvik School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Anna Tobeluk Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ayaprun Elitnaurvik	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ayaprun School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Bethel Regional High School	Tier III	Not Tier I

Lower Kuskokwim School District	Bethel Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Chaputnguak School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Chief Paul Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Dick R Kiunya Memorial School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Gladys Jung Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Joann A. Alexie Memorial School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ket'acik/Aapalluk Memorial School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Kuinerrarmiut Elitnaurviat	Tier I	Grad
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Lewis Angapak Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Mikelnguut Elitnaurviat	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Nelson Island Area School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Nightmute School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Paul T. Albert Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	William Miller Memorial School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Z. John Williams Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Alakanuk School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Emmonak School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Yukon School District	Hooper Bay School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Ignatius Beans School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Kotlik School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Marshall School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Russian Mission School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Scammon Bay School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Sheldon Point School	Tier I	Low 5
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Burchell High School	Tier I	Grad
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Goose Bay Elementary	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Houston Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	John Shaw Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Knik Elementary School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Mat-Su Day School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Mat-Su Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Matanuska-Susitna School District	MidValley High	Tier I	Grad
Nome Public Schools	Nome Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Nome Public Schools	Nome Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
North Slope Borough School District	Alak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
North Slope Borough School District	Kiita Learning Community	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
North Slope Borough School District	Meade River School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Aqqaluk High/Noorvik Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Buckland School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Davis-Ramoth School	Tier I	Grad
Northwest Arctic School District	June Nelson Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I

Northwest Arctic School District	Kiana School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Kotzebue Middle/High School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	McQueen School	Tier II	Low 5
Northwest Arctic School District	Napaaqtugmiut School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Shungnak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Sitka School District	Blatchley Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region District	Chief Ivan Blunka School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region District	Togiak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region School District	Koliganek School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Southwest Region School District	Twin Hills School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Arctic Village School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Circle School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Fort Yukon School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Yukon Flats School District	John Fredson School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Yukon Flats School District	Stevens Village School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon-Koyukuk School District	Andrew K. Demoski School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon-Koyukuk School District	Jimmy Huntington School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Yupiit School District	Akiachak School	Tier I	Grad
Yupiit School District	Akiak School	Tier I	Grad
Yupiit School District	Tuluksak School	Tier I	Low 5

Request for Applications for LEA School Improvement Grants

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

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A

Tentative Release Date: March 31, 2010

Mandatory Letter of Intent to Apply Due April 1, 2010

Applications for Tier I & Tier II Schools Due May 3, 2010

Applications for Tier III Schools Due May 10, 2010
(depending on funding availability)

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
801 W 10th Street • PO Box 110500
Juneau AK 99811-0500

March, 2010

Form # 05-10-028

GENERAL INFORMATION

DEADLINES FOR APPLICATION SUBMISSION

Mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply..... April 1, 2010

LEA SIG Application and Supplements for Tier I and II Schools .....May 3, 2010

LEA SIG Application and Supplements for Tier III Schools (tentative) .May 10, 2010

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

Submit applications electronically to: lauri.bates@alaska.gov

For more information, contact:

Margaret MacKinnon
Title I/NCLB Administrator
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0500
Phone: (907) 465-2970
Fax: (907) 465-2989
margaret.mackinnon@alaska.gov

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

Contents

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

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

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

A. Directions & Checklist 11
B. LEA Application Evaluation Criteria 12
C. School Level Application Criteria – Transformation Model 14
D. School Level Application Criteria – Turnaround Model 17
E. School Level Application Criteria – Restart Model 19
F. School Level Application Criteria – Closure Model 21
G. School Level Application Criteria – Tier III School 23

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

A. Mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply 25
B. Application Cover Sheet 26
C. Application Elements 28
D. Assurances & Waivers 32

IV. APPENDICES

A. Alaska's Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools 33
B. Alaska's List of Eligible Schools in Tier I, II, and III 37
Schools Sorted by Tier 37
Schools Sorted by District 41

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

Under 1003(g) of the ESEA

A. Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. Under the final requirements, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January 2010 (final requirements, attached as Appendix A), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are a State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools. Tier II schools are a State's persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools ("Tier III schools"). (See Appendix C for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

B. Final Requirements and Guidance

The *Final Requirements* that govern the SIG grants and the US Department of Education *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under 1003(g) of the ESEA, January 21, 2010* published by the US Department of Education provide complete information about the program and provides answers to frequently asked questions. These documents are posted on the department website at http://www.eed.state.ak.us/stim/home.html under the heading "ARRA Title I School Improvement Grants." References will be made to the "requirements" and to the "guidance" that will provide assistance in completing the grant application. Applicants are strongly encouraged to print and review these documents carefully in addition to this application packet prior to submitting a Notice of Intent to Apply for any funds under this application.

C. Availability of Funds and Related Conditions

1. **Projected Total Available for Awards:** For state fiscal year (FY) 2010, there is up to $10,190,261 available for three-year School Improvement Grants to LEAs under section 1003(g): $1,572,600 through the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2009; and $8,617,661 through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). The total amount of funding available for the initial grant awards may be reduced by up to 25% if only a portion of Tier I schools in the state are served with these funds.

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. 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. 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.

2. **Grant Period:** FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2013, based on the department's decision to seek a waiver from the US Department of Education to permit the SEA and its LEAs to obligate the funds through September 30, 2013.

   Initial grant awards will be for the 2010-2011 school year. Funding in subsequent years will be dependent upon 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.

3. **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. 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.

D. Mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply Required

In order to determine the expected applications and amount of funding that LEAs will be requesting, the department is requiring a mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply to be submitted by April 1, 2010. This notice requires the LEA to list the Tier I, II, and III schools that it commits to serve, if funding is available. The department will use that information to determine how many Tier I and II schools may be able to be served and the amount of funding, if any, that will be available to serve Tier III schools. The department will provide additional guidance to districts related to the possible amounts of funding available prior to submission of final applications.

E. Eligible LEAs and Schools

An LEA is eligible to receive a SIG grant if it has at least one school on the list of eligible schools. Schools that are eligible for funding are those listed on the list of Tier I, 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 <u>must</u> 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

F. 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 a Notice of Intent to Apply.

Turnaround Model Overview

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

Transformation Model Overview

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

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 2010-2011 school year. If it misses AYP based on the spring 2011 SBAs, it will be considered to be at AYP Level 1 for 2011-2012. A school must make progress toward its annual goals in its SIG application and continue to receive SIG funding for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 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.

G. 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).

H. 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.

I. 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 consider the number and amount of funding expected from applications for Tier I and Tier II schools based on the Notice of Intent to Apply. If it is determined that additional funding will be available to serve Tier III schools, then the department will accept applications for Tier III schools as well.

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 10 priority points. Within Tier III, each school that did not have more than 25 FAY students and therefore did not qualify for Tier I will receive 10 priority points. Within the applications for Tier III schools, each Tier III school at AYP Level 4 or 5 will receive 10 priority points.

J. Reporting Requirements

Data will be collected for the US Department of Education on each school that receives a SIG grant. The state will report a list of all LEAs that received a SIG grant and the amount of the grant. It will also report the list of schools in each LEA that were served, and the amount of funds or value of services received. Additional reporting metrics are required and will be reported for each Tier I 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.

K. 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.

L. Conditions of Grant award

<u>Evaluation of Grantee performance / continuation of funding:</u>

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.

M. 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

a) Go to: http://www.legis.state.ak.us/cgi-bin/folioisa.dll/aac

b) Select TITLE 4 Education and Early Development

c) Scroll down to 40. Appeals of Decisions to Deny or Withhold Funding. (4 AAC 40.010 - 4 AAC 40.050)

N. 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 requirements and guidance from the US Department of Education, the following resources will be helpful:

- *Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants* from the Center on Innovation and Improvement
- *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
- Links to the Alaska Parent Information and Resource Center (AKPIRC) at 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 a Notice of Intent to Apply. 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#.**

O. Timeline for Applications

RFA Released (tentative date, dependent upon US ED approval) ..... March 1, 2010

SIG Overview Audio Conference ..... February 22, 2010, 10:30 AM

SIG Overview Audio Conference ..... March 3, 2010, 3:30 PM

SIG Transformation Model Audio Conference ..... March 8, 2010, 3:30 PM

SIG Turnaround Model Audio Conference ..... March 9, 2010, 3:30 PM

SIG Restart & Closure Model Audio Conference ..... March 10, 2010, 3:30 PM

SIG Q&A Audio Conference ..... March 16, 2010, 10:30 AM

SIG Q&A Audio Conference ..... March 23, 2010, 3:30 PM

Notice of Intent to Apply for Tier I, II, and III Schools ..... Due April 1, 2010

Notification to Districts of Availability of Funds for Tier III ..... April 9, 2010

SIG Q&A Audio Conference ..... April 13, 2010, 10:30 AM

LEA Application for Tier I and Tier II Schools ..... Due May 3, 2010

LEA Application for Tier III Schools (depending on funding availability) ..... Due May 10, 2010

Grant Review Period ..... May, 2010

Notice of Intent to Award ..... June 1, 2010

Grant Funding Begins ..... July 1, 2010

Implementation of School Improvement model begins ..... Fall, 2010

P. 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

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.

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

A. Directions & Checklist

A complete LEA application consists of Section III of this application packet, a budget 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 - 32)
  - ☐ 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 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 2006-2007, 2007-2008, & 2008-2009 (using Report Card format from DIASA)
  - ☐ School Report Card for 2008-2009 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 2010-2011

B. LEA Application Evaluation Criteria

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

LEA Overall Application	**Inadequate (information not provided)**	**Minimal (requires additional clarification)**	**Good (clear and complete)**	**Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)**
LEA overall application				
LEA has provided a complete application with all required elements addressed for each Tier I or Tier II school it commits to serve. LEA has provided complete information in the Tier III supplement for each Tier III school it commits to serve. Each school supplement plan has minimum point score of 60% of the total possible points, and no required elements receiving 0 points, excluding priority points.	0	2	6	10
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
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. It has described the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting any external providers that will be used to provide support to the schools.	0	1	3	5
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
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
LEA has sufficiently explained why it does not have the capacity to serve each of its Tier I schools, addressing all applicable areas. The explanation of lack of capacity supports the LEA's description of the capacity it does have to serve the schools that it has committed to serve.	0	1	3	5
LEA overall application and individual school plans demonstrate a likelihood that the proposed reform efforts will succeed.	0	1	3	5

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
LEA has provided a comprehensive, realistic budget to serve all schools throughout the period of funding availability.	0	1	3	5
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	**55**			

C. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Transformation Model

The following criteria will be used by the reviewers to evaluate each school level Transformation Model application supplement. In order to be considered for funding, a school plan must receive at least 60% of the total possible points 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				
All required data is provided (SBAs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment).	0	1	3	5
Additional data has been analyzed.	0	1	3	5
Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided.	0	1	3	5
Intervention model chosen has shows likelihood of addressing identified needs.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly articulated it capacity to implement each component of the selected model.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends.	0	1	3	5
Timeline, Goals & Monitoring				
LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented as fully as possible in 2010-2011, with additional components implemented in future years as required according to rationale provided by the district.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable).	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds.	0	1	3	5
Implementation of Transformation Model				
(1) Developing Teacher & Leader Effectiveness – Required Activities				
(A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model.	0	1	3	5
(B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable systems for evaluation of teachers and principals that take into account data on student growth and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model.	0	1	3	5
(C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and /or high school graduation rates and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve, have not done so.	0	1	3	5

(D) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching & learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	0	1	3	5
(E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.	0	1	3	5
(2) Comprehensive Instructional Reform Strategies – Required Activities				
(A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards.	0	1	3	5
(B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	0	1	3	5
(3) Increasing Learning Time – Required Activities				
(A) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time that significantly increases the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects, (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities, and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development (as defined in Appendix A).	0	1	3	5
(B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.	0	1	3	5
(4) *Providing Operational Flexibility and support – Required Activities*				
(A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement a fully comprehensive approach to substantially approve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.	0	1	3	5
(B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).	0	1	3	5
Transformation Model – Permissible Activities				
All permissible activities have been described completely and are aligned with and enhance the model.	0	1	3	5
Budget & Resources				
Budget provided is within the estimated range for the transformation model, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range.	0	1	3	5
Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the transformation model for the entire grant period.	0	1	3	5

Budget narrative clearly aligns with components of transformation model.	0	1	3	5
Funding sources and amounts are provided for all four school years.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen.	0	1	3	5
Priority Points				
School index value for 2008-2009 is less than 90.				10
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE (before priority points)	**135**			

D. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Turnaround Model

The following criteria will be used by the reviewers to evaluate each school level Turnaround Model application supplement. In order to be considered for funding, a school plan must receive at least 60% of the total possible points 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				
All required data is provided (SBAs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment).	0	1	3	5
Additional data has been analyzed.	0	1	3	5
Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided.	0	1	3	5
Intervention model chosen has shows likelihood of addressing identified needs.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly articulated it capacity to implement each component of the selected model.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends.	0	1	3	5
Timeline, Goals & Monitoring				
LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented as fully as possible in 2010-2011, with additional components implemented in future years as required according to rationale provided by the district.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable).	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds.	0	1	3	5
Implementation of Turnaround Model				
Required Activities				
(i) Replace the principal and grant sufficient operational flexibility in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting to fully implement comprehensive reform.	0	1	3	5
(ii) Screen existing staff, rehire no more than 50% and select new staff using locally adopted competencies to measure the staff effectiveness to work in a turnaround model.	0	1	3	5
(iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.	0	1	3	5

(iv) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching & learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	0	1	3	5
(v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.	0	1	3	5
(vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards.	0	1	3	5
(vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	0	1	3	5
(viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time that significantly increases the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects, (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities, and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development (as defined in Appendix A).	0	1	3	5
(ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.	0	1	3	5
All permissible activities have been described completely and are aligned with and enhance the model.	0	1	3	5
Budget & Resources				
Budget provided is within the estimated range for the turnaround model, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range.	0	1	3	5
Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the turnaround model for the entire grant period.	0	1	3	5
Budget narrative clearly aligns with components of turnaround model.	0	1	3	5
Funding sources and amounts are provided for all four school years.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen.	0	1	3	5
Priority Points				
School index value for 2008-2009 is less than 90.				10
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE (before priority points)	**125**			

E. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Restart Model

The following criteria will be used by the reviewers to evaluate each school level Restart Model application supplement. In order to be considered for funding, a school plan must receive at least 60% of the total possible points 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)**
LEA Analysis of Needs & LEA Capacity				
All required data is provided (SBAs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment).	0	1	3	5
Additional data has been analyzed.	0	1	3	5
Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided.	0	1	3	5
Intervention model chosen has shows likelihood of addressing identified needs.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to implement each component of the selected model.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends.	0	1	3	5
Timeline, Goals & Monitoring				
LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented as fully as possible in 2010-2011, with additional components implemented in future years as required according to rationale provided by the district.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable).	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier 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				
LEA has clearly described how it will engage in a rigorous process to verify the capacity of the charter school operator to provide services that reflect what is required at this school.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate that its strategies are research-based.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate that its curriculum, instruction, and assessment are aligned with Alaska's grade level expectations.	0	1	3	5

LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate a healthy fiscal history.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to demonstrate that it has provided realistic detailed budget estimates for operating the school and implementing the school improvement services.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will require a prospective operator to insure that its instructional programs will be secular, neutral, and non-ideological.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will develop a set of non-negotiable performance-based benchmarks to serve as the basis for holding the charter school operator accountable for meeting the final requirements for SIG fund expenditures.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will ensure that the charter school operator is provided autonomy and flexibility to enact school improvement activities and to administer the entire school program.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how it will assure that all former students are allowed to be enrolled in the school that has selected the restart model.	0	1	3	5
Budget & Resources				
Budget provided is within the estimated range for the restart model, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range.	0	1	3	5
Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the restart model for the entire grant period.	0	1	3	5
Budget narrative clearly aligns with components of restart model.	0	1	3	5
Funding sources and amounts are provided for all four school years.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen.	0	1	3	5
Priority Points				
School index value for 2008-2009 is less than 90.				10
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE (before priority points)	**120**			

F. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Closure Model

The following criteria will be used by the reviewers to evaluate each school level Closure Model application supplement. In order to be considered for funding, a school plan must receive at least 60% of the total possible points 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				
All required data is provided (SBAs, attendance & grad rates, ELP assessment).	0	1	3	5
Additional data has been analyzed.	0	1	3	5
Needs identified from data provided match data analysis provided.	0	1	3	5
Intervention model chosen has shows likelihood of addressing identified needs.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly articulated its capacity to implement each component of the selected model.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly identified any potential barriers to implementing any components of the selected model and how those barriers will be overcome.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described a reasonable plan for sustaining the reform efforts after the funding period ends.	0	1	3	5
Timeline, Goals & Monitoring				
LEA has clearly described a timeline for the implementation of the model. The model is implemented fully by the end of the 2010-2011 school year, or rationale is provided for the need for extended time to close the school.	0	1	3	5
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				
LEA has described the process by which the district will close the school.	0	1	3	5
LEA has described how parents and community members will be notified and involved in the decision for school closure.	0	1	3	5
LEA described how it will decide which other schools are in reasonable proximity to the closed school in order to receive its former students.	0	1	3	5
LEA described how it will decide which of the nearby schools are higher achieving than the closed school.	0	1	3	5
LEA described how it will assure that all former students are allowed to be enrolled in a new school.	0	1	3	5

LEA described in what ways parents will be notified of the school closure and of their children's new school destination.	0	1	3	5
Budget & Resources				
Budget provided is within the estimated range for the closure model, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range.	0	1	3	5
Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the closure model.	0	1	3	5
Budget narrative clearly aligns with components of closure model.	0	1	3	5
Funding sources and amounts are provided for 2009-2010 and 2011-2012.	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how other resources align with and enhance the intervention model chosen.	0	1	3	5
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE	**100**			

G. SCHOOL LEVEL APPLICATION CRITERIA – Tier III School

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

Tier III School Criteria	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Good (clear and complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
Strategies Address Needs				
Strategies to be implemented or services to be received address one or more of the six domains for instructional effectiveness.	0	1	3	5
Strategies to be implemented or services to be received shows likelihood of addressing identified needs in the School Improvement Plan.	0	1	3	5
Goals & Monitoring				
LEA has clearly described reasonable & achievable goals for the school in language arts, mathematics, and graduation rate (as applicable).	0	1	3	5
LEA has clearly described how it will monitor the progress of its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds.	0	1	3	5
Budget & Resources				
Budget provided is within the estimated range for Tier III schools, or adequate rationale is provided for budgets outside the estimated range.	0	1	3	5
Budget realistically estimates the cost of implementing the strategies for the entire grant period.	0	1	3	5
Budget narrative clearly aligns with strategies or services described.	0	1	3	5
Priority Points				
School is classified as Tier III due to not having more than 25 FAY students.				10
School is designated at AYP Level 4 or 5 for 2009-2010.				10
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE (before priority points)	**35**			

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

MANDATORY NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY

LEA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS UNDER SECTION 1003(g) ESEA

FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2010-2011

FORM DUE APRIL 1, 2010

District: _____

District Contact: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

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

SCHOOL NAME	AK School ID Number (# # # # # #)	Tier (I, II, or III)	Proposed Model (Transformation, Turnaround, Restart or Closure)	Estimated Funding Total (Sum for all 3 years)

Add extra rows as needed

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

Districts will be notified by April 9 of the anticipated funding, if any, that will be available to serve Tier III schools based on the number of Tier I and Tier II schools projected for funding.

This form can be mailed, faxed or emailed to

Margaret MacKinnon, Title I Administrator
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
801 W 10th Street, P.O. Box 110500, Juneau, AK. 99811-0500
margaret.mackinnon@alaska.gov
FAX: 465-2989

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

This page intentionally left blank.

LEA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS 1003(g)
APPLICATION COVER SHEET

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.

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

List each Tier I, 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)				FUNDING Total sum requested for all 3 years
			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:

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

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

applicable). Describe the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting any external providers that will be used to provide support to the schools.

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

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

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

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

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

B. 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.

(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.

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

(6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement, and which of the six domains for instructional effectiveness will be addressed by the services or activities.

(7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

B.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 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

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.

Attach a complete budget and narrative for each school for all three years, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 for which SIG funding is requested. The budget for each school served may include district level expenses that are used to support or provide services to the school. Use the Budget and Narrative Form #05-07-071 found on the department website under Forms & Grants: http://www.eed.state.ak.us/forms/home.cfm

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

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

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

D. 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.

E. 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

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 2009-2010 with more than 25 FAY students tested on the SBAs in 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 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 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 that is either eligible for but did not receive Title I, Part A funds in 2009-2010 ***or*** *any Title I secondary school (did receive Title I, Part A funds in 2009-2010) 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 2007-2008 and 2008-2009.
- **Number of years for determining graduation rate** – the state will determine graduation rates based on three years, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009. 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 118 Title I Schools in improvement, corrective action or restructuring (at AYP Level 2 or above) for 2009-2010 based on the 2008-2009 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 87, 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 each assessment year. This exclusion includes schools that did not have any test data for 2007-2008 and/or 2008-2009, 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 2009-2010 **or** any Title I secondary school (did receive Title I, Part A funds in 2009-2010) 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 44 to 88.

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 2009-2010.
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 118 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 (2007-2008 and 2008-2009).
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 2009
   - ✓ Language arts for 2008
   - ✓ Math for 2009
   - ✓ Math for 2008
5. Add the 4 ranking numbers for each school to create a combined rank.
6. Re-rank based on the combined ranking (rank of 1 = highest rank in reading/language arts and math combined).
7. Determine schools that showed some progress in language arts and in math from 2008 to 2009 (those that had a school index point value of greater than or equal to 90).
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. To complete the list of schools in Tier I add any high school from the ranked group of schools from the original list of 118 (including K-12 schools) that had a graduation rate of *less than* sixty percent for 2007, 2008 *and* 2009. 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 2009-2010.
2. Add any Title I participating secondary schools in 2009-2010 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 87 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.
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 2007, 2008, *and* 2009. 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 Name	School Name	Tier	Reason
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Chaputnguak School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ket'acik/Aapalluk Memorial School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Nightmute School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	William Miller Memorial School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Yukon School District	Sheldon Point School	Tier I	Low 5
Yupiit School District	Tuluksak School	Tier I	Low 5
Anchorage School District	Whaley School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Aniguiin School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Anthony A. Andrews School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Gambell School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Hogarth Kingeekuk Memorial School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Koyuk-Malemute School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Tukurngailnguq School	Tier I	Grad
Dillingham City School District	Dillingham Middle/High School	Tier I	Grad
Kashunamiut School District	Chevak School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Kuinerrarmiut Elitnaurviat	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Hooper Bay School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Kotlik School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Russian Mission School	Tier I	Grad
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Burchell High School	Tier I	Grad
Matanuska-Susitna School District	MidValley High	Tier I	Grad
Northwest Arctic School District	Davis-Ramoth School	Tier I	Grad
Yupiit School District	Akiachak School	Tier I	Grad
Yupiit School District	Akiak School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Dick R Kiunya Memorial School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Joann A. Alexie Memorial School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Nelson Island Area School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Yukon School District	Emmonak School	Tier II	Low 5
Northwest Arctic School District	McQueen School	Tier II	Low 5
Craig City School District	PACE Correspondence	Tier II	Grad
Fairbanks North Star School District	Effie Kokrine Charter School	Tier II	Grad
Alaska Gateway School District	Gateway Correspondence	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Alaska Gateway School District	Tetlin School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Alaska Gateway School District	Tok School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Alaska Gateway School District	Walter Northway School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Airport Heights Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	AK School for Deaf & Hard of Hearing	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Avail School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool

Anchorage School District	Benson Secondary/S.E.A.R.C.H.	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Chinook Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Clark Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Crossroads School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Fairview Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Lake Otis Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	McLaughlin Secondary School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Mountain View Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Muldoon Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	North Star Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Nunaka Valley Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Ptarmigan Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Russian Jack Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Spring Hill Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Taku Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Tudor Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	William Tyson Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Williwaw Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Willow Crest Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Wonder Park Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Bering Strait School District	Brevig Mission School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Bering Strait School District	Diomede School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Bering Strait School District	Shishmaref School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Chatham School District	Angoon School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Copper River School District	Slana School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Craig City School District	Craig Alternative High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Delta-Greely School District	New Horizons High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Dillingham City School District	Dillingham Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Fairbanks North Star School District	Denali Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Fairbanks North Star School District	Fairbanks Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Fairbanks North Star School District	Hunter Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Fairbanks North Star School District	Nordale Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Iditarod Area School District	David-Louis School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Iditarod Area School District	Holy Cross School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Iditarod Area School District	Innoko River School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Iditarod Area School District	Top of the Kuskokwim School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Juneau Borough School District	Gastineau Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Juneau Borough School District	Riverbend Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Juneau School District	Yaakoosge Daakahidi Alt. H.S.	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Homer Flex School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Kenai Alternative High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Kenai Peninsula Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Port Graham School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Spring Creek School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool

Ketchikan Gateway School District	Ketchikan Regional Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Ketchikan Gateway School District	Revilla Jr/Sr High School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kodiak Island School District	Kodiak Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Kodiak Island School District	Larsen Bay School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	George Morgan Sr. H.S.	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Johnnie John Sr. School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Joseph S. & Olinga Gregory Elementary	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Zackar Levi Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lake and Peninsula School District	Newhalen School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lake and Peninsula School District	Nondalton School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Akiuk Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Akula Elitnaurvik School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Anna Tobeluk Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ayaprun Elitnaurvik	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ayaprun School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Bethel Regional High School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Bethel Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Chief Paul Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Gladys Jung Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Lewis Angapak Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Mikelnguut Elitnaurviat	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Paul T. Albert Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Z. John Williams Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Alakanuk School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Ignatius Beans School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Marshall School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Scammon Bay School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Goose Bay Elementary	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Houston Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	John Shaw Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Knik Elementary School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Mat-Su Day School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Mat-Su Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Nome Public Schools	Nome Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Nome Public Schools	Nome Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
North Slope Borough School District	Alak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
North Slope Borough School District	Kiita Learning Community	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
North Slope Borough School District	Meade River School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Aqqaluk High/Noorvik Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Buckland School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	June Nelson Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Northwest Arctic School District	Kiana School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Kotzebue Middle/High School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Napaaqtugmiut School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II

Northwest Arctic School District	Shungnak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Sitka School District	Blatchley Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region District	Chief Ivan Blunka School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region District	Togiak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region School District	Koliganek School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Southwest Region School District	Twin Hills School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Arctic Village School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Circle School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Fort Yukon School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Yukon Flats School District	John Fredson School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Yukon Flats School District	Stevens Village School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon-Koyukuk School District	Andrew K. Demoski School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon-Koyukuk School District	Jimmy Huntington School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II

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
Not Tier I or Tier II	School was in original Tier I pool, not identified as Tier I, qualified to be considered for Tier II, but was not identified as Tier II either
FAY Tier I Pool	School was in original Tier I pool, but was excluded from consideration based on having 25 or fewer full academic year (FAY students)
FAY Tier II Pool	School was in original Tier II pool, but was excluded from consideration based on having 25 or fewer full academic year (FAY students)

Schools Sorted by District

District Name	School Name	Tier	Reason
Alaska Gateway School District	Gateway Correspondence	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Alaska Gateway School District	Tetlin School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Alaska Gateway School District	Tok School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Alaska Gateway School District	Walter Northway School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Airport Heights Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	AK School for Deaf & Hard of Hearing	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Avail School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Anchorage School District	Benson Secondary/S.E.A.R.C.H.	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Chinook Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Clark Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Crossroads School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Fairview Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Lake Otis Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	McLaughlin Secondary School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Anchorage School District	Mountain View Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Muldoon Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	North Star Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Nunaka Valley Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Ptarmigan Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Russian Jack Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Spring Hill Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Taku Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Tudor Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Whaley School	Tier I	Grad
Anchorage School District	William Tyson Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Williwaw Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Willow Crest Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Anchorage School District	Wonder Park Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Bering Strait School District	Aniguiin School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Anthony A. Andrews School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Brevig Mission School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Bering Strait School District	Diomede School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Bering Strait School District	Gambell School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Hogarth Kingeekuk Memorial School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Koyuk-Malemute School	Tier I	Grad
Bering Strait School District	Shishmaref School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Bering Strait School District	Tukurngailnguq School	Tier I	Grad
Chatham School District	Angoon School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Copper River School District	Slana School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Craig City School District	Craig Alternative High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool

Craig City School District	PACE Correspondence	Tier II	Grad
Delta-Greely School District	New Horizons High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Dillingham City School District	Dillingham Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Dillingham City School District	Dillingham Middle/High School	Tier I	Grad
Fairbanks North Star School District	Denali Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Fairbanks North Star School District	Effie Kokrine Charter School	Tier II	Grad
Fairbanks North Star School District	Fairbanks Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Fairbanks North Star School District	Hunter Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Fairbanks North Star School District	Nordale Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Iditarod Area School District	David-Louis School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Iditarod Area School District	Holy Cross School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Iditarod Area School District	Innoko River School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Iditarod Area School District	Top of the Kuskokwim School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Juneau Borough School District	Gastineau Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Juneau Borough School District	Riverbend Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Juneau School District	Yaakoosge Daakahidi Alt. H.S.	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kashunamiut School District	Chevak School	Tier I	Grad
Kenai Peninsula School District	Homer Flex School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Kenai Alternative High School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Kenai Peninsula Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Port Graham School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kenai Peninsula School District	Spring Creek School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Ketchikan Gateway School District	Ketchikan Regional Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Ketchikan Gateway School District	Revilla Jr/Sr High School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kodiak Island School District	Kodiak Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Kodiak Island School District	Larsen Bay School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	George Morgan Sr. H.S.	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Johnnie John Sr. School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Joseph S. & Olinga Gregory Elementary	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Kuspuk School District	Zackar Levi Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lake and Peninsula School District	Newhalen School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lake and Peninsula School District	Nondalton School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Akiuk Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Akula Elitnaurvik School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Anna Tobeluk Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ayaprun Elitnaurvik	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ayaprun School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Bethel Regional High School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Bethel Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Chaputnguak School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Chief Paul Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Dick R Kiunya Memorial School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Gladys Jung Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Joann A. Alexie Memorial School	Tier II	Low 5

Lower Kuskokwim School District	Ket'acik/Aapalluk Memorial School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Kuinerrarmiut Elitnaurviat	Tier I	Grad
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Lewis Angapak Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Mikelnguut Elitnaurviat	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Nelson Island Area School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Nightmute School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Paul T. Albert Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Kuskokwim School District	William Miller Memorial School	Tier I	Low 5
Lower Kuskokwim School District	Z. John Williams Memorial School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Alakanuk School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Emmonak School	Tier II	Low 5
Lower Yukon School District	Hooper Bay School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Ignatius Beans School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Kotlik School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Marshall School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Russian Mission School	Tier I	Grad
Lower Yukon School District	Scammon Bay School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Lower Yukon School District	Sheldon Point School	Tier I	Low 5
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Burchell High School	Tier I	Grad
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Goose Bay Elementary	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Houston Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	John Shaw Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Knik Elementary School	Tier III	Not Tier I
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Mat-Su Day School	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Matanuska-Susitna School District	Mat-Su Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
Matanuska-Susitna School District	MidValley High	Tier I	Grad
Nome Public Schools	Nome Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Nome Public Schools	Nome Youth Facility	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
North Slope Borough School District	Alak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
North Slope Borough School District	Kiita Learning Community	Tier III	FAY Tier II Pool
North Slope Borough School District	Meade River School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Aqqaluk High/Noorvik Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Buckland School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Davis-Ramoth School	Tier I	Grad
Northwest Arctic School District	June Nelson Elementary	Tier III	Not Tier I
Northwest Arctic School District	Kiana School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Kotzebue Middle/High School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	McQueen School	Tier II	Low 5
Northwest Arctic School District	Napaaqtugmiut School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Northwest Arctic School District	Shungnak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Sitka School District	Blatchley Middle School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region District	Chief Ivan Blunka School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region District	Togiak School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Southwest Region School District	Koliganek School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool

Southwest Region School District	Twin Hills School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Arctic Village School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Circle School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon Flats School District	Fort Yukon School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Yukon Flats School District	John Fredson School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Yukon Flats School District	Stevens Village School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon-Koyukuk School District	Andrew K. Demoski School	Tier III	FAY Tier I Pool
Yukon-Koyukuk School District	Jimmy Huntington School	Tier III	Not Tier I or II
Yupiit School District	Akiachak School	Tier I	Grad
Yupiit School District	Akiak School	Tier I	Grad
Yupiit School District	Tuluksak School	Tier I	Low 5

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
Not Tier I or Tier II	School was in original Tier I pool, not identified as Tier I, qualified to be considered for Tier II, but was not identified as Tier II either
FAY Tier I Pool	School was in original Tier I pool, but was excluded from consideration based on having 25 or fewer full academic year (FAY students)
FAY Tier II Pool	School was in original Tier II pool, but was excluded from consideration based on having 25 or fewer full academic year (FAY students)