

# KENTUCKY'S SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS APPLICATION



**APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS**

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Kentucky Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: Capital Plaza Tower 500 Mero Street Frankfort, KY 40601</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Debbie Hicks</p> <p>Position and Office: Division Director</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: Kentucky Department of Education Capital Plaza Tower-8<sup>th</sup> floor 500 Mero Street Frankfort, KY 40601</p> <p>Telephone: (502) 564-3791</p> <p>Fax: (502) 564-8149</p> <p>Email address: <a href="mailto:debbie.hicks@education.ky.gov">debbie.hicks@education.ky.gov</a></p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Terry Holliday, Ph.D.</p>	<p>Telephone: (502) 564-4770</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p>X _____</p>	<p>Date: 2/11/10</p>
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p>	

## PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

### A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS:

**Link to Definition:**

<http://www.education.ky.gov/KDE/Administrative+Resources/Finance+and+Funding/American+Recovery+and+Reinvestment+Act/State+Fiscal+Stabilization+Fund/>

Persistently low-achieving school means:

**Tier I**-A Title I school that is in the lowest five percent of all Title I schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring based on averaging the percentage of proficient or higher in reading and mathematics on the state assessments and failed to make AYP for three consecutive years or has a graduation rate of sixty percent or less for three consecutive years.

**Tier II**- A non-Title I (in KY this means eligible but not served) middle or high school that is in the lowest five percent of all non-Title I schools based on averaging the percentage of proficient or higher in reading and mathematics on the state assessments and failed to make AYP for three consecutive years or has a graduation rate of sixty percent or less for three consecutive years.

**Tier III**-All Title I schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring and are not in Tier I.

**Note:** Only one high school meets the graduation rate requirement and it qualifies under the persistently low performing definition.

HB176, passed by the Kentucky legislature in January 2010, defines Kentucky's persistently low-achieving schools. The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) then applied that definition to the process outlined in the School Improvement Grants Guidance and Application. The steps in identifying Tier I schools (lowest 5% or 5, whichever is greater) were:

- Identify all Title I schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring
- Determine the average percent of proficient or higher in reading and mathematics on the state assessments
- Determine which schools failed to make AYP for three consecutive years
- Determine if any high schools have a graduation rate of 60% or less for three consecutive years that are not identified in the steps above

The steps in identifying Tier II schools (lowest 5% or 5, whichever is greater) were:

- Identify all schools that have any combination of grades 7-12 and are eligible to receive Title I funds but are not served by Title I

- Determine the average percent of proficient or higher in reading and mathematics for all groups on the state assessment
- Determine which schools failed to make AYP for three consecutive years
- Determine if any high schools have a graduation rate of 60% or less for three consecutive years that are not identified in the steps above

The steps in identifying Tier III schools were:

- Identify all Title I schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring and are not in Tier I

LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2102990: Jefferson County						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Shawnee High School	210299000777	Yes				
Western Middle School	210299000785	Yes				
Frost Middle School	210299000678	Yes				
Western High School	210299000677	Yes				
Valley High School	210299000639	Yes				
Fern Creek High School	210299000628		Yes			
Thomas Jefferson MS	210299000682			Yes		
Doss HS	210299000691			Yes		
Iroquois HS	210299000753			Yes		
Knight MS	210299000725			Yes		
Stuart MS	210299001427			Yes		
Conway MS	210299000726			Yes		
Fairdale HS	210299000651			Yes		
Lassiter MS	210299000711			Yes		
Myers MS	210299000723			Yes		
Westport Traditional MS	210299000670			Yes		
Moore Traditional School	210299002026			Yes		
Waggener Traditional HS	210299000649			Yes		
Central HS	210299000730			Yes		
Farnsley MS	210299001530			Yes		
Southern HS	210299000637			Yes		
Stonestreet Elem	210299000665			Yes		
Whitney Young Elem	210299000757			Yes		
Lincoln Elem	210299000772			Yes		
Rangeland Elem	210299000674			Yes		
Coral Ridge Elem	210299000654			Yes		

<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2103330: Leslie County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Leslie County High School	210333000885		Yes			
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2103240: Lawrence County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Lawrence County High School	210324000874		Yes			
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2104140: Metcalfe County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Metcalfe High School	210414001044		Yes			
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2101110: Caverna Independent</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Caverna High School	210111000214		Yes			
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2100030: Adair County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Adair Co. MS	210003001919			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID#2100070: Allen County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Allen Co. Intermediate Center	210007000013			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2100480: Berea Independent</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Berea Community MS	210048001658			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2100510: Boone County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Hillard Collins Elem.	210051001608			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2100570: Bowling Green Independent</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>

Bowling Green MS	210057000104			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2100620: Boyd County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Boyd Co. MS	210062000112			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2100720: Breckinridge County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Breckinridge Co. MS	210072001304			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2100750: Bullitt County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Bullitt Lick MS	210075001410			Yes		
Zoneton MS	210075001973			Yes		
Hebron MS	210075000147			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2100870: Calloway County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Calloway Co. HS	210087000171			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2100990: Carroll County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Carroll Co. MS	210099000191			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2101020: Carter County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
East Carter MS	210102001698			Yes		
Heritage Elem.	210102001884			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2101150: Christian County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
North Drive MS	210115001580			Yes		
Christian Co. MS	210115000221			Yes		
Hopkinsville MS	210115000225			Yes		
Martin Luther King Jr. Elem.	210115002024			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2101200: Clark County</b>						

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Central Elem.	210120000236			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2101230: Clay County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Clay Co. MS	210123001699			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2101410: Cumberland County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Cumberland Co. Elem.	210141000286			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2101760: Estill County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Estill Co. HS	210176000342			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2101860: Fayette County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Bryan Station HS	210186000388			Yes		
Russell Cave Elem.	210186000380			Yes		
Crawford MS	210186000357			Yes		
Tates Creek MS	210186000382			Yes		
Leestown MS	210186000369			Yes		
Cardinal Valley Elem.	210186000392			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2101950: Floyd County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
South Floyd HS	210195000472			Yes		
Betsy Layne HS	210195000406			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2102100: Fulton County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Fulton Co. HS	210210000445			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID#2102160: Garrard County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD	NEWLY

					RATE	ELIGIBLE
Garrard MS	210216001672			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2102300: Grayson County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Grayson Co. MS	210230000487			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2102490: Hardin County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Bluegrass MS	210249001673			Yes		
North Hardin HS	210249000517			Yes		
John Hardin HS	210249001910			Yes		
East Hardin MS	210249000512			Yes		
Meadow View Elem.	210249001566			Yes		
Central Hardin HS	210249000528			Yes		
Radcliff MS	210249000520			Yes		
James T Alton MS	210249000518			Yes		
Parkway Elem.	210249000519			Yes		
West Hardin MS	210249000525			Yes		
Vine Grove Elem.	210249000524			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2102710: Henderson County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Henderson Co. South MS	210271000585			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2102860: Hopkins County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Browning Springs MS	210286000601			Yes		
James Madison MS	210286000681			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2102940: Jackson County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Jackson Co. HS	210294000615			Yes		
Jackson Co. MS	210294001674			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2103030: Jessamine County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE

East Jessamine MS	210303000797			Yes		
Rosenwald Dunbar Elem	210303000092			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2103120: Knott County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Beaver Creek Elem	210312000826			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2103150: Knox County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Lynn Camp HS	210315000850			Yes		
Knox Central HS	210315000847			Yes		
Knox Co. MS	210315002029			Yes		
West Knox Co. Elem	210315001617			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2103270: Lee County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Lee Co. MS	210327000877			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2103510: Livingston County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Livingston Co. MS	210351001484			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2103990: McCreary County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
McCreary Central HS	210399001014			Yes		
McCreary Co. MS	210399002002			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2104170: Middlesboro Independent</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Middlesboro HS	210417001050			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2104200: Monroe County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Monroe Co. MS	210420001053			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2104290: Morgan County</b>						

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Morgan Co. MS	210429001067			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2104440: Newport Independent</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Newport MS	210444001104			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2104530: Oldham County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
South Oldham MS	210453001433			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2104620: Owsley County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Owsley Co. HS	210462001143			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2104650: Paducah Independent</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Paducah Tilghman HS	210465001154			Yes		
Paducah MS	210465001144			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2105040: Robertson County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Deming School	2105040*			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID#2105190: Russellville Independent</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
R E Stevenson Elem	210519001274			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2105370: Silver Grove Independent</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Silver Grove School	210537001727			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2105520: Taylor County</b>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE

Taylor Co. HS	210552001318			Yes		
Taylor Co. MS	210552001319			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID#2105610: Trimble County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Trimble Co. MS	210561001331			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2105640: Union County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Union Co. MS	210564001602			Yes		
Morganfield Elem	210564001334			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2105880: Whitley County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Whitley Co. MS	210588001387			Yes		
<b>LEA NAME,NCES ID# 2105970: Wolfe County</b>						
<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>	<b>NEWLY ELIGIBLE</b>
Wolfe Co. HS	210597001397			Yes		

**\*Robertson County has one school, grades K-12, for assessment accountability purposes. The scores are calculated as a joint score under the district NCES ID#.**

**B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

Part 1.

A team consisting of staff from all offices within the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) will evaluate the LEA’s application for Tier I and Tier II schools using a scoring rubric (Attachment A). The rubric will analyze the extent to which the LEA successfully:

- analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school in its application
- used the results of the school’s audit to select the intervention model
- selected the intervention to be implemented based on the needs analysis
- determined the district capacity to support each identified Tier I and Tier II school
- budgeted sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention and support Tier III school improvement activities over a three-year period

A cross agency team will also evaluate the LEA’s applications for Tier III schools using a scoring rubric (Attachment B). The rubric will analyze the extent to which the LEA successfully:

- analyzed the needs of each Tier III school in its application
- developed an improvement plan to be implemented based on the needs analysis

- provided services to the school
- established annual goals for student achievement and developed a process to monitor progress
- budgeted sufficient funds to implement the improvement plan and support Tier III school improvement activities over a three-year period

An application will be deemed “not approvable” if any section is not sufficiently addressed. The LEA may revise and resubmit the application.

## Part 2.

The team consisting of staff from all offices within the KDE will evaluate the LEA’s application using a scoring rubric (Attachments A and B). The rubric will analyze the actions taken prior to submitting the application or will be taken after the application is approved. The rubric will determine the extent to which the LEA successfully:

- designed interventions consistent with the final requirements
- implemented, or will implement, the designed interventions
- recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, the LEA will describe:
  - a. the needs assessment conducted to determine the focus area(s) of external support
  - b. conduct research to determine external providers capable of supporting the school and have been successful in assisting similar schools
  - c. the process for selecting the external provider following state and local policies for contractual agreements
  - d. the projected work plan for the external provider
  - e. how the LEA will determine the external provider’s effectiveness on an annual basis
- aligned other resources with the interventions
  - a. in the detailed budget narrative the LEA will describe how state (examples included but are not limited to, Family Resource/Youth Service Centers, Preschool, Professional Development, etc.) and federal (examples include but are not limited to, Title I, Title II, Title III, etc.) funds are aligned with the selected intervention model
  - b. in the detailed budget narrative the LEA will describe how other resources (e.g., personnel, materials and services) will be used to support the selected intervention model
- modified its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively
  - a. the LEA will describe how it will conduct a review of the practices or policies of the Board of Education and School Based Councils to determine necessary modifications
  - b. the LEA will provide minutes of the Board of Education meetings and School Based Council meetings documenting a review of policies to ensure the policies support the implementation of the intervention model

- described how the reforms will be sustained after the funding period ends
  - a. the LEA will describe how the identified state and federal resources (funds and personnel) will be adjusted to continue the practices implemented with the intervention model after the funding period ends
  - b. the LEA will describe how data analysis will continue to drive instructional changes and establish annual goals to ensure student achievement continues

An application will be deemed “not approvable” if any section is not sufficiently addressed. The LEA may revise and resubmit the application.

**C. CAPACITY:**

In January and February of 2010, the Commissioner of Education visited each superintendent with schools in Tier I and Tier 2 to discuss the identification process, the audit process and the intervention models. At that time, all superintendents indicated they had the capacity to lead change in the identified schools. Some superintendents indicated they would need additional support from Kentucky Department of Education (KDE).

In the spring of 2010, the KDE will conduct audits in the districts that have Tier I and Tier II schools, regardless of the district’s claim of lack of capacity. The audit teams will use “The Kentucky Standards and Indicators for School Improvement” (SISI) for districts, the “Missing Piece to the Proficiency Puzzle” and a working conditions survey to determine the district’s capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school. The results of these assessments will detail the challenges and issues that are driving low achievement, as well as successes and potentially promising practices. This data will inform the best course of action for struggling schools.

Each school audit shall include in its findings the following:

- 1) a determination regarding the principal’s leadership capacity in turning around the school and if the principal should be replaced
- 2) a determination of the school council’s leadership capacity and a decision on the council’s authority to govern per Kentucky Revised Statute 160.345
- 3) a recommendation as to which of the four options the audit team feels would best serve the students of the school

Each district audit shall include in its findings the following:

- 1) a determination regarding the district leadership’s capacity to manage the turnaround of the identified schools(s)

The KDE will deliver the audit reports to each district, review the findings and collaborate with the district to determine what support the district needs from KDE. If it is determined that neither the school nor the district has the capacity to lead the turnaround effort, the KDE will have an oversight role in the management of the turnaround and will approve the turnaround option chosen. That oversight will be managed by the Kentucky Department of Education’s Office of Educational Recovery Services.

**Link to SISI:**

<http://www.education.ky.gov/kde/administrative+resources/school+improvement/standards+and+indicators+for+school+improvement/sisi+toolkit/>

**Link to Missing Piece to the Proficiency Puzzle:**

<http://www.education.ky.gov/kde/instructional+resources/student+and+family+support/parents+and+families/the+missing+piece+of+the+proficiency+puzzle.htm>

**D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:**

Timeline for approving LEA applications:

- KDE will conduct audits in districts with Tier I and Tier II schools during February-April 2010. At the same time, audits will be conducted in the Tier I and Tier II schools. The audit reports will be delivered to the districts and schools within four weeks of completion of the onsite audit.
- Within 30 days of receiving approval of KDE's school improvement grants application, KDE staff will provide onsite technical assistance to districts regarding school improvement grant requirements (approximately March 30, 2010).
- District applications will be due to KDE for review 30 days after the completion of the technical assistance (approximately April 30, 2010).
- Applications will be reviewed by a KDE cross agency team within 30 days of receipt of the applications using the rubrics in Attachments A and B. Awards will be made immediately upon completion of the reviews and approval of the LEA application (approximately May 30, 2010).

Reviewing the goals of Tier I and Tier II schools:

A team consisting of the Educational Recovery Specialist assigned to each identified school, staff from the Office of Educational Recovery Services and Centers for Learning Excellence will review the baseline data and compare it to the goals the district has established to determine if the goals are S.M.A.R.T. (specific, measureable, attainable, relevant and timely) goals and meet the requirements of the new reporting matrix. At the end of each school year the team will compare current data and other leading indicators to determine if goals have been met or sufficient growth has occurred for continued funding.

Reviewing goals of Tier III schools:

A team consisting of staff from the Office of Educational Recovery Services and Centers for Learning Excellence will review the baseline data and compare it to the goals the district has established to determine if the goals are S.M.A.R.T. goals. At the end of each

school year the team will compare current data to determine if goals have been met or sufficient growth has occurred for continued funding.

#### Monitoring LEA Implementation:

The Kentucky Department of Education will undergo a re-organization that will create the Office of Educational Recovery Services (OERS). This office will have as its primary responsibility to monitor and provide support to Tier I, II, and III schools with specific focus on Tier I and II. Each Tier I and Tier II school will receive the services of an Educational Recovery Specialist (ERS). The ERS are individuals with specific experience and training in working with teachers to make dramatic improvement in instructional practice that leads to improved student learning. They will focus on coaching, mentoring and modeling effective instructional practices in order to increase the effectiveness of the school's staff. The ERS will assist the LEA and schools in developing a plan for implementation, collecting supporting data and reviewing/revising the plan on a monthly basis. In addition, OERS will meet monthly with the ERS to review the monthly reports. Monthly meetings are to ensure continuous progress is being made toward improving student achievement and implementing the intervention model with efficacy, in addition to determining other support services the LEA and schools may need.

An additional level of support will be provided by Centers for Learning Excellence. These centers are regional partnerships between universities, regional service providers and other partners and are established solely to address the needs of educational recovery schools.

#### Prioritizing if insufficient funds exist to serve all eligible schools:

KDE will prioritize school improvement grants to LEAs if there is an insufficient amount of funding to serve all identified schools for which the LEAs apply to serve. All Tier I and Tier II schools for which the LEAs apply will be give priority. If grant funds are not sufficient to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools for which the LEAs apply the KDE will prioritize funding based on:

- Lowest average percentage of students proficient or higher in reading/language arts and mathematics on the state assessment
- Most years implementing school improvement consequences
- Lowest overall rating on the audit report which was conducted to determine leadership capacity and the schools' with the greatest needs.

#### Prioritizing Tier III schools:

KDE has assigned weights to two criteria for Tier III schools. The criteria are AYP status (10 points for restructuring, 8 points for planning/corrective action, 6 points for corrective action, 4 points for improvement-year 2, and 2 points for improvement), and the average percentage of students proficient or higher in reading/language arts and mathematics on the state assessments (40 points for 30%, 30 points for 40%, 20 points for 50%, 10 points for 60%, 0 points for 70% higher).

Funds have been prioritized into four levels that districts may request in the LEA application for Tier III schools. Those districts with schools having the highest weighted score may request the top level of funding. Those districts with schools having the lowest weighted score may request the lowest level of funding.

SEA Take-over:

If audit determinations result in the SEA having an oversight role in the recovery, the Office of Educational Recovery Services will use the audit determinations and findings to make decisions as to turnaround options. All five of Kentucky's Tier I schools and one Tier II school are in the largest, and only, urban district. The other four Tier II schools are in rural areas. It is most likely that the option in the large urban district would be the Turnaround option and the option in the other Tier II schools would be the "Transformation" option since these schools are the only high schools in the LEA and "Re-Start" or "Closure" would be difficult.

**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.
- ✓ 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:**

- KDE will provide technical assistance and guidance to districts with Tier I, Tier II and Tier III during the application process.
- KDE will conduct audits in districts with Tier I and Tier II schools to determine the district's capacity to support the schools.
- KDE will conduct audits in the Tier I and Tier II schools to determine school needs and recommend an intervention model.
- KDE will establish an Office of Educational Recovery Services to monitor and support eligible schools.
- KDE will contract with an external provider to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of state activities.

**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. A WebEx was held on February 2, 2010. COP had suggestions for technical assistance, but no recommendations for the 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 the Race to the Top Advisory Council, which includes members for external agencies (i.e., KY Education Association, KY School Board Association, KY Association of School Superintendents, KY Parent Teacher Organization, etc.).

**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.**

Kentucky 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.

**Link to waiver:**

<http://www.education.ky.gov/KDE/>

Attachment C is a copy of the waiver that was posted on the KDE website for public comment and was included in the commissioner’s Monday email to all district superintendents. No comments were received regarding the waivers.

**PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS**

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

- ✓ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.
  
- ✓ “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.

## Attachment C

### **\*\* REVISED MESSAGE ON TITLE I, PART A SIG GUIDELINES \*\***

The following message was shared with school personnel on Jan. 19. The U.S. Department of Education has issued revised guidance that removes the need for districts to apply for a waiver to use Title I, Part A School Improvement Grant Section 1003g funds to serve schools in federal Tier II status. The message below has been revised to reflect this updated guidance.

### **Opportunity for local education agencies to comment on the waiver requests regarding Title I, Part A School Improvement Grant Section 1003g guidance provided by the USED in December 2009**

As a part of the US Department of Education's (USED's) waiver request process, the Kentucky Department of Education is required to provide all local education agencies with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the waiver requests described below; thus, we are providing this invitation to comment via this e-mail. **If you have questions or wish to comment on this waiver request, please contact Debbie Hicks, director of the Division of Federal Programs, via e-mail at [debbie.hicks@education.ky.gov](mailto:debbie.hicks@education.ky.gov) or via phone at (502) 564-3791 no later than Monday, February 1, 2010, close of business.**

#### ***Explanation of waiver requests***

Based upon new Title I, Part A School Improvement Grant Section 1003g guidance provided by the USDOE in December 2009, states have been granted the opportunity to apply for waivers of the requirements of the following regulations pursuant to Title I, Part A to allow:

1. Extending the availability of the Section 1003g funds to September 30, 2013.
2. A school in Federal Tier I status that will implement a turnaround or restart model to start over (will not implement improvement consequences for 2010-11 and 2011-12) in the school improvement timeline.
3. A school in Federal Tier I status to operate a Title I schoolwide program if the school's percent of poverty is below 40%.

The Kentucky Department of Education believes that by allowing these waivers, the quality of instruction for students and the academic achievement of students will improve by providing:

- Schools extended time to access school improvement funds in order to develop and implement a long- range, comprehensive plan for improving and sustaining student achievement
- Schools the opportunity to implement a new turnaround model without focusing on implementing consequences outlined in NCLB
- Schools the flexibility to focus resources, funds and programs on all students

**Again, please direct any questions or comments on Kentucky's waiver request of the above Title I requirements to Debbie Hicks, director, Division of Federal Programs, via e-mail at [debbie.hicks@education.ky.gov](mailto:debbie.hicks@education.ky.gov) or via phone at (502) 564-3791 no later than Monday, February 1, 2010, close of business.**

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

**Kentucky Department of Education**  
**District Application for School Improvement Funds**

(Section 1003g)  
Spring 2010

District:	Mailing Address:
District School Improvement Grant Contact: Name:  Position:  Contact's Mailing Address  Telephone:  Email address:	
Signature of the Superintendent:	Date:
The District, 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 District receives through this application.	

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

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

Note: Districts with schools in Tier I and/or Tier II, that also have schools in Tier III, must complete this chart for both applications.

School Name	NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Intervention (Tier I and II only)			
					Turnaround (restaffing)	Restart	Closure	Transformation

Districts with Tier I and Tier II schools must complete B. Descriptive Information - Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, C. Budget, E. Waivers and Appendix B.

Districts with Tier III schools must complete B. Descriptive Information - Sections 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, C. Budget, E. Waivers and Appendix B..

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

Please describe in narrative form the following information.

Sections 1 and 2. Commitment to Serve

Describe:

- How the district has analyzed the needs of each school in Tier I and Tier II
- How the district analyzed the audit results and determined the resources and related support each school needs
- How the district has selected the school intervention model based on the needs analysis
- If the district is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school (include supporting documentation from the audit)

Section 3: Actions

Describe actions the district has taken, or will take, to:

- Design and implement the school intervention model (four approved models are described in Appendix A)
- Recruit, screen and select external providers, if applicable. Description must include the needs analysis, research conducted, process for selecting the external provider that has success in schools with similar demographics and that can best address the needs identified in the assessment, projected work plan and how the district will evaluate the external provider's effectiveness.
- Support schools in the creation and implementation of school-wide literacy and mathematics improvement plans
- Align other state and federal resources with the selected intervention (i.e., technology, family and community supports, personnel, materials, services funding sources, professional development, etc.)
- Modify practices and policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. Description must include minutes from Board of Education meetings and School Based Council meetings documenting a review of policies.
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. Description must include how the identified state and federal funding and resources will be adjusted to continue the practices and how the data analysis will continue to drive instructional changes and annual goals after the funding period ends.

Section 4. Timeline

Describe the timeline delineating the steps the district will take to implement the intervention model in each **Tier I and Tier II** school identified in the district's application. Districts with **Tier III** schools must describe the timeline delineating the steps the district will take to implement the improvement plan for each Tier III school identified in the district's application.

### Section 5. Annual Goals

Describe the annual goals the district has established for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics for each Tier I and Tier II school receiving the school improvement funds. Include how the district will monitor the progress throughout the school year.

### Section 6. Tier III Services

Describe how the district will provide services to the Tier III schools or the activities the school will implement to improve student achievement.

### Section 7. Tier III Annual Goals

Describe the annual goals the district has established for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics for each Tier III school receiving the school improvement funds. Include how the district will monitor the progress throughout the school year.

### Section 8. Consultation

Describe how the district consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the district's application and the implementation of the intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools. Describe how the district consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the district's application and the implementation of the improvement plan in Tier III schools.

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

### Section 1. Budget Narrative

Describe how the district intends to use the school improvement funds each year (grants may be renewed annually for a total of three years) to:

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve
- Conduct district level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention model in the Tier I and Tier II schools
- Support school improvement activities at the school or district level for each Tier III school identified

### Section 2. Budget

Complete a budget page (Appendix B) for the district and each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school it is serving for each year (2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13). The budget must include a minimum amount of \$50,000 per school per year and may not exceed \$2 million per school per year. Tier I and Tier II schools must include salaries for Education Recovery Specialist.

**D. Assurances:** A district must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The district must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the district 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 KDE) 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 education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- (4) Report to the KDE the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

**E. Waivers:** If the State has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the district's School Improvement Grant, a district must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The Kentucky Department of Education has applied for the waivers listed below. The district must check each waiver that the district will implement. If the district does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the district must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

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

## **Appendix A – Intervention Models Guidance Under Section 1003(g) of ESEA**

A turnaround model (KY HB176 Restaffing Model) is one in which an LEA must do the following:

- (1) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
- (2) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,
  - (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and
  - (B) Select new staff;
- (3) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
- (4) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
- (5) 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;
- (6) 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;
- (7) 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;
- (8) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and
- (9) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

In addition to the required elements, an LEA implementing a turnaround model may also implement other strategies, such as a new school model or any of the required and permissible

activities under the transformation intervention model described in the final requirements. It could also, for example, replace a comprehensive high school with one that focuses on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). The key is that these actions would be taken within the framework of the turnaround model and would be in addition to, not instead of, the actions that are required as part of a turnaround model.

Other strategies permissible when implementing a turnaround model:

- (1) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a transformation school;
- (2) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or
- (3) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.
  - a. Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
  - b. Implementing a schoolwide "response-to-intervention" model;
  - c. Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
- (4) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and
- (5) In secondary schools—
  - (a) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework, early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;
  - (b) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
  - (c) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or
  - (d) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or to graduate.

- (6) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;
- (7) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;
- (8) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or
- (9) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.
- (10) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or
- (11) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

A **restart model** is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school

**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.

The **transformation model** employs the same elements as the turnaround model. The strategies that are used to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a turnaround model may be the same strategies that are used to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a transformation model.

A district implementing a transformation model is **required** to:

- (1) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
- (2) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that —
  - (a) Take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and

ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates; and

- (b) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
- (3) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;
- (4) 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 and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and
- (5) 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.
- (6) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and
- (7) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) in order to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students.
- (8) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time; and
- (9) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.
- (10) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and
- (11) 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).

In addition to the required activities for a transformation model, a district **may** also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness, such as:

- (10) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a transformation school;
- (11) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or

- (12) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher’s seniority.
  - a. Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
  - b. Implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model;
  - c. Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
- (13) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and
- (14) In secondary schools—
  - (e) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework, early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;
  - (f) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
  - (g) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or
  - (h) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or to graduate.
- (15) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students’ social, emotional, and health needs;
- (16) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;
- (17) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or
- (18) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

(10) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or

(11) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Districts also have flexibility to develop and implement their own strategies, as part of their efforts to successfully implement the transformation model, to increase the effectiveness of teachers and school leaders. Any such strategies must be in addition to those that are required as part of this model.

**Appendix B**  
**Proposed District Budget Summary**  
**School Improvement Grants**  
 2010-11 School Year

District: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Munis Code</b>	<b>Description of Activity</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>
110		
111		
113		
120		
211		
212		
213		
214		
221		
222		
231		
251		
253		
260		
294		
295		
296		
297		
320		
580		
610		
630		

Munis Code	Description of Activity	Amount Requested
640		
670		
734		
735		
810		
892		
894		
933		
Total Amount Requested		\$

Proposed District Budget Summary  
 School Improvement Grants  
 2011-12 School Year

District: \_\_\_\_\_

Munis Code	Description of Activity	Amount Requested
110		
111		
113		
120		
211		
212		
213		
214		
221		
222		
231		
251		
253		
260		
294		
295		
296		
297		
320		
580		
610		
630		
640		

Munis Code	Description of Activity	Amount Requested
670		
734		
735		
810		
892		
894		
933		

Total Amount Requested	\$
------------------------	----

Proposed District Budget Summary  
**School Improvement Grants**  
 2012-13 School Year

District: \_\_\_\_\_

Munis Code	Description of Activity	Amount Requested
110		
111		
113		
120		
211		
212		
213		
214		
221		
222		
231		
251		
253		
260		
294		
295		
296		
297		
320		
580		
610		
630		
640		

Munis Code	Description of Activity	Amount Requested
670		
734		
735		
810		
892		
894		
933		

Total Amount Requested	\$
------------------------	----

Proposed School Budget Summary  
 School Improvement Grants  
 2010-11 School Year

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Munis Code	Description of Activity	Amount Requested
110		
111		
113		
120		
211		
212		
213		
214		
221		
222		
231		
251		
253		
260		
294		
295		
296		
297		
320		
580		
610		
630		
640		

Munis Code	Description of Activity	Amount Requested
670		
734		
735		
810		
892		
894		
933		
Total Amount Requested		\$

Proposed School Budget Summary  
 School Improvement Grants  
 2011-12 School Year

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Munis Code	Description of Activity	Amount Requested
110		
111		
113		
120		
211		
212		
213		
214		
221		
222		
231		
251		
253		
260		
294		
295		
296		
297		
320		
580		
610		
630		
640		

Munis Code	Description of Activity	Amount Requested
670		
734		
735		
810		
892		
894		
933		
Total Amount Requested		\$

Proposed School Budget Summary  
**School Improvement Grants**  
 2012-13 School Year

School: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Munis Code</b>	<b>Description of Activity</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>
110		
111		
113		
120		
211		
212		
213		
214		
221		
222		
231		
251		
253		
260		
294		
295		
296		
297		
320		
580		
610		
630		
640		

Munis Code	Description of Activity	Amount Requested
670		
734		
735		
810		
892		
894		
933		

Total Amount Requested	\$
------------------------	----

**Attachment A**

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SECTION 1003G)  
KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**

**Tier I and Tier II Application ONLY**

District: \_\_\_\_\_

Cover page signed \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
Schools to be served are listed \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
Tier status identified \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
Interventions identified for Tier I and Tier II \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

<b>SECTIONS</b>	<b>Limited Evidence</b>	<b>Sufficient Evidence</b>
Sections 1 and 2. Commitment to Serve		
Section 3. Actions		
Turnaround		
Restart		
School Closure		
Transformation		
Other Indicators		
Section 4. Timeline		
Section 5. Annual Goals		
Section 8. Consultation		
Budget		

Overall strengths of the application:

Overall weaknesses of the application:

Approval will be granted when all sections are deemed "sufficient:".

## **B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION**

### **Sections 1 and 2. Commitment to Serve**

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
School level data from KY Interim Performance report and the NCLB report is provided with limited evidence of data analysis and few connections to need for intervention.	Describes school level data from KY Interim Performance report and the NCLB report with an analysis of the data indicating the school's need for intervention.
Limited evidence of analysis of non-cognitive data with few connections linking it to low student achievement.	Describes non-cognitive data and an analysis of how it contributes to low student achievement.
Limited evidence of causes and contributing factors with few connections to low student achievement and/or need for schoolwide intervention.	Describes analysis of causes and contributing factors to low student achievement and/or need for schoolwide intervention.
Limited evidence of analysis the audit results, determining the resources and related support for each school.	Describes analysis of the audit results to determine the resources and related support for each school.
Limited evidence how the intervention model was selected based on the needs analysis.	Describes how the intervention model was selected based on the needs analysis.
Limited evidence for not serving all Tier I schools.	Describes decision to not serve Tier I schools and provides supporting documentation.

### **Section 3. Actions**

For each school to be served, the district must complete the appropriate intervention information. Reviewer will complete the rubric(s) for that appropriate intervention model(s).

#### **Turnaround Model (KY HB176 Restaffing Model)**

Does the description of the turnaround model sufficiently describe how the district will:  
 Yes    No   Replace the principal (principals hired

- Yes  No in the last 2 years as part of an intervention plan does not have to be replaced)
- Yes  No Allow operational flexibility
- Yes  No Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff (rehire no more than 50% of staff, select new staff)
- Yes  No Implement working condition strategies that are designed to Recruit, place and retain staff.
- Yes  No Support schools in the creation and implementation of school-wide literacy and mathematics improvement plans
- Yes  No Provide ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development
- Yes  No Adopt a new governance structure
- Yes  No Use data to identify and implement research-based, aligned, standards driven instructional program
- Yes  No Promote the continuous use of student data
- Yes  No Establish schedules and implement strategies that increase learning time
- Yes  No Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services for students
- Yes  No

Districts are not required to address “permissible activities”. However, if a district does describe permissible activities in its application, reviewers should check those that are included. If the permissible activity does not have sufficient evidence, reviewers should make notes under each checked activity.

**Turnaround Model (KY HB176 Restaffing Model)\_Permissible activities:**

- A new school model (e.g. themed, dual language academy, etc.)
- Is the district providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff?
- Is the district instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from PD?
- Does the district provide a plan to ensure the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal?
- Does the district provide a plan to support schools in the creation and implementation of school-wide literacy and mathematics improvement plans?
- Does the district describe a plan to conduct periodic reviews to ensure the curriculum is implemented with fidelity and modified if ineffective?
- Does the district describe a plan to implement a schoolwide response to intervention?

- Does the district describe how additional supports and PD will be provided to teachers and principals to serve students with disabilities and limited English proficiency?
- Does the district describe the use and integration of technology-based supports and interventions?
- For secondary schools does the district describe plans to increase student enrollment in advanced course work including supports to ensure low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs?
- Does the district describe transition activities from middle to high school such as summer transition programs or freshman academies?
- Does the district describe strategies to increase graduation rates?
- Does the district establish identification systems for students who may be at risk of failing to achieve high standards or graduate?
- Does the district partner with parents, organizations, and other agencies to create a safe school environment?
- Does the district extend or restructure the school day?
- Does the district implement approaches to improve school climate and discipline?
- Does the district expand the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten?
- Does the district allow the school to be run under a new governance arrangement?
- Does the district implement a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs?

Restart Model –(KY currently does not have charter legislation)

- Yes  No      The district conducted a rigorous review process to examine a prospective restart operator’s reform plans and strategies (describes comprehensive needs assessment, research conducted to determine education management organization (EMO) with prior success in schools with similar demographics and that can best address the needs identified in the assessment, process for selecting the EMO, projected work plan, how the district will evaluate the EMO’s effectiveness)

- Yes  No The district describes the process used to select the Restart Model to convert or close and reopen the school under an education management organization
- Yes  No Any former student who wishes to attend the school has been allowed to enroll

### School Closure Model

- Yes  No The district conducted a review process to select the School Closure Model
- Yes  No The district identified the higher achieving schools that will be receiving schools
- Yes  No The higher achieving receiving schools are within reasonable proximity to the closed school

If the district has chosen the school closure model, skip to Section 4, Section 8 AND Budget.

### Transformation Model

- Yes  No The district described their plan to develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness
- Yes  No The district described plans to replace the principal (principals hired in the last 2 years as part of an intervention plan does not have to be replaced)
- Yes  No The district adopted/implemented rigorous, transparent and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals
- Yes  No The evaluation included student growth data, multiple observation-based assessments of performance, formative data collections tied to student achievement and increased high school graduation rates
- Yes  No The evaluation system was designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement
- Yes  No The district described plans to identify and reward school leaders, teachers and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve, have not done so
- Yes  No The district described a plan to support schools in the creation and implementation of school-wide literacy and mathematics improvement plans
- Yes  No Described professional development plans that are aligned with the school's instructional program to implement school intervention strategies
- Yes  No The district described plans to recruit, place and retrain staff

- Yes  No The district used data to identify and implement a research based instructional program that is vertically aligned by grade and state academic standards
- Yes  No The district described a plan/process to continuously use student data to inform and differentiate instruction
- Yes  No The district established schedules and strategies to provide increased learning time
- Yes  No The district described ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.
- Yes  No The district described how it will implement operational flexibility
- Yes  No The district described the intensive technical assistance and support to be provided to the school

Districts are not required to address “permissible activities”. However, if a district does describe permissible activities in its application, reviewers should check those that are included. If the permissible activity does not have sufficient evidence, reviewers should make notes under each checked activity.

**Transformation Model Permissible activities:**

- Is the district providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff?
- Is the district instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from PD?
- Does the district provide a plan to ensure the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal?
- Does the district describe a plan to conduct periodic reviews to ensure the curriculum is implemented with fidelity and modified if ineffective?
- Does the district describe a plan to Support schools in the creation and implementation of school-wide literacy and mathematics improvement plans
- Does the district describe a plan to implement a schoolwide response to intervention?
- Does the district describe how additional supports and PD will be provided to teachers and principals to serve students with disabilities and limited English proficiency?
- Does the district describe the use and integration of technology-based supports and interventions?
- For secondary schools does the district describe plans to increase student enrollment in advanced course work including supports to ensure low-achieving

students can take advantage of these programs?

\_\_\_ Does the district describe transition activities from middle to high school such as summer transition programs or freshman academies?

\_\_\_ Does the district describe strategies to increase graduation rates?

\_\_\_ Does the district establish identification systems for students who may be at risk of failing to achieve high standards or graduate?

\_\_\_ Does the district partner with parents, organizations, and other agencies to create a safe school environment?

\_\_\_ Does the district extend or restructure the school day?

\_\_\_ Does the district implement approaches to improve school climate and discipline?

\_\_\_ Does the district expand the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten?

\_\_\_ Does the district allow the school to be run under a new governance arrangement?

\_\_\_ Does the district implement a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs?

**NOTE:** If applicable, the district application must describe how external providers were recruited, screened and selected.

\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No Does the application sufficiently explain how the district recruited, screened and selected the external providers?

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
Limited evidence of technology integrated in classroom instruction and in addressing the school's improvement goals.	Describes how the school will integrate technology in classroom instruction, (i.e., lesson development, formative assessments, student access, public relations, etc.), that support the school's improvement goals.
Limited evidence of family and community supports in planning, implementing and engaging partners in the intervention model.	Describes how family and community supports will be involved in a meaningful way with planning, implementing and engaging partners in the intervention model.
Limited evidence of personnel assigned to support school's improvement goals.	Describes how personnel have been assigned, or reassigned, to maximize these resources in addressing the

<p>Limited evidence of how funds will be redirected and used to support the intervention model and the school's improvement goals.</p> <p>Limited evidence of professional development aligned to the school's improvement goals and is not job-embedded nor is it connected to classroom instructional practices.</p> <p>Limited evidence of resources (in addition to technology, family and community supports, personnel, other funds, and professional development) to address the school's improvement goals.</p> <p>Limited evidence of external support.</p> <p>Limited evidence of the process used to review practices and policies.</p> <p>Limited evidence of changes in practices and policies that prohibit a school from implementing the intervention model with fidelity.</p> <p>Limited evidence of how the reform efforts will be sustained after the SIG funds are no longer available.</p>	<p>school's improvement goals.</p> <p>Describes how funds will be redirected from various sources and used to support the school's improvement goals.</p> <p>Describes professional development that is aligned to the school's improvement goals, designed with the school staff, connected to standards, school curricula and is job-embedded.</p> <p>Describes other resources that are aligned with the schools improvement goals.</p> <p>Describes recruiting, screening, selecting and evaluating external supports. Describes how district will utilize external supports (i.e., Education Recovery Specialist, education cooperatives, site researchers, higher education personnel, etc.) as support and assistance.</p> <p>Describes the process used to review the practices and policies of the Board of Education and the School Based Councils to determine necessary modifications.</p> <p>Describes what practices and policies (i.e. staffing, calendars/time, budgeting, etc.) have been modified to ensure the school is able to implement the intervention model with fidelity.</p> <p>Describes how the reform efforts will be sustained when the SIG funds are no longer available. Description includes how identified state and federal funding and resources will be adjusted to continue practices and how the data analysis will continue to drive instructional</p>
---	---

	changes and annual goals.
--	---------------------------

Section 4: Timeline

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
Limited evidence of a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement an intervention model.	Describes a timeline that delineates the necessary steps to implement the selected intervention model.

Section 5: Annual Goals

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
Limited evidence of annual goals that will improve student achievement and classroom instruction.	Describes annual S.M.A.R.T. goals.
Limited evidence of quarterly benchmarks and how they will be used to monitor the school's annual improvement goals.	Describes quarterly benchmarks and how the district will determine that sufficient progress is being made toward the annual goals.
Limited evidence that the district is providing additional supports when a school is not making sufficient progress toward reaching annual goals.	Describes what the district will provide in support to ensure the school reaches its annual goals.

Note: Sections 6 and 7 are for Tier III only.

Section 8. Consultation

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
Limited evidence of consultation with stakeholders regarding the district's application and implementation of the school's intervention model.	Describes how the district consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the district's application and the implementation of the school's intervention model.

**C. BUDGET**

Section 1. Budget Narrative and Section 2. Budget

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
<p>Limited evidence of how funds are to be used at the school level.</p>	<p>Describes how the district intends to use the school improvement funds for each school it will serve.</p>
<p>Limited evidence of how the funds are aligned with state and federal funds.</p>	<p>Describes how the district aligned multiple state and federal funds with the selected intervention model. (May include but are not limited to Family Resource/Youth Service Centers, Preschool, Professional Development, Title I, Title II, Title III funds etc.)</p>
<p>Limited evidence of how other resources will be used to support the intervention model.</p>	<p>Describes how the district will use other resources (personnel, materials and services) to support the selected intervention model.</p>
<p>Limited evidence of how the district activities are to be used to support the school's intervention model.</p>	<p>Describes district level activities that support the implementation of the selected intervention model for Tier I and Tier II schools.</p>
<p>Limited evidence of a three year budget.</p>	<p>Contains complete budget information for each year of the three-year grant cycle for the district and each school it commits to serve.</p>
<p>Costs projected for each year do not reflect realistic amounts for implementing intervention model.</p>	<p>Costs projected for each year are reasonable within the context of the intervention model.</p>
<p>Limited evidence of alignment with the narrative description of the intervention model.</p>	<p>Budget information correlates with the narrative description of the intervention model.</p>
<p>Budgets are not within the minimum-maximum amounts.</p>	<p>Budgets are within the minimum \$50,000- maximum \$2 million amount for each school for each school the district commits to serve.</p>

**Attachment B**

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SECTION 1003G)  
KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER FORM**

**Tier III Application ONLY**

District: \_\_\_\_\_

Cover page signed \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
Schools to be served are listed \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
Tier status identified \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

<b>SECTIONS</b>	<b>Limited Evidence</b>	<b>Sufficient Evidence</b>
Section 1. Commitment to Serve		
Section 3. Actions		
Section 4. Timeline		
Section 6. Tier III Services		
Section 7. Tier III Annual Goals		
Section 8. Consultation		
Budget		

Overall strengths of the application:

Overall weaknesses of the application:

Approval will be granted when all sections are deemed "sufficient".

**B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION**

**Section 1. Commitment to Serve**

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
School level data from KY Interim Performance report and the NCLB report is provided with limited evidence of data analysis and few connections to need for intervention.	Describes school level data from KY Interim Performance report and the NCLB report with an analysis of the data indicating the school's need for intervention.
Limited evidence of analysis of non-cognitive data with few connections linking it to low student achievement.	Describes non-cognitive data and an analysis of how it contributes to low student achievement.
Limited evidence of causes and contributing factors with few connections to low student achievement and/or need for an improvement plan.	Describes analysis of causes and contributing factors to low student achievement and/or need for schoolwide improvement plan.
Limited evidence of how the improvement strategies were selected based on the needs analysis.	Describes how the improvement strategies were selected based on the needs analysis.

**Note: Section 2 addresses the district's capacity to serve Tier I schools. This rubric is for Tier III schools.**

**Section 3. Actions**

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
Limited evidence of technology integrated in classroom instruction and in addressing the school's improvement goals.	Describes how the school will integrate technology in classroom instruction (i.e., lesson development, formative assessments, student access, public relations, etc.) that support the school's improvement goals.
Limited evidence of family and community supports in planning, implementing and engaging partners in the improvement plan.	Describes how family and community supports will be involved in a meaningful way with planning, implementing and engaging partners in the improvement plan.
Limited evidence of personnel assigned to support school's improvement goals.	Describes how personnel have been assigned, or reassigned, to maximize these resources in addressing the school's improvement goals.

<p>Limited evidence of how funds will be redirected and used to support the improvement plan and the improvement goals.</p> <p>Limited evidence of professional development aligned to the school's improvement goals and is not job-embedded nor is it connected to classroom instructional practices.</p> <p>Limited evidence of resources (in addition to technology, family and community supports, personnel, other funds, and professional development) to address the school's improvement goals.</p> <p>Limited evidence of external support.</p> <p>Limited evidence of the process used to review practices and policies.</p> <p>Limited evidence of changes in practices and policies that prohibit a school from implementing the improvement plan with fidelity.</p> <p>Limited evidence of how the reform efforts will be sustained after the SIG funds are no longer available.</p>	<p>Describes how funds will be redirected from various sources and used to support the school's improvement goals.</p> <p>Describes professional development that is aligned to the school's improvement goals, designed with the school staff, connected to standards, school curricula and is job-embedded.</p> <p>Describes other resources that are aligned with the schools improvement goals.</p> <p>Describes recruiting, screening, selecting and evaluating external supports. Describes how district will utilize external supports (i.e., Education Recovery Specialist, education cooperatives, site researchers, higher education personnel, etc.) as support and assistance.</p> <p>Describes the process used to review the practices and policies of the Board of Education and the School Based Councils to determine necessary modifications.</p> <p>Describes what practices and policies (i.e. staffing, calendars/time, budgeting, etc.) have been modified to ensure the school is able to implement the improvement plan with fidelity.</p> <p>Describes how the reform efforts will be sustained when the SIG funds are no longer available. Description includes how identified state and federal funding and resources will be adjusted to continue practices and how the data analysis will continue to drive instructional changes and annual goals.</p>
--	--

Section 4: Timeline

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
Limited evidence of a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement an improvement plan.	Describes a timeline that delineates the necessary steps to implement the improvement plan.

**Note: Section 5: Annual Goals is specific to Tier I and Tier II schools and is not scored for Tier III schools.**

Section 6. Tier III Services

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
Limited evidence of district services to the school.	Describes services the district will provide to the school, including personnel and financial supports.
Limited evidence of activities the school will implement to improve student achievement.	Describes the activities and strategies that will be implemented in the school based on a comprehensive needs assessment. Activity and strategies are best practices and are research based.
Limited evidence of a school-wide literacy and mathematics plan.	Describes a plan to support schools in the creation and implementation of school-wide literacy and mathematics improvement plans

Section 7. Tier III Annual Goals

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
Limited evidence of annual goals that will improve student achievement and classroom instruction for reading/language arts and mathematics.	Describes annual S.M.A.R.T. goals for reading/language arts and mathematics.
Limited evidence of quarterly benchmarks and how they will be used to monitor the school's improvement goals.	Describes quarterly benchmarks and how the district will determine that sufficient progress is being made toward the annual goal.
Limited evidence that the district is providing additional supports when a school is not making sufficient progress toward reaching annual goals.	Describes what the district will provide in support to ensure the school reaches its annual goals.

Section 8. Consultation

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
Limited evidence of consultation with stakeholders regarding the district's application and implementation of the school's intervention model.	Describes how the district consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the district's application and the implementation of the school's intervention model.

**C. BUDGET**

Section 1. Budget Narrative and Section 2. Budget

LIMITED EVIDENCE	SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE
Limited evidence of how funds are to be used at the school level.	Describe how the district intends to use the school improvement funds for the schools it will serve.
Limited evidence of how the funds are aligned with state and federal funds.	Describes how the district aligned multiple state and federal funds with the selected intervention model. (May include but are not limited to Family Resource/Youth Service Centers, Preschool, Professional Development, Title I, Title II, Title III funds etc.)
Limited evidence of how other resources will be used to support the intervention model.	Describes how the district will use other resources (personnel, materials and services) to support the selected intervention model
Limited evidence of how the district activities are to be used to support the school's improvement plan.	Describes district level activities that support the implementation of the improvement plan developed for the Tier III schools it will serve.
Limited evidence of a three year budget.	Contains complete budget information for each year of the three-year grant cycle for the district and each school it commits to serve.
Costs projected for each year do not reflect realistic amounts for implementing intervention model.	Costs projected for each year are reasonable within the context of the intervention model.
Limited evidence of alignment with the narrative description of the	Budget information correlates with the narrative description of the intervention

<p>intervention model.</p> <p>Budgets are not within the minimum-maximum amounts.</p>	<p>model.</p> <p>Budgets are within the minimum \$50,000- maximum \$2 million amount for each school for each school the district commits to serve.</p>
---	---