

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Mississippi Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: 359 North West Street Post Office Box 771 Jackson, MS 39205</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Lynn J. House, Ph.D.</p> <p>Position and Office: Deputy State Superintendent, Office of Instructional Enhancement and Internal Operations</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: 359 North West Street Post Office Box 771 Jackson, MS 39205</p> <p>Telephone: (601) 359-3077</p> <p>Fax: (601) 359-2566</p> <p>Email address: lhouse@mde.k12.ms.us</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Tom Burnham, Ed.D.</p>	<p>Telephone: (601) 359-1750</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X <u>Tom Burnham</u></p>	<p>Date: July 29, 2010</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>	

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF NEED

To have a complete and accurate understanding of the need for 1003(g) school improvement funding to help facilitate an educational system that prepares students in Mississippi for a competitive global economy, it is imperative to consider and understand the relevant issues unique to the state. According to the *2010 Statistical Abstract* published by the Census Bureau, Mississippi's population ranks 31st in the nation with a total of 2,938,618 residents.

Although a large portion of Mississippi remains rural, it is most prominent in the Mississippi Delta region where agriculture continues to be the main source of income. Mississippi struggles to balance the needs of these rural areas with the needs of the state's 3 urban areas. Statewide, the median household income ranks 50th in the nation at \$36,338, with 20.6% of the population living in poverty (1st in the nation), making it the poorest state in the nation. The unemployment rate is 2nd highest in the nation at 6.3%, the number of doctors per 100,000 residents is 177 (48th lowest in the nation), Mississippi's teen pregnancy rate is the highest in the nation (60 percent higher than the national average), and the infant mortality rate is the highest in the nation at 11.4%.

Considering that assessments have shown a high correlation between race, poverty and scoring below proficient on the state's assessments, poverty and its well-documented ties to African-Americans is an issue that must be addressed and resolved by the entire nation. In Mississippi the ties between poverty and race are even more critical considering that over 37% of Mississippi residents are African-American giving the state the highest concentration of African-American residents in the nation; within the state, the highest concentration of African-American residents is in the Delta region.

Further complicating the issue, Mississippi faces the challenge of educating one of the highest per-capita populations of children in the nation (6th highest in the nation with 26.3% of its population under 18 years old) with so few financial resources. According to the 2008-2009 Mississippi Report Card, enrollment for Mississippi's schools for the school year was 484,735 students, 58.42% of which were participating in the National School Lunch Program. The majority of Mississippi's districts are small. Only 29 of the 152 districts have an enrollment over 4,000. According to the most recent statistics available, only 75.9% of high school students graduate and only 18.9% (47th lowest in the nation) of residents over 25 have a bachelor's degree.

In spite of the financial hardships Mississippi faces, educational leadership affirmed its commitment to preparing Mississippi's children to succeed in the 21st century economy by raising state standards so that Mississippi's students are challenged at a much higher level. New curriculum standards aligned more closely with the National Assessment of Educational Progress were established and are being implemented. In November 2009, leadership reaffirmed its commitment to facing the challenge by releasing a new state accountability rating system aligned with the more rigorous curriculum which has Mississippi students competing against the national average rather than the state average. In this first year of

implementation of the new accountability ratings system, only four percent of Mississippi's schools received the system's highest rating of Star School and only 17 percent of schools reached the next highest rating of High Performing. Both Star and High Performing schools are performing above the national average. The state's legislators and governor also affirmed their commitment to the educational system by fully funding the Mississippi Adequate Education Program in the 2008-2009 school year.

However, even with the highest amount of state funding provided, Mississippi still lacks many of the resources needed to provide its children with an education that is globally competitive. Funding for the Title I, Part A §1003(a) and Title I, Part A §1003(g) school improvement grants, State Longitudinal Data System Project Application and the Race to the Top grant application are critical, particularly in the current economic climate, for implementing the broad scope of change Mississippi so critically needs if it is to produce a workforce that can compete globally.

SECTION A: Eligible Schools

TOTAL LEAS	TOTAL SCHOOLS	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
100	225	7	50	169	2	158

Each eligible school can be found in Attachment A.

Attachment B contains Mississippi’s definition of persistently lowest achieving schools.

SECTION B: Grant Evaluation Criteria

Part I—LEA Plans & Capacity

Requirement 1—Selecting an intervention: The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT: All local educational agencies in Mississippi are required to conduct an annual comprehensive needs assessment. The qualitative and quantitative data helps schools to monitor and assess the impact of programs and instruction on student achievement. The comprehensive needs assessment focuses on gathering data in five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization. Data must be disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency, in order to compare the achievement between subgroups. Data may be examined across multiple years, grade levels or schools to identify patterns and trends. By using multiple data sources to triangulate the data, priority needs emerge from a foundation supported by objective data.

Each LEA seeking SIG funds must conduct the comprehensive needs assessment to determine the needs of each eligible school and the capacity of the LEA to serve each eligible school.

SELECTING AN INTERVENTION: As a companion document to the needs assessment, the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) will provide LEAs with a decision-making tool which uses the results of the needs assessment to assist LEAs in selecting a “best fit” intervention. This decision-making tool is based on work by the Center on Innovation and Improvement. LEAs will be asked to use this or a similar tool to aid in the selection of the appropriate intervention.

The evaluation of an LEA’s intervention selection for each school is embedded within the evaluation of each school proposal, which is part of the LEA application. If an LEA’s selection

for an individual school does not align with the results of the needs assessment, MDE may reject the portion of the LEA’s application that pertains to the eligible school. MDE may then collaborate with the district to find a more appropriate intervention.

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

DETERMINING CAPACITY: As described in Part I, Requirement 1, each LEA will conduct a needs assessment. This needs assessment will not only evaluate individual schools, it will also evaluate the existing capacity of district leadership and of district operation and support systems. MDE will determine whether the LEA has the existing capacity to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools based on the results of these two parts of the five-dimension comprehensive needs assessment.

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

FISCAL PLANS: Within the LEA application, the LEA will provide an LEA fiscal plan for funding reform as well as detailed fiscal plans for each school proposal. MDE will judge each of these fiscal plans in order to determine whether the LEA is providing sufficient funds to implement the selected interventions fully and effectively.

The LEA fiscal plan will include the following information:

- *Financial Policies*—The LEA’s financial policies, including financial controls and audit requirements
- *SIG Budget*—A budget detailing the use of SIG funds on the district-level to implement reforms; LEAs must use the budget spreadsheet provided
- *Budget Narrative*—Description of the budget items included in the LEA’s SIG budget; LEAs must use the budget narrative form provided
- *Additional Resources*—A description of supplemental financial resources (above and beyond normal school expenditures) or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s school reforms
- *Alignment*—Evidence of alignment of the fiscal plan with the budgets in each school proposal

Each school proposal will include the following information:

- *Budget*—A budget spreadsheet for the school in the format provided by MDE

- *Budget Narrative*—Description of the budget items in the format provided by MDE
- *Additional Resources*—A description of supplemental financial resources or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s plans
- *Alignment*—Evidence of alignment of the budget with the information detailed in the school proposal

Part II—LEA Commitment

Requirement 1—Design and Implementation: Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

LEA PLAN OVERVIEW: When an LEA applies for a School Improvement Grant for one or more schools, the LEA must complete an LEA Plan Overview containing information relevant to every eligible SIG school that the LEA seeks to serve. The LEA Plan Overview information aligns with district-wide information collected in the needs assessment. The school proposals (described below) will be appended to the LEA Plan Overview to comprise the complete LEA Application.

- I. **Introduction**—An introduction of the application to include an Executive Summary, Descriptive Information about the Eligible Schools, and Intervention Selection Information
 - A. **Executive Summary**—An executive summary of the LEA application, not to exceed five pages; this summary should be a narrative of the LEA’s reform agenda as it relates to its portfolio of eligible schools
 - B. **Descriptive Information about the Eligible Schools**—Information to include the official names of the schools, Tier designations, and state accountability labels
 - C. **Intervention Selection Information**—Information to include
 1. **Identification**—A chart matching each school to the selected intervention
 2. **Capacity for selected interventions**—Evidence an LEA’s portfolio of school reforms does not exceed its capacity
 - D. **Assurances**— A signed copy of the LEA Assurances (see attached LEA application, pages 19-23)
 - E. **Consultation With Stakeholders** – A description of the LEA’s consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools
- II. **District Leadership**—An overview of issues related to district leadership, including
 - A. **District Governance**
 1. **Policy Analysis and Timeline**—An analysis of district and school policies that may create barriers to reform (see LEA application) as well as a timeline for changes to take effect

- i. Current Policies and Practices— Copies of current policies and practices that must be changed as well as a description of how these policies or practices prevent the effective implementation of an intervention
 - ii. Proposed or Approved Policy Changes—Language of proposed or approved policy changes and how these changes support the implementation of an intervention (approved policy changes may be approved contingent upon receiving grant funds)
- 2. School Board Approval—Evidence that the LEA has secured formal approval of each school proposal and the LEA application from the school board
- 3. Lead Partner Contracts—Copies of proposed Lead Partner Contracts which meet MDE’s standards for contracting or an assurance that the LEA will use MDE’s model Memorandum of Understanding with Lead Partners
- B. LEA Fiscal Plan—A fiscal plan to include
 - 1. Financial Policies—The LEA’s financial policies, including financial controls and audit requirements
 - 2. SIG Budget—A budget detailing the use of SIG funds on the district-level to implement reforms; LEAs must use the budget spreadsheet provided
 - 3. Budget Narrative—Description of the budget items included in the LEA’s SIG budget; LEAs must use the budget narrative form provided
 - 4. Additional Resources—A description of supplemental financial resources (above and beyond normal school expenditures) or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s school reforms
 - 5. Alignment—Evidence of alignment of the fiscal plan with the budgets in each school proposal

OPTION 1—TURNAROUND: For each school that an LEA chooses to “turnaround,” the LEA must develop a School Turnaround Proposal. Elements of the School Turnaround Proposal will be evaluated according to the attached rubric. A School Turnaround Proposal is organized by the framework of the Needs Assessment and includes the information outlined below:

- I. Introduction**—An introduction of the proposal to include an Executive Summary, Descriptive Information about the Eligible School, Alignment with the Intervention Requirements, and Implementation Milestones, including a Start-up Plan
 - A. Executive Summary—An executive summary of the proposal, not to exceed three pages; this summary should be a narrative of the school’s new design
 - B. Descriptive Information about the Eligible School—Information to include the official name of the school, the school code, Tier designation, and state accountability label; the grades served by the school; and the minimum, planned, and maximum enrollment per grade per year for the full term of the grant

- C. Alignment with the Needs Assessment— A description of how a turnaround model addresses the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment
 - D. Alignment with Intervention Requirements—An account detailing how the proposal meets each of the requirements for the turnaround intervention
 - E. Implementation Milestones—A detailed listing of the major steps in the implementation process to include timelines, responsible individuals for accomplishing them, and a Start-up Plan
- II. Teaching and Learning**—A plan for high-quality teaching and learning that addresses Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, and Instructional Leadership and Staff
- A. Curriculum—A description of the academic program (courses, curriculum overview, and pacing guides) aligned with the state standards
 - 1. Research-based—Evidence that the curriculum is research-based
 - 2. Vertical alignment—Evidence that the curriculum is vertically aligned year-to-year
 - B. Instruction—A description of the school's instructional design, including the type of learning environment (such as classroom-based or independent study), class size and structure, and teaching methods.
 - 1. Three Tier Instructional Model—Identification of personalized academic and non-academic support services which support the school’s Intervention Plan in accordance with State Board of Education Policy 4300
 - 2. Data-driven decision-making—Plans for data-driven decision-making for all activities relating to instructional strategies and student-level interventions
 - 3. Special populations—The school's plans for identifying and successfully serving students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind, and gifted students, including but not limited to compliance with applicable laws and regulations
 - 4. Increased Time—Plans regarding school schedule, length of school day, length of school year
 - C. Assessments—The school's plan for using internal and external assessments to measure and report student progress on the performance framework (see LEA application). Additionally, the LEA must outline plans for the development and use of formative, interim, and summative assessments permitting immediate analysis, feedback, and targeted instruction
 - D. Instructional Leadership and Staff—A school staffing plan to include
 - 1. Staffing Chart—A staffing chart for the school's first year and any plans for growing or changing the staff during the term of the grant
 - 2. Roles and Responsibilities—A clear description of the roles and responsibilities for positions noted in the staffing chart, especially the school's leadership and management team

III. Operation and Support Systems—A plan for operation and support systems which addresses Allocation of Financial Resources; Human Resource Systems, Organizational Structures and Management; Support for Teaching and Learning; and Parent and Community Engagement

- A. Allocation of Financial Resources—A fiscal plan which describes
 - 1. Budget—A budget spreadsheet for the school in the format provided by MDE
 - 2. Budget Narrative—Description of the budget items in the format provided by MDE
 - 3. Additional Resources—A description of supplemental financial resources or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s plans
 - 4. Alignment—Evidence of alignment of the budget with the information detailed in the school proposal
- B. Human Resource Systems
 - 1. Recruiting and Hiring New Staff—Plans for recruiting new school leadership and staff, including reliance on any Lead Partners
 - i. Turnaround School Leader—A copy of the proposed job description as well as the process for evaluating applicants to select for a strong leader with a proven-track record of success in raising student achievement and, if applicable, increasing graduation rates
 - ii. Instructional Staff—A process for evaluating applicants to select for effective teachers with a record of success in raising student achievement who also possess qualities that equip them to succeed in the turnaround environment
 - iii. Financial Incentives—A description of financial incentives (such as signing bonuses, moving reimbursement, or loan repayment) that the LEA may use to recruit staff
 - 2. Screening and Re-Hiring No More Than 50% of Current Staff—A process for screening and re-hiring current staff with a record of success in raising student achievement who also possess qualities that equip them to succeed in the turnaround environment
 - 3. Employment Policies—The school’s leadership and teacher employment policies which address
 - i. Placement—Process for assigning teachers to work with specific grades, subjects, and/or groups of students
 - ii. Opportunities for promotion and career growth—A description of available career ladders for teachers and leadership or a description of opportunities for highly effective teachers to help shape and implement the reform effort
 - iii. Termination—Process for staff termination (post-turnaround) after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice

C. Organizational Structures and Management

1. Governance—An organization chart that clearly presents the school's new governance structure, including lines of authority and reporting between the school and the governing board, district-level staff, any related bodies (such as advisory bodies or parent and teacher councils), and any external organizations that will play a role in managing the school
 - i. District-Level Staff: A description of the district-level staff or structures that provide services to or oversee the turnaround school, such as whether the school reports to a new “turnaround office” in the LEA or to a district-level “turnaround leader” who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer; this description should provide the roles and responsibilities of relevant district-level staff as well as the qualifications required for these positions
 - ii. School Autonomy: A description of the school’s autonomy in making decisions related to such items as staffing, calendars/time, procedures, and budgeting or other important operations as well as how such autonomy is tied to accountability measures
2. Lead Partners—Explanations of any partnerships or contractual relationships central to the school's operations or mission, including how these partnerships align with the school proposal and the scope of work of each partner as outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding
3. Operational Services—The school's plans for providing transportation, food service, and all other significant operational or ancillary services, especially as related to extended time outside the regular school day
4. Discipline—The school's student discipline policies, including those for special education students

D. Support for Teaching and Learning

1. Professional Development—Plans for creating targeted, job-specific and job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s 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 (Role of Lead Partners – if applicable, a description of the role of Lead Partners in creating or delivering professional development)
2. Time for Faculty Collaboration—Evidence of adequate time for regular, frequent, faculty meetings and/or meetings with teams of teachers, i.e. grade level, department level, special services to discuss individual student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches and other reforms, and school-wide efforts in support of the school proposal

3. Evaluation Policies—Plans for rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for instructional staff and leadership. Evidence that the evaluation systems 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.
- E. Parent and Community Engagement—A description of opportunities for parent and community engagement

OPTION 2—RE-START: Mississippi does not have charter school legislation at this time. Furthermore, under Mississippi law, school districts do not have the authority to turn management of a school over to an Education Management Organization under charter-like conditions. Bills currently pending before the Mississippi Legislature would authorize charter schools or charter-like conditions at traditional public schools. If any of the bills enabling a “re-start” model is signed into law and would take effect during the grant period, Mississippi will submit an amended School Improvement Grant application.

OPTION 3—CLOSE AND CONSOLIDATE SCHOOLS: For each school that an LEA chooses to close and consolidate with a nearby higher-performing school, the LEA must develop a School Consolidation Proposal. Elements of the School Consolidation Proposal will be evaluated according to the attached rubric. A School Consolidation Proposal is organized by the framework of the Needs Assessment and includes the information outlined below:

- I. **Introduction**—An introduction of proposal to include an Executive Summary, Descriptive Information about the Eligible Schools, Alignment with the Intervention Requirements, and Implementation Milestones, including a Start-up Plan
 - A. Executive Summary—An executive summary of the proposal, not to exceed three pages; this summary should be a narrative of the consolidation process and expected outcomes
 - B. Descriptive Information about the Eligible Schools—Information to include
 1. Eligible Schools—The official school name, the school code, Tier designation, and state accountability label of the school from which students will be transferred and the school name(s), school code(s), and state accountability label(s) of the higher achieving school or schools to which students will be transferred
 2. Grades Served—The grades served by the newly consolidated school or schools, and if the consolidation is phased-in, the grades to be served each year by the closing school and each consolidated school
 3. Enrollment—The minimum, planned, and maximum enrollment per grade per year for the full term of the grant of each eligible school and any resulting alterations in attendance zones or feeder patterns
 - C. Alignment with the Needs Assessment—A description of how the consolidation model addresses the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment

- D. Alignment with Intervention Requirements—An account detailing how the proposal meets each of the requirements for the close and consolidate intervention
- E. Implementation Milestones—A detailed listing of the major steps in the implementation process to include timelines, responsible individuals for accomplishing them, and a Start-up Plan

II. Teaching and Learning—For each newly consolidated school, a plan for high-quality teaching and learning that addresses Instruction and Instructional Leadership and Staff

- A. Instruction— A brief description of the consolidated school’s instructional design, including the type of learning environment (such as classroom-based or independent study), class size and structure, and teaching methods. Additionally, the description must include the consolidated school’s plans identifying and successfully serving new students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind, and gifted students, including but not limited to compliance with applicable laws and regulations
- B. Instructional Leadership and Staff—A school staffing plan
 - 1. Staffing Chart—A staffing chart for the consolidated school, and if consolidation is phased in, staffing charts for each year of the grant
 - 2. Roles and Responsibilities—A clear description of the roles and responsibilities for positions noted in the staffing chart, especially of the school’s leadership and management
 - 3. Current Staff—The names and qualifications of current staff who will be part of the intervention as well as the current positions these staff hold

III. Operation and Support Systems—A plan for each newly consolidated school which addresses Allocation of Financial Resources; Organizational Structures and Management; and Parent and Community Outreach

- A. Allocation of Financial Resources—A fiscal plan which describes
 - 1. Budget—A budget spreadsheet for the school in the format provided by MDE
 - 2. Budget Narrative—Description of the budget items in the format provided by MDE
 - 3. Additional Resources—Evidence of supplemental financial resources or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s plans
 - 4. Alignment—Evidence of alignment of the budget with the information detailed in the School Consolidation Proposal
- B. Organizational Structures and Management
 - 1. District-Level Staff—A description of roles and responsibilities of district-level staff who will be involved in the consolidation process
 - 2. Facilities—Information pertaining to the use of facilities, including any necessary facility changes to accommodate additional students or students of a different age

3. Operational Services—The school’s plans for providing transportation and all other significant operational or supplemental services related to and affected by consolidation
- C. Parent and Community Outreach—Plans for parent and community outreach related to a student’s transition to a new school which may include
1. Media outreach—Planned press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, or direct mail notices
 2. Opportunities for questions and answers—Hotlines or meetings regarding the school closure
 3. Available services—A description of services to help parents and students transition to a new school

OPTION 4—TRANSFORMATION: For each school that an LEA chooses to “transform,” the LEA must develop a School Transformation Proposal. Elements of the School Transformation Proposal will be evaluated according to the attached rubric. A School Transformation Proposal is organized by the framework of the Needs Assessment and includes the information outlined below:

- I. **Introduction**—An introduction of proposal to include an Executive Summary, Descriptive Information about the Eligible School, Alignment with the Intervention Requirements, and Implementation Milestones, including a Start-up Plan
 - A. Executive Summary—An executive summary of the proposal, not to exceed three pages; this summary should be a narrative of the school’s new design
 - B. Descriptive Information about the Eligible School—Information to include the official name of the school, the school code, Tier designation, and state accountability label; the grades served by the school; and the minimum, planned, and maximum enrollment per grade per year for the full term of the grant
 - C. Alignment with the Needs Assessment— A description of how a transformation model addresses the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment
 - D. Alignment with Intervention Requirements—An account detailing how the proposal meets each of the requirements for the transformation intervention
 - E. Implementation Milestones—A detailed listing of the major steps in the implementation process to include timelines, responsible individuals for accomplishing them, and a Start-up Plan
- II. **Teaching and Learning**—A plan for high-quality teaching and learning that addresses Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, Instructional Leadership and Staff
 - A. Curriculum— A description of the academic program (courses, curriculum overview, and pacing guides) aligned with the state standards
 1. Research-based—Evidence that the curriculum is research-based

2. Vertical alignment—Evidence that the curriculum is vertically aligned year-to-year
- B. Instruction—A description of the school’s instructional design, including the type of learning environment (such as classroom-based or independent study), class size and structure, teaching methods, and how this instructional design differs from previous programs.
1. Three Tier Instructional Model—Identification of personalized academic and non-academic support services which support the school’s Intervention Plan in accordance with State Board of Education Policy 4300
 2. Data-driven decision-making—Plans for data-driven decision-making for all activities relating to instructional strategies and student-level interventions
 3. Special Populations—The school’s plans for identifying and successfully serving students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind, and gifted students, including but not limited to compliance with applicable laws and regulations
 4. Increased Time—Plans regarding school schedule, length of school day, length of school year
- C. Assessments—The school's plan for using internal and external assessments to measure and report student progress on the performance framework (see LEA application). Additionally, the LEA must outline plans for the development and use of formative, interim, and summative assessments permitting immediate analysis, feedback, and targeted instruction
- D. Instructional Leadership and Staff—A school staffing plan to include
1. Staffing Chart—A staffing chart for the school’s first year and any plans for growing or changing the staff during the term of the grant
 2. Roles and Responsibilities—A clear description of the roles and responsibilities for positions noted in the staffing chart, especially the school’s leadership and management team

III. Operation and Support Systems—A plan for operation and support systems which addresses Allocation of Financial Resources; Human Resource Systems, Organizational Structures and Management; Support for Teaching and Learning; and Parent and Community Engagement

- A. Allocation of Financial Resources—A fiscal plan which describes
1. Budget—A budget spreadsheet for the school in the format provided by MDE
 2. Budget Narrative—Description of the budget items in the format provided by MDE
 3. Additional Resources—Evidence of supplemental financial resources or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s plans
 4. Alignment—Evidence of alignment of the budget with the information detailed in the School Consolidation Proposal

B. Human Resource Systems

1. Recruitment and Hiring—Plans for recruiting new school leadership and staff, including reliance on any Lead Partners
 - i. Transformation School Leader—A copy of the proposed job description as well as the process for evaluating applicants to select for a strong leader with a proven-track record of success in raising student achievement and, if applicable, increasing graduation rates
 - ii. Instructional Staff—A process for evaluating applicants to select for effective teachers with a record of success in raising student achievement who also possess qualities that equip them to succeed in the transformation environment
 - iii. Financial incentives—A description of financial incentives (such as signing bonuses, moving reimbursement, or loan repayment) that the LEA may use to recruit staff
2. Employment Policies—The school’s leadership and teacher employment policies which address
 - i. Placement—Process for assigning teachers to work with specific grades, subjects, and/or groups of students
 - ii. Financial rewards—Plans for financially rewarding staff for student achievement by providing individual, team, or school-wide salary bonuses or raises or loan repayment
 - iii. Opportunities for promotion and career growth—A description of available career ladders for teachers and leadership or a description of opportunities for highly effective teachers to help shape and implement the reform effort
 - iv. Termination—Process for staff termination after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice

C. Organizational Structures and Management

1. Governance—An organization chart that clearly presents the school's governance structure, including lines of authority and reporting between the school and the governing board, district-level staff, any related bodies (such as advisory bodies or parent and teacher councils), and any external organizations that will play a role in managing the school
 - i. District-Level Staff—A description of the district-level staff or structures that provide services or oversee the transformation school; this description should provide the roles and responsibilities of relevant district-level staff as well as the qualifications required for these positions
 - ii. School Autonomy—A description of the school’s autonomy in making decisions related to such items as staffing, calendars/time, procedures, and budgeting or other important operations as well as how such autonomy is tied to

accountability measures

2. Lead Partners—Explanations of any partnerships or contractual relationships central to the school's operations or mission, including how these partnerships align with the school proposal and the scope of work of each external partner as noted in the Memorandum of Understanding.
3. Operational Services—The school's plans for providing transportation, food service, and all other significant operational or ancillary services, especially as related to extended time outside the regular school day
4. Discipline—The school's student discipline policies, including those for special education students

D. Support for Teaching and Learning

1. Professional Development—Plans for creating targeted, job-specific and job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's 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
 - i. Role of Lead Partners—If applicable, a description of the role of Lead Partners in creating or delivering professional development
 - ii. Integration of existing professional development activities—Plans for integrating or eliminating professional development programs currently impacting the school
2. Time for Faculty Collaboration—Evidence of adequate time for regular, frequent faculty meetings and/or meetings with teams of teachers, i.e. grade level, department level, special services, to discuss individual student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches and other reforms, and school-wide efforts in support of the school proposal
3. Evaluation Policies—Plans for rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for instructional staff and leadership which incorporate
 - i. Student growth—Evidence that evaluation systems 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
 - ii. Staff input—Description of how systems have been designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement

E. Parent and Community Engagement—A description of ongoing opportunities and structures for parent and community engagement such as the establishment of organized parent groups, public meetings involving parents and community members to review school performance and help develop school improvement plans, surveys to

gauge parent and community satisfaction and support for local public schools, complaint procedures for families, coordination with local social and health service providers to help meet family needs, and parent education classes (including GED, adult literacy, and ESL programs)

INTERVENTION REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDANCE

The pages in this section describe the required elements of each intervention in addition to suggested optional elements for an intervention and a few commonly asked questions. For more guidance, go to <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/guidance20100120.doc>.

TURNAROUND

Requirements

1. Replace the principal and grant the newly hired 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 Conservator, 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.

Optional Elements

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 turnaround 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.

Definition of “job-embedded” professional development:

- It occurs on a regular basis (*e.g.*, daily or weekly);
- It is aligned with academic standards, school curricula, and school improvement goals;
- It involves educators working together collaboratively and is often facilitated by school instructional leaders or school-based professional development coaches or mentors;
- It requires active engagement rather than passive learning by participants; and
- It focuses on understanding what and how students are learning and on how to address students’ learning needs, including reviewing student work and achievement data and collaboratively planning, testing, and adjusting instructional strategies, formative assessments, and materials based on such data.

Job-embedded professional development can take many forms, including, but not limited to, classroom coaching, structured common planning time, meetings with mentors, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice.

When implemented as part of a turnaround model, job-embedded professional development must be designed with school staff.

Guidance

Must a turnaround school proposal contain plans to adopt a new instructional design?

Not necessarily. In implementing a turnaround model, an LEA must use data to identify an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned as well as aligned with State academic standards. If an LEA determines, based on a careful review of appropriate data, that the instructional program currently being implemented in a particular school is research-based and properly aligned, it may continue to implement that instructional program. However, the Department expects that most LEAs with Tier I or Tier II schools will need to make at least minor adjustments to the instructional programs in those schools to ensure that those programs are, in fact, research-based and properly aligned.

What are some examples of social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for

students that may be provided through Response to Intervention?

Social-emotional and community-oriented services that may be offered to students in a school implementing a turnaround model may include health, nutrition, or social services that may be provided in partnership with local service providers, or services such as a family literacy program for parents who need to improve their literacy skills in order to support their children's learning. An LEA should examine the needs of students in the turnaround school to determine which social-emotional and community-oriented services will be appropriate and useful under the circumstances.

CONSOLIDATION

What costs associated with closing a school can be paid for with SIG funds?

An LEA may use SIG funds to pay certain reasonable and necessary costs associated with closing a Tier I or Tier II school, such as costs related to parent and community outreach, including, but not limited to, press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, hotlines, direct mail notices, or meetings regarding the school closure; services to help parents and students transition to a new school; or orientation activities, including open houses, that are specifically designed for students attending a new school after their prior school closes. Other costs, such as revising transportation routes, transporting students to their new school, or making class assignments in a new school, are regular responsibilities an LEA carries out for all students and generally may not be paid for with SIG funds. However, an LEA may use SIG funds to cover these types of costs associated with its general responsibilities if the costs are directly attributable to the school closure and exceed the costs the LEA would have incurred in the absence of the closure.

May SIG funds be used in the school that is receiving students who previously attended a school that is subject to closure in order to cover the costs associated with accommodating those students?

No. In general, the costs a receiving school will incur to accommodate students who are moved from a closed school are costs that an LEA is expected to cover, and may not be paid for with SIG funds. However, to the extent a receiving school is a Title I school that increases its population of children from low-income families, the school should receive additional Title I, Part A funds through the Title I, Part A funding formula, and those Title I, Part A funds could be used to cover the educational costs for these new students. If the school is not currently a Title I school, the addition of children from low-income families from a closed school might make it an eligible school.

Is the portion of an LEA's SIG subgrant that is to be used to implement a school closure renewable?

Generally, no. The portion of an LEA's SIG subgrant for a school that is subject to closure is limited to the time necessary to close the school — usually one year or less. As such, the funds allocated for a school closure would not be subject to renewal.

TRANSFORMATION

Requirements

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;
5. Implement such strategies as financial incentives and increased opportunities for promotion and career growth 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;
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;
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;
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 transformation organization or an EMO).

Optional Elements

In addition to the required activities for a transformation model, an LEA may also implement other strategies such as:

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;
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;
4. 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;
5. 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;
6. Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program;
7. 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;

- d. Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or to graduate;
8. 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;
9. 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;
10. 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;
11. Expanding the school program to offer pre-kindergarten;
12. Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a transformation division within the LEA or SEA; or
13. Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Guidance

Must the principal and teachers involved in the development and design of the evaluation system be the principal and teachers in the school in which the transformation model is being implemented?

No. The requirement for teacher and principal evaluation systems that “are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement” refers more generally to involvement by teachers and principals within the LEA using such systems, and may or may not include teachers and principals in a school implementing the transformation model.

More guidance can be found at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/guidance20100120.doc>.

Requirement 2—Lead Partners: Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

RECRUITMENT AND SCREENING OF LEAD PARTNERS: MDE will provide LEAs with a list of pre-qualified Lead Partners that LEAs must use if they choose to contract with an external provider. The MDE will approve all lead partners through a rigorous, evidence based screening process to serve eligible LEAs, and will assist LEAs in recruitment of Lead Partners that meet the needs of their schools.

SELECTION OF LEAD PARTNERS: LEAs who choose to contract with a Lead Partner must identify which Lead Partner(s) they have selected for each applicable school as part of each school proposal. Within the school proposals, LEAs will address and be evaluated on the following two dimensions for their Lead Partner selections:

- *Alignment*—How does each selected Lead Partner’s expertise align with the needs of the school as determined by the needs assessment AND the requirements of the intervention model?
- *Scope of Work*—What is the exact scope of work that the Lead Partner will engage in for each applicable school?

Finally, within the LEA Plan Overview, the LEA will address and be evaluated on whether proposed contracts for Lead Partners meet MDE’s standards for contracting.

Requirement 3—Financial and Human Capital: Align other resources with the interventions.

FISCAL SUPPORT: LEAs will provide detailed financial information for *each* school proposal in addition to its district-wide budget (see Part I, Requirement 3). This financial information will include a budget, budget narrative, a description of additional (non-SIG) resources, and evidence of alignment between the budget and the school proposal. MDE will judge the adequacy of these resources as part of its review of each school proposal (see the LEA application for rubrics). Should MDE find a school proposal lacks sufficient resources to be implemented fully and effectively, MDE may either ask an LEA to revise and resubmit the proposal or, if the school is a Tier III school, reject the proposal in question.

HUMAN RESOURCES: In each school proposal, LEAs will describe how it will bring additional human resources to bear through changes in staffing or governance structures at the school- and district-level or through the involvement of external service providers. Changes to staffing or governance structures can be found in the “Governance” and “Human Resource Systems” sections of the school proposals. The involvement of external service providers can be found in the “Lead Partners” section of the school proposals.

Requirement 4—Conditions for Reform: Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL AND DISTRICT POLICIES: MDE will provide LEAs a list of policy topics (see LEA application) that may need modification in order to implement each intervention. Each LEA will analyze whether it has policies that will prevent the full and effective implementation of chosen interventions. Within the LEA application, LEA must then provide

- *Current Policies and Practices*— Copies of current policies and practices that must be changed as well as a description of how these policies or practices prevent the effective implementation of an intervention
- *Proposed or Approved Policy Changes*—Language of proposed or approved policy changes and how these changes support the implementation of an intervention (approved policy changes may be approved contingent upon receiving grant funds)

TIMELINE FOR CHANGING POLICIES: LEAs will provide a timeline detailing when important policy changes will occur. This timeline must align with each policy change that an LEA identifies as necessary.

Requirement 5—Sustainability: Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

Although sustainability will ultimately be a function of an LEA’s implementation of its plan, MDE will assess the probability that an LEA will sustain the reforms after the funding period by the extent to which an LEA’s plan sets a foundation for making the reforms successful. MDE believes this foundation is composed of an LEA’s plans for implementation, building in-house capacity, and fostering community engagement. These three dimensions are embedded within the school proposals an LEA will submit as part of its application.

- *Implementation*—Does the LEA’s application describe thoughtful, workable plans for implementation? This question can be evaluated by examining the “Implementation Milestones” portion of each school proposal.
- *In-house capacity*—Does the LEA’s application describe plans to develop in-house capacity at the school- and district-level over the funding period? This question can be evaluated by examining the answers to the following portions of each school proposal: “Human Resource Systems,” especially “Recruiting and Hiring New Staff” and “Employment Policies;” “Lead Partners;” and “Support for Teaching and Learning,” especially “Professional Development.”
- *Community engagement*—Does the LEA’s application reflect a plan for fostering community engagement and, as a consequence, support for the reform model at each school over the funding period? This question can be evaluated by examining the answers to the “Parent and Community Engagement” portion of each school proposal.

SECTION C: Lack of Capacity

LIST OF LEAS WITH TIER I SCHOOLS: Mississippi has 6 districts with Tier I schools. Five of the district each have one Tier I school, and one district has two Tier I school. Of districts with Tier I schools, Coahoma AHS and South Pike have no Tier II or Tier III schools.

<u>School District</u>	<u>Tier I Schools of Total Identified Schools</u>
Coahoma AHS	1 of 1 school
Hazlehurst City	1 of 2 schools
Jackson Public	1 of 10 schools
South Pike	1 of 1 school
Holmes County	2 of 6 schools
Sunflower County	1 of 3 schools

EVALUATING LACK OF CAPACITY: LEAs with Tier I schools that seek to serve their Tier II or Tier III schools but not their Tier I school due to lack of capacity must explain this decision within the LEA application. MDE will evaluate this explanation in conjunction with the assessment of an LEA's capacity based on the results of the needs assessment (see Section B—Part I, Requirement 1).

LEAS WITH MORE THAN DEMONSTRATED CAPACITY: If MDE determines that an LEA has sufficient capacity to serve its Tier I school or schools, MDE will notify the LEA that it is ineligible to receive funds for any Tier II or Tier III schools until the LEA produces a quality plan for serving its Tier I school or schools.

- *Technical Assistance*—LEAs in this category will be offered additional technical assistance from MDE in order to complete the application.

SECTION D: Descriptive Information

Requirement 1—Application Process & Timeline: Describe the SEA's process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

APPLICATION PROCESS: MDE will institute the following process for approving LEA applications:

- *Letters of Intent*—LEAs will submit letters of intent to apply for funds to MDE in order for MDE to recruit enough external parties to serve as Qualified Evaluators to review applications.
- *Application*—MDE will release the final LEA application to all LEAs with eligible schools upon approval of the application by the U.S. Department of Education.
- *Needs Assessment*—Before submitting a proposal, LEAs must ensure that the required needs assessment has been conducted.
- *Application Submission and Review*—MDE will recruit qualified external reviewers to

evaluate applications based on MDE-created rubrics. These reviewers will recommend whether LEAs should be granted funds for each of its school proposals and how much funding each school proposal should receive.

- *Grant Awards*—Based on the recommendations of the external review team, MDE will award grants to LEAs for none, some, or all of the schools included in their proposals.

TIMELINE: MDE will adhere to the following timeline for approving LEA applications:

MONTH	ACTION
February 2010	USDE Webinars/SEA Application Development List of schools in each tier disseminated
March 2010	State application submitted/Letters of Intent submitted Districts receive applications after USDE approval
April 2010	District applications submitted to MDE
May 2010	Methodology for awarding grants recommended to SBE
May/June 2010	District applications reviewed
June 2010	Grant awards recommended to SBE for approval
August 2010	LEA grants awarded
Fall 2010	Implementation in school districts

Requirement 2—Tiers I & II, Evaluation of Student Achievement Goals: Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

DEFINING METRICS: The performance framework shall include both leading and lagging indicators as defined below:

- Leading Indicators
 - Length of instructional day and year;
 - Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
 - Dropout rate;
 - Student attendance rate;
 - Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
 - Discipline incidents;
 - Truants;
 - Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA’s teacher evaluation system; and
 - Teacher attendance rate.

- Lagging Indicators
 - Student academic proficiency;
 - Student academic growth;
 - Achievement gaps in both proficiency and growth between major student subgroups; and
 - Postsecondary readiness (for high schools) as measured by the percent of seniors who have taken the ACT and the average ACT score.

SETTING TARGETS: Once an LEA’s application has been accepted for one or more schools, LEAs, in conjunction with MDE, will set annual performance targets for leading and lagging indicators at each applicable school; these targets shall be designed to help each school meet applicable federal and state expectations. These annual targets will become part of the School Improvement Grant Memorandum of Understanding executed between MDE and the LEA before funds are disbursed.

EVALUATING PROGRESS FOR RENEWAL: MDE will make grant renewal decisions for each school based on whether the school has met its annual performance targets for leading and lagging indicators. A school must make at least 80% of its leading indicators—8 of 11—and 75% of its lagging indicators—3 of 4—in order to qualify for a grant renewal. MDE may grant exceptions to this rule only if highly unusual, extenuating circumstances occur, such as a natural disaster in the course of a school year.

Requirement 3—Tier III, Evaluation of Student Achievement Goals: Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

DEFINING METRICS: The performance framework shall include both leading and lagging indicators as defined below:

- Leading Indicators
 - Length of instructional day and year;
 - Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
 - Dropout rate;
 - Student attendance rate;
 - Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
 - Discipline incidents;
 - Truants;
 - Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA’s teacher evaluation system; and
 - Teacher attendance rate.

- Lagging Indicators
 - Student academic proficiency;
 - Student academic growth;
 - Achievement gaps in both proficiency and growth between major student subgroups; and
 - Postsecondary readiness (for high schools) as measured by the percent of seniors who have taken the ACT and the average ACT score.

SETTING TARGETS: Once an LEA’s application has been accepted for one or more schools, LEAs, in conjunction with MDE, will set annual performance targets for leading and lagging indicators at each applicable school; these targets shall be designed to help each school meet applicable federal and state expectations. These annual targets will become part of the School Improvement Grant Memorandum of Understanding executed between MDE and the LEA before funds are disbursed.

EVALUATING PROGRESS FOR RENEWAL: MDE will make grant renewal decisions for each school based on whether the school has met its annual performance targets for leading and lagging indicators. A school must make at least 80% of its leading indicators—8 of 11—and 75% of its lagging indicators—3 of 4—in order to qualify for a grant renewal. MDE may grant exceptions to this rule only if highly unusual, extenuating circumstances occur, such as a natural disaster in the course of a school year.

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

TACTIC 1—REPORTING: MDE will monitor LEA progress in meeting leading and lagging indicators through a system of electronic and paper reporting.

- **MSIS**—MDE will use the Mississippi Student Information System to monitor data pertaining to each indicator that is tracked by MSIS.
- **Forms**—For the remaining indicators, MDE will provide LEAs with forms for data not tracked by MSIS.

TACTIC 2—SITE VISITS: MDE will conduct annual site visits to each LEA and school that receives a School Improvement Grant. The site visit protocol will track with the original needs assessment as well as each school proposal. Additionally, technical assistance visits will occur throughout the year to ensure that the LEA and school are on track to meet annual targets.

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

Protocol for prioritizing Tier I and Tier II schools

The MDE will identify persistently low achieving schools based on the approved definition by the US Department of Education. LEAs will be encouraged to submit applications, which will be evaluated by qualified external reviewers. These reviewers will recommend LEAs that should be granted funds. Rubrics will be designed to objectively reflect the greatest need, commitment and capacity to implement reform. All applications that receive a score of 300 or higher will be considered eligible for funding. If there are more applications receiving a score of 300 or higher eligible than funds available, the following funding priority will be applied—

Priority 1 – First priority will be given to eligible Tier I schools.

Priority 2 – Second priority will be given to eligible Tier II schools within LEAs that have been designated as “failing” under the state accountability system.

Priority 3 – Third priority will be given to eligible Tier II schools individually designated as “failing” under the state accountability system.

Priority 4 – Fourth priority will be given to LEAs that propose to serve all eligible Tier I and Tier II schools in a feeder pattern.

Priority 5 – Fifth priority will be given to all remaining Tier II schools.

Requirement 6—Tier III Prioritization: Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

CRITERION 1—“FAILING SCHOOL” DESIGNATION: Within Tier III, MDE intends to prioritize schools labeled as “failing” under the state accountability system. There are 25 Tier III schools with a “failing” designation.

- *Use of Close and Consolidate, Turnaround, or Transformation Models*—Within this criterion, MDE will prioritize school proposals that seek to use one of the U.S. Department of Education’s four models.

CRITERION 2—FEEDER PATTERN: MDE’s second priority will be Tier III schools which are part of a Tier I or Tier II school’s feeder pattern.

- *Use of Close and Consolidate, Turnaround, or Transformation Models*—Within this criterion, MDE will prioritize school proposals that use one of the U.S. Department of Education’s four models.

Requirement 7—State Takeover of Schools: If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

Below, please find a list of Tier I or II schools currently under state conservatorship and the selected intervention model.

LEA	SCHOOL	TIER DESIGNATION	INTERVENTION
Hazlehurst City	Hazlehurst High School	Tier I	Transformation
Indianola	Gentry High School	Tier II	Transformation

Requirement 8—SEA Direct Service Provision: If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA’s approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

Not Applicable—MDE has no plans at this time to provide services directly to any schools that have not been taken over by the state.

SECTION E: Assurances

By submitting this application, MDE 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).
- 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 requirement. (Contingent on pending legislation in Mississippi)

- 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.

SECTION F: SEA Reservation

TOTAL SEA RESERVATION: \$2.35M

ADMINISTRATION: MDE will spend \$600,000 of its reservation over three years to fund two positions to administer the grant and to fund office overhead, such as supplies and materials.

- Staff-Program Manager and Office Assistant (130K + fringe)
- Office set up/operation, supplies, and materials

EVALUATION: MDE will spend \$900,000 of its reservation over three years to fund external evaluators and an MDE liaison to serve an estimated 30 schools per year.

- External evaluators and MDE liaison
- Costs calculated at \$10,000 per school x 30 schools for a total of \$300,000 per year

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: MDE will spend \$1.8M over three years to provide technical assistance to interested LEAs during the application process and once grants have been awarded. MDE will also use a portion of this funding to compensate Qualified Evaluators.

- Costs calculated at \$20,000 per school X estimate of 30 schools

SECTION G: Consultation with Stakeholders

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

SECTION H: Waivers

Mississippi 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.
- Waive sections 1003(g)(1) and (7) of the ESEA that limit the use of school improvement funds to Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to permit LEAs to use school improvement funds to serve Tier II schools.

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.

ATTACHMENT A: List of Eligible Schools

Number	District	School	NCES ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
1402000	Coahoma AHS	Coahoma AHS	28011002801100	X				
1520008	Hazlehurst City	Hazlehurst High	28018300000315	X				
2520089	Jackson Public	Wingfield High	28021900000423	X				
5712028	South Pike	South Pike Sr High	28040800000773	X			X	
2600004	Holmes County	William Sullivan High	28019800000339	X				
6700028	Sunflower County	Ruleville Middle	28042000000897	X				
2600014	Holmes County	JJ McClain High	28019800001114	X				X
1500008	Copiah County	Crystal Springs High	28012200000168		X			
7620032	Greenville	Greenville Weston Hi	28016200000244		X			
1420004	Clarksdale	Clarksdale High	28010500000118		X			
4420016	Columbus	Columbus High	28012000000154		X			
6811008	East Tallahatchie	Charleston High	28014100000207		X			
3420040	Laurel	Laurel High School	28024600000479		X			
7500025	Vicksburg-Warren	Vicksburg High	28044700000830		X			
2000012	George County	George County High	28015600000228		X		X	
0300008	Amite County	Amite County High	28004200000027		X			X
4520008	Canton	Canton Public High	28009000000101		X			X
1100008	Claiborne County	Port Gibson High	28010200000116		X			X
1400004	Coahoma County	Coahoma Co Jr/Sr Hi	28011100000139		X			X
1600008	Covington County	Collins High	28012900000117		X			X
6720004	Drew	Drew High	28013500000201		X			X
4220012	Greenwood	Greenwood High	28016500000256		X			X
1820008	Hattiesburg	B C Hattiesburg High	28018000000310		X			X
2502001	Hinds AHS	Hinds County AHS	28018402801840		X			X
2500040	Hinds County	Raymond High	28018600000328		X			X
7611012	Hollandale	Simmons High	28018900001037		X			X
4720004	Holly Springs	Holly Springs High	28019500000335		X			X
6721012	Indianola	Gentry High	28020700000352		X			X
2520068	Jackson Public	Provine High	28021900000409		X			X
3300024	Jeff.Davis Co.	Prentiss Sr High	28022500000435		X			X
3200008	Jefferson Co.	Jefferson Co High	28022200000427		X			X
3500016	Kemper County	Kemper County High	28023100001116		X			X
4000020	Leake County	Thomastown Att Ctr	28025200000491		X			X
4200004	Leflore County	Amanda Elzy High	28025800001123		X			X
4200020	Leflore County	Leflore Co High	28025800000503		X			X
4400012	Lowndes County	West Lowndes High	28027300000531		X			X
3711004	Lumberton	Lumberton High	28027600000535		X			X
4600008	Marion County	East Marion High	28028200000545		X			X
4700004	Marshall County	Byhalia High	28028500000548		X			X

Number	District	School	NCES ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
5720012	McComb	McComb High	28028800000556		X			X
3020004	Moss Point	Moss Point High	28030000000587		X			X
0130044	Natchez-Adams	Natchez High	28030300000608		X			X
5130008	Newton City	Newton High	28031800000626		X			X
0613004	North Bolivar	Broad Street High	28007200000072		X			X
0921008	Okolona Separate	Okolona High	28033900000654		X			X
5300016	Oktibbeha Co.	E Oktibbeha Co High	28034200000659		X			X
5300012	Oktibbeha County	West Oktibbeha County High	28034200000658		X			X
6000020	Quitman County	M S Palmer High	28038100000730		X			X
6312008	South Delta	South Delta High	28039600000753		X			X
6700032	Sunflower County	Ruleville Central High	28042000001211		X			X
6900012	Tate County	Independence High	28042300000800		X			X
7200008	Tunica County	Rosa Fort High	28042900000808		X			X
7400004	Walthall Co.	Dexter High	28044400000833		X			X
0611004	West Bolivar	W Bolivar Dist Hi	28006600000064		X			X
1320020	West Point	West Point High	28046200000865		X			X
7900008	Wilkinson County	Wilkinson Co High	28047100000879		X			X
8220020	Yazoo City	Yazoo City High	28047700000888		X			X
4820024	Aberdeen	Shivers Jr High	28003600000014		X			X
0300016	Amite County	Liberty Elem	28004200000026		X			X
0612004	Benoit	Ray Brooks School	28006900000071		X			X
0500006	Benton County	Ashland High School	28006000000049		X			
1000016	Choctaw County	Weir High School	28009900000116		X			X
1420008	Clarksdale	W A Higgins Middle	28010500000119		X			X
0614014	Cleveland	D M Smith Middle	28007500000080		X			X
0614012	Cleveland	East Side High	28007500000079		X			X
8111006	Coffeeville	Coffeeville High	28011400000146		X			X
1600012	Covington County	Carver Middle School	28012900000178		X			
6720012	Drew	Hunter Middle	28013500000202		X			X
3111004	East Jasper	Heidelberg High	28013800000204		X			X
1520004	Hazlehurst City	Hazlehurst Middle	28018300000316		X			
7611004	Hollandale	Chambers Middle	28018900000332		X			X
4720007	Holly Springs	Holly Springs Jr	28019500001248		X			X
2600012	Holmes County	J J McClain Middle Sc	28019800001324		X			X
2600020	Holmes County	Mileston Middle	28019800000342		X			X
2600026	Holmes County	S V Marshall High	28019800001154		X			
2700008	Humphreys County	Humphreys Jr High	28020400001572		X			X
2520005	Jackson Public	Bailey Magnet	28021900001053		X			
2520031	Jackson Public	Forest Hill High	28021900000384		X			X
2520039	Jackson Public	Jim Hill High	28021900000390		X			X

Number	District	School	NCES ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
3300008	Jeff.Davis Co.	Bassfield High	28022500000429		X			X
3200012	Jefferson Co.	Jefferson Co Jr Hi	28022200001292		X			
4000016	Leake County	South Leake High	28025200000490		X			X
4100016	Lee County	Plantersville Middle	28025500000495		X			X
4100027	Lee County	Shannon Middle Schl	28025500001325		X			X
4200012	Leflore County	East Elementary	28025800000501		X			
4500016	Madison	Velma Jackson High	28027900000541		X			X
4600014	Marion County	West Marion High	28028200001247		X			X
3820036	Meridian	Meridian High	28029100000567		X			
5411016	North Panola	North Panola High	28032100000630		X			
5200010	Noxubee County	B F Liddell Middle	28033000000643		X			
5200012	Noxubee County	Noxubee County High	28033000000642		X			
5520016	Picayune	Picayune Memorial Hi	28036300000695		X			X
0615004	Shaw	McEvans School	28007800000086		X			X
0615008	Shaw	Shaw High	28007800000087		X			X
6400014	Simpson County	Mendenhall High	28039900001086		X			X
7500028	Vicksburg-Warren	Warren Central High	28044700000842		X			X
3112008	West Jasper	Bay Springs High	28045900000858		X			X
6812036	West Tallahatchie	West Tallahatchie Hi	28046500000873		X			X
7613016	Western Line	O'Bannon High	28046800000975		X			X
4820012	Aberdeen	Aberdeen Middle	28003600000010			X		X
4820020	Aberdeen	Prairie Elementary	28003600000013			X		X
0200024	Alcorn	Kossuth High	28003900000020			X		X
0300012	Amite County	Gloster Elem	28004200000024			X		X
0400020	Attala County	McAdams Att Ctr	28005100000039			X		X
4320004	Brookhaven	Alexander Jr High	28008400000090			X		
4320020	Brookhaven	Mamie Martin Elem	28008400000095			X		X
4520016	Canton	Nichols Middle Sch	28009000000103			X		
1420040	Clarksdale	Booker T Washington	28010500000128			X		X
1420028	Clarksdale	Geo H Oliver Elem	28010500000124			X		X
1420016	Clarksdale	Heidelberg School	28010500000121			X		X
1420020	Clarksdale	Kirkpatrick School	28010500000122			X		X
1400016	Coahoma County	Friars Point Elem	28011100000141			X		X
1400028	Coahoma County	Jonestown Elementary	28011100000895			X		X
1400036	Coahoma County	Lyon Elem	28011100000143			X		X
4620008	Columbia	Columbia High	28011700000149			X		X
4420044	Columbus	Hunt Intermediate	28012000000161			X		
1500004	Copiah County	Crystal Springs Mid	28012200000167			X		
0220004	Corinth	Corinth High	28012600000171			X		X
1600004	Covington County	Collins Elementary	28012900000176			X		X

Number	District	School	NCES ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
1600024	Covington County	Seminary Att Center	28012900000182			X		
1700048	DeSoto County	Southaven Middle	28013200000933			X		X
6720008	Drew	A W James Elementary	28013500000199			X		X
6811012	East Tallahatchie	Charleston Middle	28014100000208			X		
6220008	Forest City	Forest High	28014700000213			X		
6220012	Forest City	Hawkins Middle	28014700000214			X		
1802004	Forrest AHS	Forrest County AHS	28015100000222			X		
1800036	Forrest County	Earl Travillion	28014900000221			X		X
7620004	Greenville	Akin Elementary	28016200000236			X		X
7620008	Greenville	Armstrong Elem	28016200000237			X		X
7620016	Greenville	Boyd Elementary	28016200000239			X		X
7620024	Greenville	Darling Elementary	28016200000241			X		X
7620040	Greenville	Manning Elementary	28016200000246			X		X
7620048	Greenville	Solomon Middle	28016200000248			X		
7620056	Greenville	Trigg Elementary	28016200000250			X		X
4220008	Greenwood	Davis Elementary	28016500000255			X		X
4220020	Greenwood	Threadgill Elem	28016500000259			X		X
2220012	Grenada	Grenada Middle	28016800000264			X		X
2300008	Hancock County	Hancock High	280174000001153			X		X
1820048	Hattiesburg	9th Grade Acad-HHS	28018000000309			X		
1820038	Hattiesburg	Hawkins Elem	28018000001570			X		X
1820030	Hattiesburg	N R Burger Middle	28018000000980			X		
2500008	Hinds County	Byram Middle School	28018600000321			X		X
2500020	Hinds County	Gary Road Elem	28018600001036			X		X
2500028	Hinds County	Utica Elem/Mid Sch	28018600000326			X		
7611008	Hollandale	Sanders Elementary	28018900000333			X		X
2600006	Holmes County	Williams Sullivan Elem	28019800001341			X		X
2700010	Humphreys County	Humphreys Co High	28020400001041			X		X
2700004	Humphreys County	Ida Greene Lower El	28020400000349			X		X
6721004	Indianola	Carver Upper Elem	28020700000350			X		X
6721016	Indianola	Cassie Pennington Jr	28020700000353			X		
6721008	Indianola	Robert L Merritt Mid	28020700000351			X		
3000024	Jackson County	St Martin Middle	28021600000963			X		X
2520010	Jackson Public	Blackburn Middle	28021900000372			X		
2520018	Jackson Public	Callaway High	28021900000377			X		X
2520023	Jackson Public	Chastain Middle	28021900000380			X		
2520062	Jackson Public	Peeples Middle	28021900000405			X		
2520086	Jackson Public	Whitten Middle	28021900000421			X		
3200010	Jefferson Co.	Jefferson Upper Ele	28022200000209			X		
3500012	Kemper County	West Kemper Elem	28023100000455			X		X

Number	District	School	NCES ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
0420016	Kosciusko	Kosciusko Sr High	28023400000460			X		X
3800008	Lauderdale Co.	NE Lauderdale High	28024300000469			X		X
3420020	Laurel	Mason Elementary	28024600000476			X		X
3420024	Laurel	Oak Park Elem	28024600000477			X		X
4000004	Leake County	Carthage High	28025200000487			X		
4000014	Leake County	South Leake Elem	28025200001120			X		X
4100004	Lee County	Guntown	28025500000492			X		X
4200005	Leflore County	Amanda Elzy Elem	28025800000499			X		X
4300008	Lincoln County	Enterprise	28026400000513			X		
4400016	Lowndes County	New Hope High	28027300001127			X		
4400010	Lowndes County	West Lowndes Mid	28027300001176			X		
4500006	Madison	East Flora Elem	28027900001006			X		X
4600002	Marion County	East Marion Primary	28028200001243			X		X
4600016	Marion County	West Marion Primary	28028200001060			X		X
4700012	Marshall County	Byhalia Elem	28028500000550			X		X
4700013	Marshall County	Byhalia Middle	28028500001291			X		
4700023	Marshall County	H W Byers Elem	28028500001268			X		
5720002	McComb	Kennedy Elementary	28028800001061			X		X
3820004	Meridian	George W Carver Mid	28029100000559			X		X
3820024	Meridian	Magnolia Middle	28029100000564			X		
3820048	Meridian	Oakland Hts Elem	28029100000570			X		X
4900012	Montgomery Co.	Montgomery Co Elem	28029700000585			X		X
3020020	Moss Point	Kreole Elem	28030000000591			X		
3020028	Moss Point	Magnolia Jr High	28030000000592			X		
0130028	Natchez-Adams	Morgantown Elem	28030300000602			X		
0130036	Natchez-Adams	Robert Lewis Mid	28030300000604			X		
5000006	Neshoba County	Neshoba Central Mid	28030600000990			X		
4111010	Nettleton	Nettleton Middle	28030900001160			X		
5411004	North Panola	Como Elementary	28032100000627			X		X
5411028	North Panola	Crenshaw Elementary	28032100000633			X		
5411012	North Panola	Greenhill Elementary	28032100000629			X		X
5411006	North Panola	N Panola Jr High Sch	28032100001339			X		X
5711012	North Pike	North Pike Middle	28032400000635			X		
5300004	Oktibbeha Co.	E Oktibbeha Co Elem	28034200000656			X		X
5300020	Oktibbeha Co.	W Oktibbeha Co Elem	28034200000660			X		X
3620016	Oxford	Oxford Middle Sch	28034500000664			X		X
3022040	Pascagoula	Gautier Middle	28034800000675			X		
5520012	Picayune	Picayune Junior High	28036300000697			X		
6000024	Quitman County	Quitman Co Elem	28038100000732			X		X
6100008	Rankin County	Brandon High	28038300001074			X		X
6500004	Smith County	Mize Attendance Ctr	28040200000758			X		

Number	District	School	NCES ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
5412008	South Panola	Batesville Jr High	28040500000764			X		
5412007	South Panola	Batesville Middle	28040500001250			X		
5320020	Starkville	Armstrong Middle	28041400000784			X		X
6700024	Sunflower County	Ruleville Central El	28042000000926			X		X
6900020	Tate County	Coldwater Elementary	28042300000802			X		X
6900004	Tate County	Coldwater High	28042300000798			X		X
7100024	Tishomingo Co.	Tishomingo Co High	28042600001227			X		X
7200004	Tunica County	Tunica Elementary	28042900001185			X		X
7200012	Tunica County	Tunica Middle	28042900000809			X		
7500014	Vicksburg-Warren	Dana Rd Elementary	28044700000993			X		X
7500021	Vicksburg-Warren	Sherman Ave Elem	28044700000995			X		X
7500015	Vicksburg-Warren	Vicksburg Interm	28044700000994			X		
7500026	Vicksburg-Warren	Vicksburg Jr High	28044700000831			X		X
7500022	Vicksburg-Warren	Warren Central Inter	28044700000996			X		X
7500030	Vicksburg-Warren	Warren Central Jr Hi	28044700000843			X		X
7400016	Walthall Co.	Tylertown High	28044400000836			X		X
8113004	Water Valley	Water Valley High	28045000000845			X		X
0611008	West Bolivar	W Bolivar Dist Mid	28006600000065			X		X
3112010	West Jasper	Bay Springs Middle	28045900000899			X		X
6812032	West Tallahatchie	R H Bearden Elem	28046500000872			X		X
7613008	Western Line	O'Bannon Elementary	28046800000875			X		X
7613020	Western Line	Riverside High	28046800000976			X		X
8220016	Yazoo City	B E Woolfolk Middle	28047700000887			X		
8200006	Yazoo City	McCoy Elementary	28047700001260			X		X
8200004	Yazoo County	Yazoo County High	28048000000890			X		X

ATTACHMENT B: Mississippi's Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Mississippi used the guidance issued in support of School Improvement Grants and State Fiscal Stabilization Funds to define persistently low achieving schools in Mississippi. Specific steps and procedures were followed in defining those schools.

Before defining persistently low achieving schools in the state, certain elements relating to persistently low achieving schools had to be defined.

The following definitions are for purposes of defining persistently low achieving schools.

1. A secondary school is defined as any school whose lowest grade taught is no lower than grade 7.
2. A high school is defined as any school whose highest grade taught is grade 12.
3. "A number of Years" for purposes of determining "lack of progress" on Mississippi's assessments is determined using assessments from the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 school years. For a school formed in 2008-2009, "a number of years" would be only the 2008-2009 school year.
4. "A number of Years" for purposes of determining whether a high school has had a graduation rate less than 60 percent is 2 years. Mississippi has adopted and used the cohort graduation rate as proposed by the National Governor's Association for a number of years. However, those cohort graduation rates have been calculated at the school level for only 2 years. Consequently, we only have two years of longitudinal data at the school level.

Mississippi currently has 79 schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Because 5% represents only four schools, we will use the lowest five schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring rather than the lowest five percent of schools.

Mississippi currently has 127 secondary schools who are eligible for but do not receive Title I funds. Five percent of these schools represents seven schools.

It should also be noted that Mississippi is not using a minimum n-count to include schools and our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools does not exclude any category of schools.

Establishing Percent Proficient and Above

Next, the State decided to use a single percentage of students proficient and above in Language Arts and Mathematics for each school. For 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, the total number of students in the “all students” group who took the language arts assessment and the total number of students in the “all students” group who took the mathematics assessment were combined to provide one overall count of all students taking the language arts and/or mathematics assessments. Of those students, the number scoring proficient or advanced (proficient and above) were determined. The number scoring proficient or advanced was then divided by the total number taking the assessments with the resulting quotient representing the overall percentage proficient or advanced for each school.

Establishing “Lack of Progress” and “Academic Achievement”

For each year, the schools were ranked with from lowest to highest. A rank of “one” represented the lowest performing school in that year up through the highest performing school in that year. Any school not in existence during that particular year was excluded from the ranking. Once a ranking from each year was established, an average ranking for each school was determined by combining the rankings of a school and then dividing by the number of rankings available for that school. This average ranking then became the “progress” of each school “over a number of years” while the ranking for the 2008-2009 school year became the “academic achievement” of each school. In each ranking, lower rankings reflect lower progress and achievement.

Weighting “Lack of Progress” and “Academic Achievement”

After establishing the academic achievement and lack of progress for each school, the weighting of each factor was considered. Realizing that the performance of a school should be considered longitudinally and not in the context of one year, it was decided to weight progress over time more heavily than the performance in a single year. In determining the final ranking of each school, it was decided that progress would account for 80% of the final ranking and achievement the other 20%.

Determining the lowest quintile

The next step was to decide the lowest quintile of all schools in the state. All schools were sorted in ascending order and the bottom 20% was determined. In this step, it was determined that the lowest quintile represents those schools whose percentage proficient or above is no higher than 31.2%.

Determining Tier I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring

Schools were limited to those Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The lowest performing five schools from this category were determined based on the weighted average of “Lack of Progress” and “Academic Achievement.” This step resulted in five schools identified as Tier I schools.

Determining Tier I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with a graduation rate of 60% or less for a number of years

The list of schools in improvement was limited to high schools with a graduation rate of 60% or less for two years; doing so resulted in one school being identified as a Tier I school.

Determining Tier II secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds

These eligible secondary schools not receiving Title I funds were ranked based on their weighted average of “Lack of Progress” and “Academic Achievement.” The lowest performing five schools from this category were determined resulting in five Tier II schools.

Determining Tier II high schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds with a graduation rate of 60% or less for a number of years

The list of secondary schools eligible for but not receiving Title I funds was limited to high schools with a graduation rate of 60% or less for two years; doing so resulted in one school being identified as a Tier II school.

Using the above steps and criteria, Mississippi has identified six Tier I schools and six Tier II schools that are defined as Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools.

Using the newly issued guidance dated January 20, 2010, the state expanded the list of schools identified in Tiers I and II for inclusion in the School Improvement Grant under the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

**Mississippi Department of Education
School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)
LEA Application**



Application Due: April 30, 2010

Table of Contents

<u>APPLICATION PROCESS AND TIMELINE</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>APPLICATION</u>	<u>4</u>
LEA PLAN OVERVIEW	6
TURNAROUND PROPOSAL	8
CONSOLIDATION PROPOSAL	12
TRANSFORMATION PROPOSAL	14
<u>GUIDANCE ON SELECTING SCHOOLS TO SERVE</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>LEA ASSURANCES</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>INTERVENTION REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDANCE</u>	<u>24</u>
TURNAROUND	25
CONSOLIDATION	27
TRANSFORMATION	28
<u>LIST OF LEA POLICY AREAS FOR ANALYSIS</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK</u>	<u>39</u>
<u>LEA WAIVERS</u>	<u>40</u>
<u>RUBRICS</u>	<u>41</u>
LEA PLAN OVERVIEW	42
TURNAROUND PROPOSAL	47
CONSOLIDATION PROPOSAL	64
TRANSFORMATION PROPOSAL	70

APPLICATION PROCESS AND TIMELINE

APPLICATION PROCESS

- *Letters of Intent*—Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) will submit letters of intent to apply for funds to the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) in order for MDE to recruit enough external parties to review applications.
- *Application*—MDE will release the final LEA application to all LEAs with eligible schools upon approval of the application by the United States Department of Education (USDE).
- *Needs Assessment*—Prior to submitting a proposal, LEAs must conduct a comprehensive needs assessment focused on gathering qualitative and quantitative data in five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization. Data must be disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency, in order to compare the achievement between subgroups. Data may be examined across multiple years, grade levels or schools to identify patterns and trends. By using multiple data sources to triangulate the data, priority needs emerge from a foundation supported by objective data.

Each LEA seeking SIG funds must conduct the comprehensive needs assessment to determine the needs of each eligible school and the capacity of the LEA to serve each eligible school.

- *Application Submission and Review*—MDE will recruit qualified external reviewers to evaluate applications based on MDE-created rubrics. These reviewers will recommend whether LEAs should be granted funds for each of its school proposals and how much funding each school proposal should receive.
- *Grant Awards*—Based on the recommendations of the external review team, MDE will award grants to LEAs for none, some, or all of the schools included in their proposals.

TIMELINE

<u>MONTH</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
February 2010	USDE Webinars/SEA Application Development List of schools in each Tier disseminated
March 2010	Letters of Intent submitted Districts receive applications
April 2010	District applications submitted to MDE
May 2010	Methodology for awarding grants recommended to the State Board of Education (SBE)
May/June 2010	District applications reviewed
June 2010	Grant awards recommended to SBE for approval
August 2010	LEA grants awarded
Fall 2010	Implementation in school districts

APPLICATION

Instructions: The LEA Application for School Improvement Grant funds is comprised of two parts: the LEA Plan Overview and the school proposals. In addition to completing an LEA Plan Overview, the LEA must complete a school proposal corresponding to the correct intervention for *each* school that it wishes to serve. Should the information submitted by an LEA be insufficient, MDE may ask an LEA to revise and resubmit the application if time and funding allow. MDE is offering technical assistance for the completion of this application.

Official District Name and District Code:

Address:

District Contact:

Email:

Phone:

Fax:

School(s) Served:
Official School Name and School Code

**Intervention
Model:**

Allocation:

School(s) Served: Official School Name and School Code	Intervention Model:	Allocation:

LEA PLAN OVERVIEW

Instructions: Every LEA application must contain an LEA Plan Overview that details the information listed below.

- I. **Introduction**—An introduction of the application to include an Executive Summary, Descriptive Information about the Eligible Schools, Intervention Selection Information, and Assurances
 - A. Executive Summary—An executive summary of the LEA application, not to exceed five pages; this summary should be a narrative of the LEA’s reform agenda as it relates to its portfolio of eligible schools
 - B. Descriptive Information about the Eligible Schools—Information to include the official names of the schools, school codes, Tier designations, and state accountability labels
 - C. Intervention Selection Information—Information to include
 1. Identification—A chart matching each school to the selected intervention
 2. Capacity for selected interventions—Evidence an LEA’s portfolio of school reforms does not exceed its capacity
 - D. Assurances— A signed copy of the LEA Assurances (see pages 19-23)
 - E. A description of the LEA’s consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools
- II. **District Leadership**—An overview of issues related to district leadership, including
 - A. District Governance
 1. Policy Analysis and Timeline—An analysis of district and school policies that may create barriers to reform (see LEA application) as well as a timeline for changes to take effect
 - i. Current Policies and Practices— Copies of current policies and practices that must be changed as well as a description of how these policies or practices prevent the effective implementation of an intervention
 - ii. Proposed or Approved Policy Changes—Language of proposed or approved policy changes and how these changes support the implementation of an intervention (approved policy changes may be approved contingent upon receiving grant funds)
 2. School Board Approval—Evidence that the LEA has secured formal approval of each school proposal and the LEA application from either the school board or the comparable relevant entity
 3. Lead Partner Contracts—Copies of proposed Lead Partner Contracts which meet MDE’s standards for contracting or an assurance that the LEA will use MDE’s model Memorandum of Understanding with Lead Partners (MOU)

B. LEA Fiscal Plan—A fiscal plan to include

1. Financial Policies—The LEA’s financial policies, including financial controls and audit requirements
2. SIG Budget—A budget detailing the use of SIG funds on the district-level to implement reforms; LEAs must use the budget spreadsheet provided
3. Budget Narrative—Description of the budget items included in the LEA’s SIG budget; LEAs must use the budget narrative form provided
4. Additional Resources—A description of supplemental financial resources (above and beyond normal school expenditures) or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s school reforms
5. Alignment—Evidence of alignment of the fiscal plan with the budgets in each school proposal

TURNAROUND PROPOSAL

Instructions: Complete a Turnaround Proposal that includes the information below for each school that will use the turnaround model. Remember to address carefully each intervention requirement for a turnaround. If the proposal does not address these requirements, it may be automatically rejected. Should a Turnaround Proposal be insufficient in other ways, MDE may ask an LEA to revise and resubmit the application if time and funding allow.

- I. Introduction**—An introduction of the proposal to include an Executive Summary, Descriptive Information about the Eligible School, Alignment with the Intervention Requirements, and Implementation Milestones, including a Start-up Plan
 - A. Executive Summary—An executive summary of the proposal, not to exceed three pages; this summary should be a narrative of the school’s new design
 - B. Descriptive Information about the Eligible School—Information to include the official name of the school, the school code, Tier designation, and state accountability label; the grades served by the school; and the minimum, planned, and maximum enrollment per grade per year for the full term of the grant
 - C. Alignment with the Needs Assessment— A description of how a turnaround model addresses the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment
 - D. Alignment with Intervention Requirements—An account detailing how the proposal meets each of the requirements for the turnaround intervention
 - E. Implementation Milestones—A detailed listing of the major steps in the implementation process to include timelines, responsible individuals for accomplishing them, and a Start-up Plan
- II. Teaching and Learning**—A plan for high-quality teaching and learning that addresses Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, and Instructional Leadership and Staff
 - A. Curriculum—A description of the academic program (courses, curriculum overview, and pacing guides) aligned with the state standards
 1. Research-based—Evidence that the curriculum is research-based
 2. Vertical alignment—Evidence that the curriculum is vertically aligned year-to-year
 - B. Instruction—A description of the school's instructional design, including the type of learning environment (such as classroom-based or independent study), class size and structure, and teaching methods.
 1. Three Tier Instructional Model/Intervention Process (IP)—Identification of personalized academic and non-academic support services which support the school’s IP in accordance with State Board of Education Policy 4300
 2. Data-driven decision-making—Plans for data-driven decision-making for all activities relating to instructional strategies and student-level interventions
 3. Special populations—The school's plans for identifying and successfully serving

students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind, and gifted students, including but not limited to compliance with applicable laws and regulations

4. Increased Time—Plans regarding school schedule, length of school day, length of school year

C. Assessments—The school's plan for using internal and external assessments to measure and report student progress on the performance framework (see LEA application). Additionally, the LEA must outline plans for the development and use of formative, interim, and summative assessments permitting immediate analysis, feedback, and targeted instruction

D. Instructional Leadership and Staff—A school staffing plan to include

1. Staffing Chart—A staffing chart for the school's first year and any plans for growing or changing the staff during the term of the grant

2. Roles and Responsibilities—A clear description of the roles and responsibilities for positions noted in the staffing chart, especially the school's leadership and management team

III. Operation and Support Systems—A plan for operation and support systems which addresses Allocation of Financial Resources; Human Resource Systems, Organizational Structures and Management; Support for Teaching and Learning; and Parent and Community Engagement

A. Allocation of Financial Resources—A fiscal plan which describes

1. Budget—A budget spreadsheet for the school in the format provided by MDE

2. Budget Narrative—Description of the budget items in the format provided by MDE

3. Additional Resources—A description of supplemental financial resources or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA's plans

4. Alignment—Evidence of alignment of the budget with the information detailed in the school proposal

B. Human Resource Systems

1. Recruiting and Hiring New Staff—Plans for recruiting new school leadership and staff, including reliance on any Lead Partners

i. Turnaround School Leader—A copy of the proposed job description as well as the process for evaluating applicants to select for a strong leader with a proven-track record of success in raising student achievement and, if applicable, increasing graduation rates

ii. Instructional Staff—A process for evaluating applicants to select for effective teachers with a record of success in raising student achievement who also possess qualities that equip them to succeed in the turnaround environment

- iii. Financial Incentives—A description of financial incentives (such as signing bonuses, moving reimbursement, or loan repayment) that the LEA may use to recruit staff
- 2. Screening and Re-Hiring No More Than 50% of Current Staff—A process for screening and re-hiring current staff with a record of success in raising student achievement who also possess qualities that equip them to succeed in the turnaround environment
- 3. Employment Policies—The school’s leadership and teacher employment policies which address
 - i. Placement—Process for assigning teachers to work with specific grades, subjects, and/or groups of students
 - ii. Opportunities for promotion and career growth—A description of available career ladders for teachers and leadership or a description of opportunities for highly effective teachers to help shape and implement the reform effort
 - iii. Termination—Process for staff termination (post-turnaround) after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice

C. Organizational Structures and Management

- 1. Governance—An organization chart that clearly presents the school's new governance structure, including lines of authority and reporting between the school and the governing board, district-level staff, any related bodies (such as advisory bodies or parent and teacher councils), and any external organizations that will play a role in managing the school
 - i. District-Level Staff: A description of the district-level staff or structures that provide services to or oversee the turnaround school, such as whether the school reports to a new “turnaround office” in the LEA or to a district-level “turnaround leader” who reports directly to the Superintendent or Conservator; this description should provide the roles and responsibilities of relevant district-level staff as well as the qualifications required for these positions
 - ii. School Autonomy: A description of the school’s autonomy in making decisions related to such items as staffing, calendars/time, procedures, and budgeting or other important operations as well as how such autonomy is tied to accountability measures
- 2. Lead Partners—Explanations of any partnerships or contractual relationships central to the school's operations or mission, including how these partnerships align with the school proposal and the scope of work of each partner as outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding
- 3. Operational Services—The school's plans for providing transportation, food service, and all other significant operational or ancillary services, especially as related to

extended time outside the regular school day

4. Discipline—The school's student discipline policies, including those for students with disabilities

D. Support for Teaching and Learning

1. Professional Development—Plans for creating targeted, job-specific and job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's 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 (Role of Lead Partners – if applicable, a description of the role of Lead Partners in creating or delivering professional development)
2. Time for Faculty Collaboration—Evidence of adequate time for regular, frequent, faculty meetings and/or meetings with teams of teachers, i.e. grade level, department level, special services to discuss individual student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches and other reforms, and school-wide efforts in support of the school proposal
3. Evaluation Policies—Plans for rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for instructional staff and leadership. Evidence that the evaluation systems 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.

- E. Parent and Community Engagement—A description of opportunities for parent and community engagement

CONSOLIDATION PROPOSAL

Instructions: Complete a Consolidation Proposal that includes the information below for each school that will use the consolidation model. Remember to address carefully each intervention requirement for a consolidation. If the proposal does not address these requirements, it may be automatically rejected. Should a Consolidation Proposal be insufficient in other ways, MDE may ask an LEA to revise and resubmit the application if time and funding allow.

- I. Introduction**—An introduction of proposal to include an Executive Summary, Descriptive Information about the Eligible Schools, Alignment with the Intervention Requirements, and Implementation Milestones, including a Start-up Plan
 - A. Executive Summary—An executive summary of the proposal, not to exceed three pages; this summary should be a narrative of the consolidation process and expected outcomes
 - B. Descriptive Information about the Eligible Schools—Information to include
 1. Eligible Schools—The official name of the school, the school code, Tier designation, and state accountability label of the school from which students will be transferred and the school name(s), school codes, and state accountability label(s) of the higher achieving school or schools to which students will be transferred
 2. Grades Served—The grades served by the newly consolidated school or schools, and if the consolidation is phased-in, the grades to be served each year by the closing school and each consolidated school
 3. Enrollment—The minimum, planned, and maximum enrollment per grade per year for the full term of the grant of each eligible school and any resulting alterations in attendance zones or feeder patterns
 - C. Alignment with the Needs Assessment—A description of how the consolidation model addresses the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment
 - D. Alignment with Intervention Requirements—An account detailing how the proposal meets each of the requirements for the close and consolidate intervention
 - E. Implementation Milestones—A detailed listing of the major steps in the implementation process to include timelines, responsible individuals for accomplishing them, and a Start-up Plan
- II. Teaching and Learning**—For each newly consolidated school, a plan for high-quality teaching and learning that addresses Instruction and Instructional Leadership and Staff
 - A. Instruction— A brief description of the consolidated school’s instructional design, including the type of learning environment (such as classroom-based or independent study), class size and structure, and teaching methods. Additionally, the description must include the consolidated school’s plans identifying and successfully serving new students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind, and gifted students, including but not limited to compliance with applicable laws and regulations

- B. Instructional Leadership and Staff—A school staffing plan
 - 1. Staffing Chart—A staffing chart for the consolidated school, and if consolidation is phased in, staffing charts for each year of the grant
 - 2. Roles and Responsibilities—A clear description of the roles and responsibilities for positions noted in the staffing chart, especially of the school’s leadership and management
 - 3. Current Staff—The names and qualifications of current staff who will be part of the intervention as well as the current positions these staff hold

III. Operation and Support Systems—A plan for each newly consolidated school which addresses Allocation of Financial Resources; Organizational Structures and Management; and Parent and Community Outreach

- A. Allocation of Financial Resources—A fiscal plan which describes
 - 1. Budget—A budget spreadsheet for the school in the format provided by MDE
 - 2. Budget Narrative—Description of the budget items in the format provided by MDE
 - 3. Additional Resources—Evidence of supplemental financial resources or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s plans
 - 4. Alignment—Evidence of alignment of the budget with the information detailed in the school proposal
- B. Organizational Structures and Management
 - 1. District-Level Staff—A description of roles and responsibilities of district-level staff who will be involved in the consolidation process
 - 2. Facilities—Information pertaining to the use of facilities, including any necessary facility changes to accommodate additional students or students of a different age
 - 3. Operational Services—The school’s plans for providing transportation and all other significant operational or supplemental services related to and affected by consolidation
- C. Parent and Community Outreach—Plans for parent and community outreach related to a student’s transition to a new school which may include
 - 1. Media outreach—Planned press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, or direct mail notices
 - 2. Opportunities for questions and answers—Hotlines or meetings regarding the school closure
 - 3. Available services—A description of services to help parents and students transition to a new school

TRANSFORMATION PROPOSAL

Instructions: Complete a Transformation Proposal that includes the information below for each school that will use a transformation model. Remember to address carefully each intervention requirement for a transformation. If the proposal does not address these requirements, it may be automatically rejected. Should a Transformation Proposal be insufficient in other ways, MDE may ask an LEA to revise and resubmit the application if time and funding allow.

- I. **Introduction**—An introduction of proposal to include an Executive Summary, Descriptive Information about the Eligible School, Alignment with the Intervention Requirements, and Implementation Milestones, including a Start-up Plan
 - A. Executive Summary—An executive summary of the proposal, not to exceed three pages; this summary should be a narrative of the school’s new design
 - B. Descriptive Information about the Eligible School—Information to include the official name of the school, the school code, Tier designation, and state accountability label; the grades served by the school; and the minimum, planned, and maximum enrollment per grade per year for the full term of the grant
 - C. Alignment with the Needs Assessment— A description of how a transformation model addresses the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment
 - D. Alignment with Intervention Requirements—An account detailing how the proposal meets each of the requirements for the transformation intervention
 - E. Implementation Milestones—A detailed listing of the major steps in the implementation process to include timelines, responsible individuals for accomplishing them, and a Start-up Plan
- II. **Teaching and Learning**—A plan for high-quality teaching and learning that addresses Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, Instructional Leadership and Staff
 - A. Curriculum— A description of the academic program (courses, curriculum overview, and pacing guides) aligned with the state standards
 1. Research-based—Evidence that the curriculum is research-based
 2. Vertical alignment—Evidence that the curriculum is vertically aligned year-to-year
 - B. Instruction—A description of the school’s instructional design, including the type of learning environment (such as classroom-based or independent study), class size and structure, teaching methods, and how this instructional design differs from previous programs.
 1. Three Tier Instructional Model/Intervention Process (IP)—Identification of personalized academic and non-academic support services which support the school’s IP in accordance with State Board of Education Policy 4300
 2. Data-driven decision-making—Plans for data-driven decision-making for all activities relating to instructional strategies and student-level interventions

3. Special Populations—The school’s plans for identifying and successfully serving students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind, and gifted students, including but not limited to compliance with applicable laws and regulations
 4. Increased Time—Plans regarding school schedule, length of school day, length of school year
- C. Assessments—The school's plan for using internal and external assessments to measure and report student progress on the performance framework (see LEA application). Additionally, the LEA must outline plans for the development and use of formative, interim, and summative assessments permitting immediate analysis, feedback, and targeted instruction
- D. Instructional Leadership and Staff—A school staffing plan to include
1. Staffing Chart—A staffing chart for the school’s first year and any plans for growing or changing the staff during the term of the grant
 2. Roles and Responsibilities—A clear description of the roles and responsibilities for positions noted in the staffing chart, especially the school’s leadership and management team

III. Operation and Support Systems—A plan for operation and support systems which addresses Allocation of Financial Resources; Human Resource Systems, Organizational Structures and Management; Support for Teaching and Learning; and Parent and Community Engagement

- A. Allocation of Financial Resources—A fiscal plan which describes
1. Budget—A budget spreadsheet for the school in the format provided by MDE
 2. Budget Narrative—Description of the budget items in the format provided by MDE
 3. Additional Resources—Evidence of supplemental financial resources or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s plans
 4. Alignment—Evidence of alignment of the budget with the information detailed in the school proposal
- B. Human Resource Systems
1. Recruitment and Hiring—Plans for recruiting new school leadership and staff, including reliance on any Lead Partners
 - i. Transformation School Leader—A copy of the proposed job description as well as the process for evaluating applicants to select for a strong leader with a proven-track record of success in raising student achievement and, if applicable, increasing graduation rates
 - ii. Instructional Staff—A process for evaluating applicants to select for effective teachers with a record of success in raising student achievement who also possess qualities that equip them to succeed in the transformation environment

- iii. Financial incentives—A description of financial incentives (such as signing bonuses, moving reimbursement, or loan repayment) that the LEA may use to recruit staff
 - 2. Employment Policies—The school’s leadership and teacher employment policies which address
 - i. Placement—Process for assigning teachers to work with specific grades, subjects, and/or groups of students
 - ii. Financial rewards—Plans for financially rewarding staff for student achievement by providing individual, team, or school-wide salary bonuses or raises or loan repayment
 - iii. Opportunities for promotion and career growth—A description of available career ladders for teachers and leadership or a description of opportunities for highly effective teachers to help shape and implement the reform effort
 - iv. Termination—Process for staff termination after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice
- C. Organizational Structures and Management
 - 1. Governance—An organization chart that clearly presents the school's governance structure, including lines of authority and reporting between the school and the governing board, district-level staff, any related bodies (such as advisory bodies or parent and teacher councils), and any external organizations that will play a role in managing the school
 - i. District-Level Staff—A description of the district-level staff or structures that provide services or oversee the transformation school; this description should provide the roles and responsibilities of relevant district-level staff as well as the qualifications required for these positions
 - ii. School Autonomy—A description of the school’s autonomy in making decisions related to such items as staffing, calendars/time, procedures, and budgeting or other important operations as well as how such autonomy is tied to accountability measures
 - 2. Lead Partners—Explanations of any partnerships or contractual relationships central to the school's operations or mission, including how these partnerships align with the school proposal and the scope of work of each external partner as noted in the Memorandum of Understanding.
 - 3. Operational Services—The school's plans for providing transportation, food service, and all other significant operational or ancillary services, especially as related to extended time outside the regular school day
 - 4. Discipline—The school's student discipline policies, including those for students with disabilities

D. Support for Teaching and Learning

1. Professional Development—Plans for creating targeted, job-specific and job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s 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
 - i. Role of Lead Partners—If applicable, a description of the role of Lead Partners in creating or delivering professional development
 - ii. Integration of existing professional development activities—Plans for integrating or eliminating professional development programs currently impacting the school
2. Time for Faculty Collaboration—Evidence of adequate time for regular, frequent faculty meetings and/or meetings with teams of teachers, i.e. grade level, department level, special services, to discuss individual student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches and other reforms, and school-wide efforts in support of the school proposal
3. Evaluation Policies—Plans for rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for instructional staff and leadership which incorporate
 - i. Student growth—Evidence that evaluation systems 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
 - ii. Staff input—Description of how systems have been designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement

- E. Parent and Community Engagement—A description of ongoing opportunities and structures for parent and community engagement such as the establishment of organized parent groups, public meetings involving parents and community members to review school performance and help develop school improvement plans, surveys to gauge parent and community satisfaction and support for local public schools, complaint procedures for families, coordination with local social and health service providers to help meet family needs, and parent education classes (including GED, adult literacy, and ESL programs)

GUIDANCE ON SELECTING SCHOOLS TO SERVE

The chart below was developed by the U.S. Department of Education to assist LEAs in determining which schools it must commit to serve based on an LEA’s eligible schools portfolio.

If an LEA has one or more . . .	In order to get SIG funds, the LEA <u>must</u> commit to serve . . .
Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school <i>OR</i> at least one Tier II school ¹
Tier I and Tier II schools, but no Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school <i>OR</i> at least one Tier II school ¹
Tier I and Tier III schools, but no Tier II schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier II and Tier III schools, but no Tier I schools	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II and Tier III schools as it wishes
Tier I schools only	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve
Tier II schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II schools as it wishes
Tier III schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier III schools as it wishes

¹ The number of Tier I schools an LEA has capacity to serve may be zero if, and only if, the LEA is using all of the capacity it would otherwise use to serve its Tier I schools in order to serve Tier II schools.

LEA ASSURANCES

Certain terms and conditions are required for receiving funds under the School Improvement Grant and through the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE); therefore, by signing the following assurances, the grantee agrees to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, rules and regulations, provisions and public policies required and all assurances in the performance of this grant as stated below.

School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)

The LEA must sign and return a copy of the following assurances as part of its application.

The LEA will use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively one of the following interventions in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school identified on the LEA grant application: (A) Turnaround Model; (B) Consolidation Model; (C) Transformation Model.

The LEA will 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, Tier II, and Tier III school that it serves with school improvement funds.

The LEA will report to the SEA the school-level data required under Section III of the final requirements, which may include from the three previous school years, at a minimum,

- Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
- Dropout rate/graduation rate;
- Student attendance rate;
- Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
- Discipline incidents;
- Truants;
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system; and
- Teacher attendance rate.

The LEA will establish an LEA-based School Improvement Officer(s) or School Improvement Office that will be responsible for taking an active role in the day-to-day management of turnaround efforts at the school level in each identified Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school to be served by the application and for coordinating with the SEA.

The LEA must conduct a comprehensive needs assessment of the school(s), and as needed, assist in the implementation of the intervention model.

LEAs that commit to serve one or more Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools that do not receive Title I, Part A funds are to ensure that each of those schools receive all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of the School Improvement Grant funds.

- A. LEAs should include in any contracts with outside providers terms or provisions that will enable the LEA to ensure full and effective implementation of the model.
- B. LEAs cannot use School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to support district-level activities for schools that are not receiving SIG funds.
- C. LEAs with a school implementing a school improvement timeline waiver of Section 1116(b)(12) of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA) would begin the improvement timeline anew beginning the first year in which the improvement model is being implemented. For example, with respect to SIG grants made using FY 2009 funds for implementation in the 2010–2011 school year, the school would start the improvement timeline over beginning with the 2010–2011 school year.

Awarded programs understand future funding opportunities may be hindered if reporting and/or performance expectations per this or any grant opportunity/contract with MDE have not been met and/or reports are not submitted in a timely fashion.

The MDE may cancel an award immediately if the State finds that there has been a failure to comply with the provisions of an award, the reasonable progress has not been made or that the the purposes for which the funds were awarded/granted have not been or will not be fulfilled.

Changes

This agreement will not be modified, altered, or changed except by mutual agreement by an authorized representative(s) of each party to this agreement and must be confirmed in writing through the Mississippi Department of Education grant modification procedures.

Independent Grantee

The grantee shall perform all services as an independent grantee and shall discharge all of its liabilities as such. No act performed or representation made, whether oral or written, by grantee with respect to third parties shall be binding on the Mississippi Department of Education.

Termination

The Mississippi Department of Education, by written notice, may terminate this grant, in whole or in part, if funds supporting this grant are reduced or withdrawn. To the extent that this grant is for services, and if so terminated, the Mississippi Department of Education shall be liable only for payment in accordance with payment provision of this grant for services rendered prior to the effective date of termination.

The Mississippi Department of Education, in whole or in part, may terminate this grant for cause by written notification. Furthermore, the Mississippi Department of Education and the grantee may terminate this grant, in whole or in part, upon mutual agreement.

Either the Mississippi Department of Education or the grantee may terminate this agreement at any time by giving 30 days written notice to the other party of such termination and specifying the effective date thereof. The grantee shall be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total compensation as the services actually performed bear to the total services of the grantee covered by the agreement, less payments of compensation previously made.

Access to Records

The grantee agrees that the Mississippi Department of Education, or any of its duly authorized representatives, at any time during the term of this agreement, shall have access to, and the right to audit and examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the grantee related to the grantee's charges and performance under this agreement. Such records shall be kept by grantee for a period of five (5) years after final payment under this agreement, unless the Mississippi Department of Education authorizes their earlier disposition. Grantee agrees to refund to the Mississippi Department of Education any overpayments disclosed by any such audit. However, if any litigation, claim, negotiation, audit or other action involving the records has been started before the expiration of the 5-year period, the records shall be retained until completion of the actions and resolution of all issues, which arise from it.

Laws

This agreement, and all matters or issues collateral to it, shall be governed by, and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Mississippi.

Legal Authority

The grantee assures that it possesses legal authority to apply for and receive funds under this agreement.

Equal Opportunity Employer

The grantee shall be an equal opportunity employer and shall perform to applicable requirements; accordingly, grantee shall neither discriminate nor permit discrimination in its operations or employment practices against any person or group of persons on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, handicap, or sex in any manner prohibited by law.

Copyrights

The grantee: (i) agrees that the Mississippi Department of Education shall determine the disposition of the title and the rights under any copyright by grantee or employees on copyrightable material first produced or composed under this agreement; and, (ii) hereby grants to the MDE a royalty free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license to reproduce, translate, publish, use and dispose of, to authorize others to do so, all copyrighted or copyrightable work not first produced or composed by grantee in the performance of this agreement, but which is incorporated in the material furnished under the agreement, provided that such license shall be only to the extent grantee now has, or prior to the completion or full final settlements of agreement may acquire, the right to grant such license without becoming liable to pay compensation to others solely because of such grant.

Grantee further agrees that all material produced and/or delivered under this grant will not, to the best of the grantee's knowledge, infringe upon the copyright or any other proprietary rights of any third party. Should any aspect of the materials become, or in the grantee's opinion be likely to become, the subject of any infringement claim or suite, the grantee shall procure the rights to such material or replace or modify the material to make it non-infringing.

Personnel

Grantee agrees that, at all times, employees of the grantee furnishing or performing any of the services specified in this agreement shall do so in a proper, workmanlike, and dignified manner.

Surrender of Equipment

On termination or expiration of this agreement, grantee shall restore all equipment furnished under this agreement to the Mississippi Department of Education in the same condition as when originally made available to grantee, reasonable wear and tear expected. Grantee and the Mississippi Department of Education shall jointly conduct a closing inventory and grantee shall replace or repair all equipment lost, damaged, or destroyed to make up any deficiency between opening and closing inventories.

Assignment

Grantee shall not assign or grant in whole or in part its rights or obligations under this agreement without prior written consent of the Mississippi Department of Education. Any attempted assignment without said consent shall be void and of no effect.

Availability of Funds

It is expressly understood and agreed that the obligation of the Mississippi Department of Education to proceed under this agreement is conditioned upon the appropriation of funds by the Mississippi State Legislature and the receipt of state and/or federal funds. If the funds anticipated for the continuing fulfillment of the agreement are, at anytime, not forthcoming or insufficient, either through the failure of the federal government to provide funds or of the State of Mississippi to appropriate funds or the discontinuance or material alteration of the program under which funds were provided or if funds are not otherwise available to the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE), the MDE shall have the right upon ten (10) working

days written notice to the grantee, to reduce the amount of funds payable to the grantee or to terminate this agreement without damage, penalty, cost, or expenses to MDE of any kind whatsoever. The effective date of reduction or termination shall be as specified in the notice of reduction or termination.

Mississippi Ethics

It is the responsibility of the grantee to ensure that subcontractors comply with the Mississippi Ethics Law in regard to conflict of interest. A statement attesting to said compliance shall be on file by the grantee.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

The subgrantee agrees to the reporting and registration requirements of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act as outlined in Exhibit 1 (pages 1-11).

Other Assurances

The LEA/grantee adheres to the applicable provisions of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR): 34 CFR Subtitle A, Parts 1-99.

The grantee adheres to the applicable regulations of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education: 34 CFR Subtitle B, Parts 100-199.

The grantee adheres to 2 CFR part 225, Office of Management and Budget (Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments).

The grantee assures that salary and wage charges will be supported by proper time reporting documentation that meets the requirements of to 2 CFR part 225, OMB Circular A-87.

Superintendent (Typed Name, and Signature) Date

LEA Board Chair (Typed Name, and Signature) Date

INTERVENTION REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDANCE

The pages in this section describe the required elements of each intervention in addition to suggested optional elements for an intervention and a few commonly asked questions. For more guidance, go to <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/guidance20100120.doc>.

TURNAROUND

Requirements

1. Replace the principal and grant the newly hired 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 Conservator, 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.

Optional Elements

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 turnaround 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.

Definition of “job-embedded” professional development:

- It occurs on a regular basis (*e.g.*, daily or weekly);
- It is aligned with academic standards, school curricula, and school improvement goals;
- It involves educators working together collaboratively and is often facilitated by school instructional leaders or school-based professional development coaches or mentors;
- It requires active engagement rather than passive learning by participants; and
- It focuses on understanding what and how students are learning and on how to address students’ learning needs, including reviewing student work and achievement data and collaboratively planning, testing, and adjusting instructional strategies, formative assessments, and materials based on such data.

Job-embedded professional development can take many forms, including, but not limited to, classroom coaching, structured common planning time, meetings with mentors, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice.

When implemented as part of a turnaround model, job-embedded professional development must be designed with school staff.

Guidance

Must a turnaround school proposal contain plans to adopt a new instructional design?

Not necessarily. In implementing a turnaround model, an LEA must use data to identify an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned as well as aligned with State academic standards. If an LEA determines, based on a careful review of appropriate data, that the instructional program currently being implemented in a particular school is research-based and properly aligned, it may continue to implement that instructional program. However, the Department expects that most LEAs with Tier I or Tier II schools will need to make at least minor adjustments to the instructional programs in those schools to ensure that those programs are, in fact, research-based and properly aligned.

What are some examples of social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students that may be provided through Response to Intervention?

Social-emotional and community-oriented services that may be offered to students in a school implementing a turnaround model may include health, nutrition, or social services that may be provided in partnership with local service providers, or services such as a family literacy program for parents who need to improve their literacy skills in order to support their children's learning. An LEA should examine the needs of students in the turnaround school to determine which social-emotional and community-oriented services will be appropriate and useful under the circumstances.

CONSOLIDATION

What costs associated with closing a school can be paid for with SIG funds?

An LEA may use SIG funds to pay certain reasonable and necessary costs associated with closing a Tier I or Tier II school, such as costs related to parent and community outreach, including, but not limited to, press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, hotlines, direct mail notices, or meetings regarding the school closure; services to help parents and students transition to a new school; or orientation activities, including open houses, that are specifically designed for students attending a new school after their prior school closes. Other costs, such as revising transportation routes, transporting students to their new school, or making class assignments in a new school, are regular responsibilities an LEA carries out for all students and generally may not be paid for with SIG funds. However, an LEA may use SIG funds to cover these types of costs associated with its general responsibilities if the costs are directly attributable to the school closure and exceed the costs the LEA would have incurred in the absence of the closure.

May SIG funds be used in the school that is receiving students who previously attended a school that is subject to closure in order to cover the costs associated with accommodating those students?

No. In general, the costs a receiving school will incur to accommodate students who are moved from a closed school are costs that an LEA is expected to cover, and may not be paid for with SIG funds. However, to the extent a receiving school is a Title I school that increases its population of children from low-income families, the school should receive additional Title I, Part A funds through the Title I, Part A funding formula, and those Title I, Part A funds could be used to cover the educational costs for these new students. If the school is not currently a Title I school, the addition of children from low-income families from a closed school might make it an eligible school.

Is the portion of an LEA's SIG subgrant that is to be used to implement a school closure renewable?

Generally, no. The portion of an LEA's SIG subgrant for a school that is subject to closure is limited to the time necessary to close the school — usually one year or less. As such, the funds allocated for a school closure would not be subject to renewal.

TRANSFORMATION

Requirements

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;
5. Implement such strategies as financial incentives and increased opportunities for promotion and career growth 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;
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;
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;

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 transformation organization or an EMO).

Optional Elements

In addition to the required activities for a transformation model, an LEA may also implement other strategies such as:

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;
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;
4. 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;
5. 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;
6. Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program;
7. 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;

- d. Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or to graduate;
8. 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;
9. 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;
10. 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;
11. Expanding the school program to offer pre-kindergarten;
12. Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a transformation division within the LEA or SEA; or
13. Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Guidance

Must the principal and teachers involved in the development and design of the evaluation system be the principal and teachers in the school in which the transformation model is being implemented?

No. The requirement for teacher and principal evaluation systems that “are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement” refers more generally to involvement by teachers and principals within the LEA using such systems, and may or may not include teachers and principals in a school implementing the transformation model.

More guidance can be found at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/guidance20100120.doc>.

LIST OF LEA POLICY AREAS FOR ANALYSIS

This list, though not exhaustive, contains many of the policy areas that may be affected by the intervention models. MDE has provided this list in order to help LEAs begin to think about which local policies might create barriers to reform.

- Employment and Assignment Policies
- Safety
- Instructional Schedules
- School Calendar
- Transportation
- Food Services
- Faculty and Staff Performance Evaluation
- Feeder Patterns and Attendance Zones
- Extra-Curricular Activities

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

The pages in this section include the LEA and school budget spreadsheets and the LEA and school budget narrative forms.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. LEA Forms
 - a. LEA Budget Spreadsheet: Complete the LEA budget spreadsheet to detail how the requested funds will be used at the LEA level to support the school improvement models. This information should include LEA activities for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
 - b. LEA Budget Narrative: A budget narrative that accompanies the LEA spreadsheet will provide an overview of the intervention activities included in the budget. This information should include a detailed description of the costs included, sufficient to document the necessity and reasonableness of all costs, and a clear and concise description of the computations used to arrive at the total amounts indicated. This page may be reproduced as needed.
2. School-Level Forms
 - a. School Budget Spreadsheet: The LEA will complete a separate budget spreadsheet for each eligible school receiving school improvement funds.
 - b. School Budget Narrative: A budget narrative that accompanies each school's budget spreadsheet will provide an overview of the intervention activities included in the budget. This information should include a detailed description of the costs included, sufficient to document the necessity and reasonableness of all costs, and a clear and concise description of the computations used to arrive at the total amounts indicated. This page may be reproduced as needed.

**FY 11 School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)
DISTRICT BUDGET NARRATIVE**

Official District Name and District Code: _____

Use the Budget Narrative form to provide a complete budget narrative **for the 2010-2011 year of the project**. On this page, please provide a **brief but detailed** budget narrative that explains: (1) the basis for estimating the costs of professional personnel salaries, administrative costs, benefits, project staff travel, materials and supplies, consultants, indirect costs, and any projected expenditures and (2) how the major cost items relate to the proposed activities and how these activities will help students achieve higher standards; This information should include a **detailed** description of the costs included, sufficient to document the **necessity and reasonableness** of **all** costs, and a **clear and concise description** of the computations used to arrive at the total amounts indicated. This page may be reproduced as needed.

CATEGORY		AMOUNT	GENERAL DESCRIPTION
Personnel	FTE:		
Administration	FTE:		
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Supplies			
Contractual			
Other			
Indirect Costs			
Subtotal for Each Page			
GRANT TOTAL			

**FY 12 School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)
DISTRICT BUDGET NARRATIVE**

Official District Name and District Code: _____

Use the Budget Narrative form to provide a complete budget narrative **for the 2011-2012 year of the project**. On this page, please provide a **brief but detailed** budget narrative that explains: (1) the basis for estimating the costs of professional personnel salaries, administrative costs, benefits, project staff travel, materials and supplies, consultants, indirect costs, and any projected expenditures and (2) how the major cost items relate to the proposed activities and how these activities will help students achieve higher standards; This information should include a **detailed** description of the costs included, sufficient to document the **necessity and reasonableness** of **all** costs, and a **clear and concise description** of the computations used to arrive at the total amounts indicated. This page may be reproduced as needed.

CATEGORY		AMOUNT	GENERAL DESCRIPTION
Personnel	FTE:		
Administration	FTE:		
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Supplies			
Contractual			
Other			
Indirect Costs			
Subtotal for Each Page			
GRANT TOTAL			

**FY 13 School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)
DISTRICT BUDGET NARRATIVE**

Official District Name and District Code: _____

Use the Budget Narrative form to provide a complete budget narrative **for the 2012-2013 year of the project**. On this page, please provide a **brief but detailed** budget narrative that explains: (1) the basis for estimating the costs of professional personnel salaries, administrative costs, benefits, project staff travel, materials and supplies, consultants, indirect costs, and any projected expenditures and (2) how the major cost items relate to the proposed activities and how these activities will help students achieve higher standards; This information should include a **detailed** description of the costs included, sufficient to document the **necessity and reasonableness** of **all** costs, and a **clear and concise description** of the computations used to arrive at the total amounts indicated. This page may be reproduced as needed.

CATEGORY		AMOUNT	GENERAL DESCRIPTION
Personnel	FTE:		
Administration	FTE:		
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Supplies			
Contractual			
Other			
Indirect Costs			
Subtotal for Each Page			
GRANT TOTAL			

**FY 11 School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)
SCHOOL BUDGET NARRATIVE**

Official District Name and District Code: _____

Official School Name and School Code: _____

Use the Budget Narrative form to provide a complete budget narrative **for the 2010-2011 year of the project**. On this page, please provide a **brief** but **detailed** budget narrative that explains: (1) the basis for estimating the costs of professional personnel salaries, administrative costs, benefits, project staff travel, materials and supplies, consultants, indirect costs, and any projected expenditures, and (2) how the major cost items relate to the proposed activities and how these activities will help students achieve higher standards; This information should include a **detailed** description of the costs included, sufficient to document the **necessity and reasonableness** of **all** costs, and a **clear and concise description** of the computations used to arrive at the total amounts indicated. This page may be reproduced as needed.

CATEGORY		AMOUNT	GENERAL DESCRIPTION
Personnel	FTE:		
Administration	FTE:		
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Supplies			
Contractual			
Other			
Indirect Costs			
Subtotal for Each Page			
GRANT TOTAL			

**FY 12 School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)
SCHOOL BUDGET NARRATIVE**

Official District Name and District Code: _____

Official School Name and School Code: _____

Use the Budget Narrative form to provide a complete budget narrative **for the 2011-2012 year of the project**. On this page, please provide a **brief** but **detailed** budget narrative that explains: (1) the basis for estimating the costs of professional personnel salaries, administrative costs, benefits, project staff travel, materials and supplies, consultants, indirect costs, and any projected expenditures, and (2) how the major cost items relate to the proposed activities and how these activities will help students achieve higher standards; This information should include a **detailed** description of the costs included, sufficient to document the **necessity and reasonableness** of **all** costs, and a **clear and concise description** of the computations used to arrive at the total amounts indicated. This page may be reproduced as needed.

CATEGORY		AMOUNT	GENERAL DESCRIPTION
Personnel	FTE:		
Administration	FTE:		
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Supplies			
Contractual			
Other			
Indirect Costs			
Subtotal for Each Page			
GRANT TOTAL			

**FY 13 School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)
SCHOOL BUDGET NARRATIVE**

Official District Name and District Code: _____

Official School Name and School Code: _____

Use the Budget Narrative form to provide a complete budget narrative **for the 2012-2013 year of the project**. On this page, please provide a **brief** but **detailed** budget narrative that explains: (1) the basis for estimating the costs of professional personnel salaries, administrative costs, benefits, project staff travel, materials and supplies, consultants, indirect costs, and any projected expenditures, and (2) how the major cost items relate to the proposed activities and how these activities will help students achieve higher standards; This information should include a **detailed** description of the costs included, sufficient to document the **necessity and reasonableness** of **all** costs, and a **clear and concise description** of the computations used to arrive at the total amounts indicated. This page may be reproduced as needed.

CATEGORY		AMOUNT	GENERAL DESCRIPTION
Personnel	FTE:		
Administration	FTE:		
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Supplies			
Contractual			
Other			
Indirect Costs			
Subtotal for Each Page			
GRANT TOTAL			

PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

After an LEA's application has been approved, and prior to an LEA receiving grant funds, the LEA and MDE will work together to set annual targets for the leading and lagging indicators of performance for *each* school. These leading and lagging indicators are listed below.

- Leading Indicators
 - Length of instructional day;
 - Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
 - Dropout rate;
 - Student attendance rate;
 - Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
 - Discipline incidents;
 - Truants;
 - Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system; and
 - Teacher attendance rate.
- Lagging Indicators
 - Student academic proficiency;
 - Student academic growth;
 - Achievement gaps in both proficiency and growth between major student subgroups; and
 - Postsecondary readiness (for high schools) as measured by the percent of seniors who have taken the ACT and the average ACT score.

EVALUATING PROGRESS FOR RENEWAL: The MDE will make grant renewal decisions for each school based on whether the school has met its annual performance targets for leading and lagging indicators. A school must make at least 80% of its leading indicators—8 of 11—and 75% of its lagging indicators—3 of 4—in order to qualify for a grant renewal. MDE may grant exceptions to this rule only if highly unusual, extenuating circumstances occur, such as a natural disaster in the course of a school year.

LEA WAIVERS

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.
- A waiver is not requested.

Required Signatures:

_____ Superintendent (Typed Name, and Signature)	_____ Date
_____ LEA Board President (Typed Name, and Signature)	_____ Date
_____ Federal Programs Coordinator (Typed Name, and Signature)	_____ Date
_____ Business Manager (Typed Name, and Signature)	_____ Date

RUBRICS

The remaining pages of this document detail the evaluation criteria for the LEA application. A team of external reviewers will be responsible for scoring each LEA application. Grants will be awarded based on the quality of the applications and the availability of funding.

LEA PLAN OVERVIEW

Total Points: 100 points

Minimum Points Required: 75

Note: Funds will be awarded based on availability. Meeting the minimum requirements for a grant does not guarantee funding.

I. Introduction—40 points

Element	Points	Guidance
<p><i>Descriptive Information about the Eligible Schools</i>—Information to include the official names of the schools, school codes, Tier designations, and state accountability labels</p>	eligibility	MDE may automatically reject the LEA application if the LEA does not provide this information.
<p><i>Intervention Selection Information</i></p> <p><i>Identification</i>—A chart matching each school to the selected intervention, which clearly shows that no more than 50% of the schools served will be served by a transformation model</p>	eligibility	MDE may automatically reject the LEA application if the LEA does not provide information matching schools to interventions or if an LEA will serve more than 50% of its schools by the transformation model.
<p><i>Capacity for selected interventions</i>—Evidence an LEA’s portfolio of school reforms does not exceed its capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If an LEA has a Tier I school that it will not serve due to capacity constraints, it must explain why it does not have the capacity to serve that school. 	40	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the LEA application if the LEA did not undergo a needs assessment or if the LEA has a Tier I school that it will not serve and provides no explanation.</p> <p>0 points—LEA has some capacity to serve schools but not as the LEA application is currently configured</p> <p>13 points— LEA has enough capacity to serve less than half of the schools in its portfolio under the current configuration; MDE must reject most of the school proposals</p> <p>26 points— LEA has enough capacity to serve most but not all of the schools in its portfolio; MDE cannot accept all school</p>

		proposals 40 points — LEA’s portfolio of school reforms will not exceed its capacity as measured by the needs assessment; MDE may accept all school proposals
Assurances —A signed copy of the LEA Assurances	eligibility	MDE may automatically reject the LEA application if the LEA fails to provide a signed copy of the LEA assurances.

II. District Leadership—60 points

Element	Points	Guidance
<p>District Governance</p> <p><i>Policy Analysis and Timeline</i>— An analysis of district and school policies that may create barriers to reform as well as a timeline for changes to take effect</p>	10	<p>0 points—No evidence that the district completed an analysis of policies that may create barriers to reform or no timeline given for changes to take effect</p> <p>3 points—Analysis and timeline are vague; timeline may not align with implementation timelines in each school proposal</p> <p>7 points—Analysis and timeline are clear; timeline may not align with Implementation timelines in each school proposal</p> <p>10 points—Analysis and timeline are clear; timeline meets the needs of implementation timelines in each school proposal</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Current Policies and Practices</i>—Copies of current policies and practices that must be changed as well as a description of how these policies or practices prevent the effective implementation of an intervention 	5	<p>0 points—No copies of policies given</p> <p>1 point—Copies of relevant policies given; vague description of how policies serve as barriers</p> <p>3 points—Copies of relevant policies given; clear description of how most of these policies serve as barriers</p> <p>5 points—Copies of relevant policies given; clear description of how each of these policies serve as barriers</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Proposed or Approved Policy Changes</i>—Language of proposed or approved policy changes and how these changes support the implementation of an intervention (approved policy changes may be approved contingent upon receiving grant funds) 	<p style="text-align: center;">10</p>	<p>0 points—Policy changes proposed or approved do not remove all barriers to full and effective implementation of an LEA’s selected interventions</p> <p>3 points—Policy changes remove all barriers to implementation but do not support full and effective implementation</p> <p>7 points—Policy changes proposed support the full and effective implementation of the LEA’s selected interventions</p> <p>10 points—Policy changes approved support the full and effective implementation of the LEA’s selected interventions</p>
<p><i>School Board Approval</i>—Evidence that the LEA has secured formal approval of each school proposal and the LEA application from either the school board or the comparable relevant entity</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">eligibility</p>	<p>MDE may automatically reject the LEA application if the LEA does not provide evidence that the LEA has secured formal approval of each school proposal and the LEA application.</p>
<p><i>Lead Partner Contracts</i>—Copies of proposed Lead Partner Contracts which meet MDE’s standards for contracting or an assurance that the LEA will use MDE’s model Memorandum of Understanding with Lead Partners (MOU)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">eligibility</p>	<p>MDE may automatically reject the LEA application if the LEA does not provide copies of proposed contracts or a written assurance that the LEA will use MDE’s model MOU.</p>
<p>LEA Fiscal Plan</p> <p><i>Financial Policies</i>—The LEA’s financial policies, including financial controls and audit requirements</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p>	<p>0 points—Proposal does not include any financial policies. If an LEA budget is not provided for FY11, FY12, and FY13, MDE may automatically reject the proposal.</p> <p>1 point—Proposal includes some financial policies but does not include information on financial controls or audit requirements</p>

		<p>3 points—Proposal includes all relevant financial policies; some policies may be vague</p> <p>5 points—Proposal includes all relevant financial policies; policies are clear</p>
<p><i>SIG Budget</i>—A budget detailing the use of SIG funds on the district-level to implement reforms; LEAs must use the budget spreadsheet provided</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Eligibility—If an LEA budget is not provided for FY11, FY12, and FY13 or SIG funds are used for improper purposes, the MDE may automatically reject the proposal</p> <p>0 points—Budget does not abide by funding guidelines set by the MDE</p> <p>3 points—Budget contains miscalculations or other errors which make evaluation difficult; budget total abides by funding guidelines</p> <p>7 points—Budget is error free and follows the funding guidelines; is not formatted using the budget spreadsheet provided</p> <p>10 points—Budget is error-free, follows funding guidelines, formatted using the budget spreadsheet provided</p>
<p><i>Budget Narrative</i>—Description of the budget items included in the LEA’s SIG budget; LEAs must use the budget narrative form provided</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>0 points—Budget narrative does not address each line item</p> <p>5 points—Budget items are addressed but some budget items are not clearly explained</p> <p>10 points—Budget items are addressed and only a few budget items not clearly explained</p> <p>15 points—Budget items are addressed and clearly explained</p>
<p><i>Additional Resources</i>—A description of supplemental financial resources (above and beyond normal school expenditures) or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—Supplemental resources required by the budget are not identified</p> <p>1 point—Supplemental resources are identified but not immediately available</p> <p>3 points—Available supplemental resources identified are not in amounts</p>

LEA's school reforms		that align with budget 5 points —Identification of available supplemental financial resources in amounts that align with budget <i>or</i> no additional resources required
<i>Alignment</i> —Evidence of alignment of the fiscal plan with the budgets in each school proposal	eligibility	MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the LEA's SIG budget does not align with the budgets in each school proposal.

TURNAROUND PROPOSAL

Total Points—300 points

Points required for a grant—225 points

Note: Funds will be awarded based on availability. Meeting the minimum requirements for a grant does not guarantee funding.

I. Introduction—40 points

Element	Points	Guidance
<p><i>Descriptive Information about the Eligible School</i>—Information to include the official name of the school, school code, Tier designation, and state accountability label; the grades served by the school; and the minimum, planned, and maximum enrollment per grade per year for the full term of the grant</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not provide this information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal is for a Tier I school, the MDE may ask the LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections. • If the proposal is for a Tier II or Tier III school and the MDE has not allocated all available school improvement funds for the current fiscal year, the MDE may ask an LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections.
<p><i>Alignment with the Needs Assessment</i>—A description of how a turnaround model addresses the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>MDE may automatically reject the school proposal if the turnaround model does not clearly address the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal is for a Tier I school, the MDE may ask the LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections. • If the proposal is for a Tier II or Tier III school and the MDE has not allocated all available school improvement funds for the current fiscal year, the MDE may ask an LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections.
<p><i>Comprehensive Needs Assessment</i>—Evidence that the LEA conducted an annual comprehensive needs assessment. The comprehensive needs</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not include a summary of the LEA’s process for conducting comprehensive needs assessment.</p>

<p>assessment focuses on gathering data in five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization. Data must be disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency, in order to compare the achievement between subgroups.</p>		<p>0 points—There is no description of the LEA’s process to conduct and analyze a comprehensive needs assessment</p> <p>3 points— Description of the needs assessment is vague. It includes limited qualitative and quantitative data in some of the five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization and the data is not disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency</p> <p>7 points—Description of the needs assessment is clear but does not include qualitative and quantitative data in all of the five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization or the data is not disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency</p> <p>10 points—Description of the needs assessment is clear and includes qualitative and quantitative data in each of the five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization. The data is disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency.</p>
<p>Alignment with Intervention</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>MDE may automatically reject the school</p>

<p>Requirements—An account detailing how the proposal meets each of the requirements for the turnaround intervention</p>		<p>proposal if it does not meet all of the U.S. Department of Education’s requirements for a turnaround school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal is for a Tier I school, the MDE may ask the LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections. • If the proposal is for a Tier II or Tier III school and the MDE has not allocated all available school improvement funds for the current fiscal year, the MDE may ask an LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections.
<p>Implementation Milestones—A detailed listing of the major steps in the implementation process and the timelines, responsible individuals for accomplishing them, and a Start-up Plan</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>0 points—Proposal contains no list of implementation milestones</p> <p>7 points—Implementation milestones include some of the meaningful steps toward full turnaround; some milestones may not have a target date</p> <p>14 points—Implementation milestones denote most of the meaningful steps toward full turnaround; most milestones have a target date</p> <p>20 points—Implementation milestones denote all meaningful steps toward full turnaround; all milestones have a target date</p>
<p>Start-up Plan—A detailed school start-up plan, identifying tasks, timelines and individuals responsible</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>0 points—Plan lacks tasks, timelines, <i>or</i> individuals responsible</p> <p>3 points—Tasks <i>and/or</i> timelines are vague</p> <p>7 points—Tasks and/or timelines are clear; individuals responsible are not assigned to specific tasks</p> <p>10 points—Plan includes clear tasks and timelines; individuals responsible are assigned to specific tasks</p>

II. Teaching and Learning—100 points

Element	Points	Guidance
<p>Curriculum—A description of the academic program (courses, curriculum overview, and pacing guides) aligned with the state standards</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>0 points—LEA does not provide two or more of the following: list of courses, a curriculum overview, and/or pacing guides for each subject/grade or the curriculum overview and/or pacing guides are not aligned with state standards</p> <p>8 points—LEA does not provide one of the following: list of courses, a curriculum overview, and/or pacing guides for each subject/grade</p> <p>15 points—Description of the academic program is complete but description is vague</p> <p>20 points—Description of the academic program is clear and complete; program is aligned to state standards</p>
<p><i>Research-based</i>—Evidence that the curriculum is research-based</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>If the LEA does not provide evidence that the curriculum is research-based or the LEA’s references to research do not clearly align with the curriculum overview, the MDE may automatically reject the school proposal.</p>
<p><i>Vertical alignment</i>—Evidence that the curriculum is vertically aligned year-to-year</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>If the LEA does not provide evidence that the curriculum is vertically aligned year-to-year, the MDE may automatically reject the school proposal.</p>
<p>Instruction—A description of the school's instructional design, including the type of learning environment (such as classroom-based or independent study), class size and structure, and teaching methods.</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>0 points—No description is given for instructional design</p> <p>3 points—Description is vague and lacks one or more of the following: type of learning environment, class size and structure, or teaching methods</p> <p>5 points—Description includes all components of instructional design but at least one is vague</p>

		<p>8 points—Description is clear and detailed for all components of the school’s instructional design</p>
<p>Three Tier Instructional Model, Intervention Process (IP)—Identification of personalized academic and non-academic support services which support the school’s IP plan</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not include a plan for IP.</p> <p>0 points—The IP plan is too vague to evaluate</p> <p>4 points—IP plan lacks two or more of the following: a clear and specific process for student identification, names of personnel responsible and their defined roles, the last 4 digits of their social security number, school structures which support IP, and a list of available support services, including social-emotional and community-based supports</p> <p>9 points— IP plan lacks one of the following: a clear and specific process for student identification, names of personnel responsible and their defined roles, the last 4 digits of their social security number, school structures which support IP, and a list of available support services, including social-emotional and community-based supports</p> <p>14 points— IP plan includes a clear and specific process for student identification, names of personnel responsible and their defined roles, the last 4 digits of their social security number, school structures which support IP, and a list of available support services, including social-emotional and community-based supports</p>
<p><i>Data-driven decision-making</i>— Plans for data-driven decision-making for all activities relating to instructional strategies and student-level interventions</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>0 points—Plans are missing or too vague to evaluate</p> <p>3 points—IP or other instructional strategies reference data but do not clearly or deeply embed data in decision-</p>

		<p>making</p> <p>5 points—Use of data is clearly and deeply embedded in decision-making for some instructional strategies but not all</p> <p>16 points—The use of data is clearly and deeply embedded in decision-making processes in IP and other instructional strategies</p>
<p><i>Special populations</i>—The school's plans for identifying and successfully serving students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind, and gifted students, including but not limited to compliance with applicable laws and regulations</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>0 points—Proposal contains no plans for identifying special populations or serving them at the turnaround school</p> <p>2 points—Proposal contains vague plans for identifying special populations or serving them at the turnaround school, and school lacks services to accommodate some populations but has no plans for providing these services</p> <p>5 points—Proposal contains clear plans for identifying special populations and serving them at the turnaround school, but plans for providing new services, if needed, are vague</p> <p>7 points—Proposal contains clear plans for identifying special populations and serving them at the turnaround school; if new services are needed, plans for providing them are clear</p>
<p><i>Increased Time</i>—Plans regarding school schedule, length of school day, length of school year</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>If the proposal does not provide evidence that the school has increased learning time significantly, the MDE may automatically reject the school proposal.</p>
<p>Assessments—The school's plan for using internal and external assessments to measure and report student progress on the performance framework</p> <p><i>Availability of student data</i>—Plans for the development and use of formative, interim, and summative assessments</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>0 points—No plans for the development or use of at least one of the following: formative, interim, or summative assessments; or plans for the development and use of formative, interim, and summative assessments are vague</p> <p>3 points—Plans may include clear timelines, tasks, and personnel</p>

<p>permitting immediate analysis, feedback, and targeted instruction</p>		<p>responsible but internal and external assessments will not measure all of the indicators in the performance framework or quality and utility of assessments are vague</p> <p>10 points—Plans include clear timelines, tasks, personnel responsible and internal and external assessments will measure all of the indicators in the performance framework but will not produce timely student-level data linked to specific skills and objectives</p> <p>15 points—Plans include clear timelines, tasks, personnel responsible and internal and external assessments will measure all of the indicators in the performance framework and will produce timely student-level data linked to specific skills and objectives</p>
<p>Instructional Leadership and Staff—A school staffing plan to include</p> <p><i>Staffing Chart</i>—A staffing chart for the school's first year and any plans for growing or changing the staff during the term of the grant</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>0 points—Staffing chart is missing for one or more years, unclear, or will not meet stated class sizes based on enrollment projections</p> <p>3 points—Staffing chart will meet stated class sizes based on enrollment projections but serious misalignment with instructional needs described in the proposal</p> <p>7 points—Staffing chart will meet stated class sizes based on enrollment projections but some misalignment with instructional needs described in the proposal</p> <p>10 points—Staffing chart meets class sizes based on enrollment projections; aligns with instructional needs described in the proposal</p>
<p><i>Roles and Responsibilities</i>—A clear description of the roles and responsibilities for positions noted in the staffing</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>0 points—No description given for positions noted in the staffing chart or descriptions are vague</p>

<p>chart, especially the school's leadership and management team</p>		<p>3 points—Each position noted in the staffing chart has a clear role and list of responsibilities; serious misalignment between these roles and responsibilities and the instructional needs of the turnaround school</p> <p>7 points—Each position noted in the staffing chart has a clear role and list of responsibilities; slight misalignment between these roles and responsibilities and the instructional needs of the turnaround school</p> <p>10 points—Each position noted in the staffing chart has a clear role and list of responsibilities; these roles and responsibilities align with the instructional needs of the turnaround school</p>
--	--	--

III. Operation and Support—160 points

Element	Points	Guidance
<p>Allocation of Financial Resources—A fiscal plan which describes</p> <p><i>Budget</i>—A budget spreadsheet for the school in the format provided by the MDE</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility— If an LEA budget is not provided for FY11, FY12, and FY13 or SIG funds are used for improper purposes, the MDE may automatically reject the proposal</p> <p>0 points—SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes but the budget is not complete and does not follow funding guidelines</p> <p>1 point— SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes but the budget does not follow funding guidelines or is not complete</p> <p>3 points— SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes and budget is complete but does not follow funding guidelines</p> <p>5 points—SIG funds are clearly delineated</p>

		and used for proper purposes; budget follows funding guidelines, and budgets are complete for the school
<i>Budget Narrative</i> — Description of the budget items in the format provided by the MDE	8	<p>0 points— Budget narrative does not address each line item</p> <p>3 points—All budget items are addressed but some budget items are not clearly explained</p> <p>5 points—All budget items are addressed and only a few budget items are not clearly explained</p> <p>8 points—All budget items are addressed and clearly explained</p>
<i>Additional Resources</i> —A description of supplemental financial resources or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s plans	10	<p>0 points—Supplemental resources required by the budget are not identified</p> <p>3 points—Supplemental resources are identified but not immediately available</p> <p>7 points—Available supplemental resources identified are not in amounts that align with budget</p> <p>10 points—Identification of available supplemental financial resources in amounts that align with budget or no additional resources required</p>
<i>Alignment</i> —Evidence of alignment of the budget with the information detailed in the School Turnaround Proposal	5	<p>0 points—Elements of the proposal are missing from the budget or SIG funds are expended on items missing from the proposal</p> <p>1 point—Each element of the proposal may be referenced in the budget but more than a few references are unclear</p> <p>3 points—Each element of the proposal is referenced in the budget; only a few references are unclear</p> <p>5 points—Each element of the proposal is clearly referenced in a budget line item</p>
Human Resource Systems <i>Recruiting and Hiring New</i>	10	0 points —Plans for recruiting and hiring staff not given

<p><i>Staff</i>—Plans for recruiting new school leadership and staff, including reliance on any Lead Partners</p>		<p>3 points—Plans for recruiting and hiring staff are vague</p> <p>7 points—Plans for recruiting and hiring staff may lack one of the following: timelines, personnel responsible, role of identified Lead Partners, or recruitment strategies</p> <p>10 points—Plans for recruiting and hiring staff include timelines, personnel responsible, role of Lead Partners, and recruitment strategies</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Turnaround School Leader</i>—A copy of the proposed job description as well as the process for evaluating applicants to select for a strong leader with a proven-track record of success in raising student achievement and, if applicable, increasing graduation rates 	<p style="text-align: center;">15</p>	<p>0 points—Proposal lacks a copy of the proposed job description <i>or</i> a description of the process for evaluating applicants</p> <p>5 points—Proposal includes a copy of the proposed job description and the process for evaluating applicants <i>but</i> both are vague</p> <p>10 points—Copy of the proposed job description is clear and high-quality <i>but</i> the process for evaluating applicants is vague</p> <p>15 points—Copy of the proposed job description is clear and high-quality; the process for evaluating applicants to select for a strong leader with a proven-track record of success in raising student achievement and, if applicable, increasing graduation rates is likely to produce quality outcomes; and a list of finalists and their qualifications is provided</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Instructional Staff</i>—A process for evaluating applicants to select for effective teachers with a record of success in raising student achievement who also possess qualities that equip them to succeed in the turnaround 	<p style="text-align: center;">10</p>	<p>0 points—Proposal lacks a description of the process for evaluating applicants</p> <p>3 points—Process for evaluating applicants may be vague, criteria for hiring do not set high standards, or criteria are not aligned to the needs of the turnaround</p> <p>7 points—Process for evaluating applicants is clear, criteria for hiring set</p>

<p>environment</p>		<p>high standards; some misalignment between criteria and the needs of the turnaround</p> <p>10 points—Process for evaluating applicants is clear; criteria for hiring set high standards and are aligned to the needs of the turnaround</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Financial Incentives</i>—A description of financial incentives (such as signing bonuses, moving reimbursement, or loan repayment) that the LEA may use to recruit staff 	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility—Proposal must include <i>either</i> financial incentives or opportunities for promotion and career growth (see below). The MDE may automatically reject the proposal if it fails to speak to these two strategies.</p> <p>0 points—No financial incentives provided</p> <p>1 point—Only one type of financial incentive offered</p> <p>3 points—Multiple financial incentives offered; signing bonuses or loan repayment in amounts less than \$1,000</p> <p>5 points—Multiple financial incentives offered; signing bonuses or loan repayment at least \$1,000</p>
<p><i>Screening and Re-Hiring No More Than 50% of Current Staff</i>—A process for screening and re-hiring current staff with a record of success in raising student achievement who also possess qualities that equip them to succeed in the turnaround environment</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if more than 50% of current staff are re-hired.</p> <p>0 points—Process for screening current staff is vague</p> <p>3 points—Process for screening current staff is clear; criteria for re-hiring do not set high standards or some misalignment between criteria and the needs of the turnaround</p> <p>7 points—Process for screening current staff is clear; criteria for re-hiring set high standards and are aligned to the needs of the turnaround; no list current staff or potential re-hires provided</p> <p>10 points—Process for screening current</p>

		staff is clear; criteria for re-hiring set high standards and are aligned to the needs of the turnaround; list current staff or potential re-hires provided
<p><i>Employment Policies</i>—The school’s leadership and teacher employment policies which address</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Placement</i>—Process for assigning teachers to work with specific grades, subjects, and/or groups of students 	5	<p>0 points—There is no process for placing teachers given</p> <p>1 point—The placement process is vague or determined by seniority</p> <p>3 points—The placement process is clear but may be overly influenced by teacher preference</p> <p>5 points—The placement process is clear and driven by matching student need to teacher effectiveness; teacher preference taken into consideration but not as the most important factor</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Opportunities for promotion and career growth</i>—A description of available career ladders for teachers and leadership or a description of opportunities for highly effective teachers to help shape and implement the reform effort 	5	<p>Eligibility—Proposal must include <i>either</i> financial incentives (see above) or opportunities for promotion and career growth. The MDE may automatically reject the proposal if it fails to speak to either of these two strategies.</p> <p>0 points—No opportunities for promotion and involvement in reform described</p> <p>1 point—Opportunities for promotion are limited and opportunities for involvement in reform are shallow or description is vague</p> <p>3 points—Opportunities for promotion are clear but opportunities for involvement in reform may be shallow</p> <p>5 points—Opportunities for promotion or involvement in the reform effort are clear and substantive</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Termination</i>—Process for staff termination (post-turnaround) after ample opportunities have been 	5	<p>0 points—There is no process for termination</p> <p>1 point—Process for termination is vague</p> <p>3 points—Process for termination is clear</p>

<p>provided for them to improve their professional practice</p>		<p>but the school does not define “ample opportunities”</p> <p>5 points—Process for termination is clear, including the school’s definition of “ample opportunities”</p>
<p>Organizational Structures and Management</p> <p><i>Governance</i>—An organization chart that clearly presents the school's new governance structure, including lines of authority and reporting between the school and the governing board, district-level staff, any related bodies (such as advisory bodies or parent and teacher councils), and any external organizations that will play a role in managing the school</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not include a new governance structure.</p> <p>0 points—Lines of authority and reporting are vague or confusing in the new governance structure</p> <p>1 point—Lines of authority and reporting are clear in the new governance structure; serious misalignment between new governance structure and the needs of the school</p> <p>3 points— Lines of authority and reporting are clear in the new governance structure; some misalignment between new governance structure and the needs of the school</p> <p>5 points—Lines of authority and reporting are clear in the new governance structure; new governance structure is aligned with the needs of the school</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>District-Level Staff</i>— A description of the district-level staff or structures that provide services to or oversee the turnaround school, such as whether the school reports to a new “turnaround office” in the LEA or to a district-level “turnaround leader” who reports directly to the Superintendent or Conservator; this description should provide the roles and responsibilities of relevant 	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—No description of the roles and responsibilities of relevant district-level staff</p> <p>1 point—Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of district-level staff are vague</p> <p>3 points—Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of district-level staff are clear</p> <p>5 points— Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of district-level staff are clear; these roles and responsibilities align with the needs of the turnaround school</p>

<p>district-level staff as well as the qualifications required for these positions</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>School Autonomy</i>—A description of the school’s autonomy in making decisions related to such items as staffing, calendars/time, procedures, and budgeting or other important operations as well as how such autonomy is tied to accountability measures 	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if school leaders lack autonomy in at least one of the following: staffing, calendars/time, procedures, or budgeting</p> <p>0 points—School leaders offered “autonomy” that is very restricted</p> <p>1 point—School leaders offered some autonomy but serious misalignment between autonomy and the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>3 points—School leaders offered some autonomy but some misalignment between autonomy and the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>5 points—School leaders offered substantive autonomy that is fully aligned with the needs of the school proposal</p>
<p><i>Lead Partners</i>—Explanations of any partnerships or contractual relationships central to the school's operations or mission, including how these partnerships align with the school proposal and the scope of work of each external partner</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—Lead Partners are identified as serving a role in the school but a description of their role, scope of work, or their alignment with the school proposal is not provided</p> <p>1 point—Role and scope of work of Lead Partners is vague or serious misalignment with the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>3 points—Role and scope of work of identified Lead Partners is clear; some misalignment with the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>5 points—Role and scope of work of identified Lead Partners is clear; full alignment with the needs of the school proposal</p>
<p><i>Operational Services</i>—The</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—Proposal does not contain a</p>

<p>school’s plans for providing transportation, food service, and all other significant operational or ancillary services related to extended time outside the regular school day</p>		<p>transportation plan</p> <p>1 point—Transportation plan <i>or</i> other service plans are vague</p> <p>3 points—Transportation plan <i>and</i> other service plans are clear and specific but may not meet the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>5 points—Transportation plan <i>and</i> other service plans are clear and specific and adequate for the needs of the school proposal</p>
<p><i>Discipline</i>—The school's student discipline policies, including those for students with disabilities</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—No discipline policies provided</p> <p>1 point—Discipline policies are vague or do not hold high standards for student behavior</p> <p>3 points—Discipline policies are clear and hold high standards for student behavior but do not address students with disabilities</p> <p>5 points—Discipline policies are clear, hold high standards for student behavior, and include policies for students with disabilities</p>
<p><i>Support for Teaching and Learning</i></p> <p><i>Professional Development (PD)</i>—Plans for creating targeted, job-specific and job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s 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</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not offer plans for “job-embedded” professional development.</p> <p>0 points—Plans for professional development are vague</p> <p>5 points—Plans for professional development are clear but PD opportunities not tied to evaluation</p> <p>10 points—Plans for professional development are clear; PD opportunities tied to evaluation; some misalignment between PD opportunities and the needs of staff and the school proposal</p> <p>15 points—Plans for professional development are clear; PD opportunities</p>

		tied to evaluation and designed to align with the needs of staff and the school proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Role of Lead Partners</i>—If applicable, a description of the role of Lead Partners in creating or delivering professional development 	2	<p>0 points—Lead Partners are identified as serving a role in professional development but a description of their role is not provided or the description is vague</p> <p>2 points—Role of identified Lead Partners is clear; full alignment with the needs of the school proposal</p>
<p><i>Time for Faculty Collaboration</i>—Evidence of adequate time for regular, frequent, faculty meetings and/or meetings with teams of teachers, i.e. grade level, department level, special services to discuss individual student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches and other reforms, and school-wide efforts in support of the school proposal</p>	5	<p>0 points—No evidence of time for faculty collaboration</p> <p>1 point—Evidence of time for faculty collaboration but time is not adequate (at least 30 minutes) and/or frequent (at least once a week)</p> <p>3 points—Evidence of time for faculty collaboration is adequate and frequent but not for the purpose of discussing individual student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches and other reforms, and school-wide efforts in support of the school proposal</p> <p>5 points—Clear evidence of adequate time for regular, frequent, faculty meetings and/or meetings with teams of teachers, i.e. grade level, department level, special services to discuss individual student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches and other reforms, and school-wide efforts in support of the school proposal</p>
<p><i>Evaluation Policies</i>— Plans for rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for instructional staff and leadership which incorporate</p>	5	<p>0 points—Plans for evaluation systems not provided</p> <p>1 point—Plans for evaluation systems are vague</p> <p>3 points—Plans are clear but may lack one of the following: rigor, transparency,</p>

		<p>or equity</p> <p>5 points—Plans are clear, rigorous, transparent, and equitable</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student growth</i>—Evidence that evaluation systems 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 	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—No evidence that student growth is a significant factor in evaluation</p> <p>1 point—Student growth is taken into account in evaluation but not as a significant factor</p> <p>3 points—Student growth is a significant factor in evaluation but growth measure is not adequate or is not explained</p> <p>5 points—Student growth is a significant factor in evaluation; growth measure is adequate</p>
<p><i>Parent and Community Outreach</i>—A description of opportunities for parent and community engagement</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—No opportunities for parent and community engagement</p> <p>1 point—Opportunities for engagement are vague</p> <p>3 points—Opportunities for engagement are clear but may be shallow</p> <p>5 points—Opportunities for engagement are clear and substantive</p>

CONSOLIDATION PROPOSAL

Total Points—100

Points Required for a Grant—75

Note: Funds will be awarded based on availability. Meeting the minimum requirements for a grant does not guarantee funding.

I. Introduction—20 Points

Element	Points	Guidance
<p><i>Descriptive Information about the Eligible Schools</i>—Information to include</p> <p><i>Eligible Schools</i>— The official name of the school, the school code, Tier designation, and state accountability label of the school <u>from which</u> students will be transferred and the name(s), school code(s) and state accountability label(s) of the school or schools <u>to which</u> students will be transferred</p>	eligibility	<p>MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not provide this information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal is for a Tier I school, MDE may ask the LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections. • If the proposal is for a Tier II or Tier III school and MDE has not allocated all available school improvement funds for the current fiscal year, MDE may ask an LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections.
<p><i>Grades Served</i>—The grades served by the newly consolidated school or schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the consolidation is phased-in, the grades to be served each year by the closing school and each consolidated school 		
<p><i>Enrollment</i>—The minimum, planned, and maximum enrollment per grade per year for the full term of the grant of each affected school and any resulting alterations in attendance zones or feeder patterns</p>		

<p>Alignment with the Needs Assessment—A description of how a consolidation model addresses the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>MDE may automatically reject the school proposal if the consolidation model does not clearly address the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal is for a Tier I school, MDE may ask the LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections. • If the proposal is for a Tier II or Tier III school and MDE has not allocated all available school improvement funds for the current fiscal year, MDE may ask an LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections.
<p>Comprehensive Needs Assessment—Evidence that the LEA conducted an annual comprehensive needs assessment. The comprehensive needs assessment focuses on gathering data in five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization. Data must be disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency, in order to compare the achievement between subgroups.</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not include a summary of the LEA’s process for conducting comprehensive needs assessment.</p> <p>0 points—There is no description of the LEA’s process to conduct and analyze a comprehensive needs assessment</p> <p>1 point— Description of the needs assessment is vague. It includes limited qualitative and quantitative data in some of the five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization and the data is not disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency</p> <p>3 points—Description of the needs assessment is clear but does not include qualitative and quantitative data in all of the five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization or the data is</p>

		<p>not disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency</p> <p>5 points—Description of the needs assessment is clear and includes qualitative and quantitative data in each of the five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization. The data is disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency.</p>
<p>Alignment with Intervention Requirements—An account detailing how the proposal meets each of the requirements for the close and consolidate intervention</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>MDE may automatically reject the school proposal if it does not meet all of the U.S. Department of Education’s requirements for consolidation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal is for a Tier I school, MDE may ask the LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections. • If the proposal is for a Tier II or Tier III school and MDE has not allocated all available school improvement funds for the current fiscal year, MDE may ask an LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections.
<p>Implementation Milestones—A detailed listing of the major steps in the implementation process to include timelines, responsible individuals for accomplishing them, and a Start-up plan.</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>0 points—Proposal contains no list of implementation milestones or target dates</p> <p>3 points—Implementation milestones include some of the meaningful steps toward full closure and consolidation; some milestones may not have a target date</p> <p>7 points—Implementation milestones denote most meaningful steps toward full closure and consolidation; most milestones have a target date</p>

		10 points —Implementation milestones denote all meaningful steps toward full closure and consolidation; all milestones have a target date
<i>Start-up Plan</i> —A detailed start-up plan identifying tasks, timelines and individuals responsible	5	0 points —Plan lacks tasks, timelines, <i>or</i> individuals responsible 1 point —Tasks <i>and/or</i> timelines 3 points —Tasks and timelines are clear; individuals responsible are not always matched to specific tasks 5 points —Plan includes clear tasks and timelines; individuals responsible are matched to specific tasks

II. Teaching and Learning—40 Points

Element	Points	Guidance
<i>Instruction</i> — A brief description of the consolidated school’s instructional design, including the type of learning environment (such as classroom-based or independent study), class size and structure, and teaching methods	15	0 points —No description is given for instructional design 5 points —Description is vague and lacks one or more of the following: type of learning environment, class size and structure, or teaching methods 10 points —Description includes all components of instructional design but at least one is vague 15 points —Description is clear and detailed for all components of the school’s instructional design
<i>Special Populations</i> —The consolidated school’s plans identifying and successfully serving new students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind, and gifted students, including but not limited to compliance with applicable	5	0 points —Proposal contains no plans for identifying special populations or integrating them into existing services at the consolidated school(s) 1 point —Proposal contains vague plans for identifying special populations <i>or</i> integrating them into existing services at the consolidated school(s), <i>and</i> school lacks services to accommodate some populations but has no plans for

<p>laws and regulations</p>		<p>providing these services</p> <p>3 points—Proposal contains clear plans for identifying special populations <i>and</i> integrating them into existing services at the consolidated school(s), but plans for providing new services, if needed, are vague</p> <p>5 points—Proposal contains clear plans for identifying special populations <i>and</i> integrating them into existing services at the consolidated school(s); if new services are needed, plans for providing them are clear</p>
<p><i>Instructional Leadership and Staff</i>—A school staffing plan</p> <p><i>Staffing Chart</i>—A staffing chart for the consolidated school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Phased consolidation</i>—If consolidation is phased-in, staffing charts for each year of the grant 	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—Staffing chart is missing <i>or</i> if the consolidation is phased in, is missing for one or more years</p> <p>1 point—Staffing chart will not meet stated class sizes based on enrollment projections <i>but</i> serious misalignment with instructional needs described in the proposal</p> <p>3 points—Staffing chart will meet stated class sizes based on enrollment projections <i>but</i> some misalignment with instructional needs described in the proposal</p> <p>5 points—Staffing chart meets class sizes based on enrollment projections; aligns with instructional needs described in the proposal</p>
<p><i>Roles and Responsibilities</i>—A clear description of the roles and responsibilities for positions noted in the staffing chart, especially of the school’s leadership and management</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>0 points—No description given of positions noted in the staffing chart</p> <p>3 points—Each position noted in the staffing chart has a clear role and list of responsibilities; serious misalignment between these roles and responsibilities and the instructional needs of the consolidated school</p> <p>7 points—Each position noted in the staffing chart has a clear role and list of</p>

		<p>responsibilities; some misalignment between these roles and responsibilities align and the instructional needs of the consolidated school</p> <p>10 points—Each position noted in the staffing chart has a clear role and list of responsibilities; these roles and responsibilities clearly align with the instructional needs of the consolidated school</p>
<p><i>Current Staff</i>—The names and qualifications of current staff who will be part of the intervention as well as the current positions these staff hold</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—Proposal lacks the names and qualifications of current staff to be retained or current staff to be retained are not highly qualified</p> <p>1 point—Current staff retained are highly qualified but no evidence presented of the effectiveness of staff retained from the closed school</p> <p>3 points—Current staff retained are highly qualified; evidence presented of the effectiveness of staff retained from the closed school may not be uniformly strong</p> <p>5 points—Current staff retained are highly qualified; qualifications include evidence of effectiveness of staff from the closed school</p>

III. Operation and Support Systems—40 Points

Element	Points	Guidance
<p>Allocation of Financial Resources—A fiscal plan which describes</p> <p><i>Budget</i>— A budget spreadsheet for the school in the format provided by MDE</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Eligibility— If an LEA budget is not provided for FY11, FY12, and FY13 or SIG funds are used for improper purposes, the MDE may automatically reject the proposal</p> <p>0 points—SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes but the budget is not complete and does not follow funding guidelines</p>

		<p>1 point—SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes but the budget does not follow funding guidelines or is not complete</p> <p>3 points—SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes and budget is complete but does not follow funding guidelines</p> <p>4 points—SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes; budget follows funding guidelines, and budgets are complete for the school</p>
<p><i>Budget Narrative</i>— Description of the budget items in the format provided by MDE</p>	4	<p>0 points—Budget narrative does not address each line item</p> <p>1 point—All budget items are addressed but some budget items are not clearly explained</p> <p>3 points—All budget items are addressed and only a few budget items not clearly explained</p> <p>4 points—All budget items are addressed and clearly explained</p>
<p><i>Additional Resources</i>—A description of supplemental financial resources or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s plans</p>	4	<p>0 points—Supplemental resources required by the budget are not identified</p> <p>1 point—Supplemental resources are identified but not immediately available</p> <p>3 points—Available supplemental resources identified are not in amounts that align with budget</p> <p>4 points—Identification of available supplemental financial resources in amounts that align with budget or no additional resources required</p>
<p><i>Alignment</i>—Evidence of alignment of the budget with the information detailed in the School Consolidation Proposal</p>	4	<p>0 points—Elements of the proposal are missing from the budget or SIG funds are expended on items missing from the proposal</p> <p>1 point—Each element of the proposal may be referenced in the budget but</p>

		<p>more than a few references are unclear</p> <p>3 points—Each element of the proposal is referenced in the budget; only a few references are unclear</p> <p>4 points—Each element of the proposal is clearly referenced in a budget line item</p>
<p><i>Organizational Structures and Management</i></p> <p><i>District-Level Staff</i>—A description of roles and responsibilities of district-level staff who will be involved in the consolidation process</p>	4	<p>0 points—No description of the roles and responsibilities of relevant district-level staff</p> <p>1 point—Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of district-level staff are vague</p> <p>3 points—Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of district-level staff are clear</p> <p>4 points— Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of district-level staff are clear; these roles and responsibilities align with the needs of the consolidated school</p>
<p><i>Facilities</i>—Information pertaining to the use of facilities, including any necessary facility changes to accommodate additional students or students of a different age</p>	5	<p>0 points—Proposal does not clearly demonstrate that the consolidated school’s facility (or schools’ facilities) can accommodate transferring students nor does proposal contain a plan to adapt the facility/facilities to accommodate transferring students</p> <p>1 point—Plans to adapt facility to accommodate additional students lack at least one of the following: a project timeline or available resources.</p> <p>5 points—Proposal clearly demonstrates that the consolidated school’s facility (or schools’ facilities) can accommodate transferring students or the plan to adapt the facility/facilities contains a clear timeline and available resources.</p>
<p><i>Operational Services</i>—The school’s plans for providing</p>	5	<p>0 points—Proposal does not contain a transportation plan</p>

<p>transportation and all other significant operational or ancillary services related to and affected by consolidation</p>		<p>1 point—Transportation plan <i>or</i> other service plans are vague</p> <p>3 points—Transportation plan <i>and</i> other service plans are clear and specific but may not meet the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>5 points—Transportation plan <i>and</i> other service plans are clear and specific and adequate for the needs of the school proposal</p>
<p><i>Parent and Community Outreach</i>—Plans for parent and community outreach related to a student’s transition to a new school which may include</p> <p><i>Media outreach</i>—Planned press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, or direct mail notices</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>0 points—Plan contains no media outreach</p> <p>1 point—Media outreach lacks a timeline, is unlikely to reach all affected parents, or information for distribution is not provided in the proposal</p> <p>2 points—Media outreach begins several weeks in advance of consolidation, is likely to reach all affected parents and most community members, and information for distribution or example materials provided in the proposal</p>
<p><i>Opportunities for questions and answers</i>—Hotlines or meetings regarding the school closure</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>0 points—Plan contains no opportunities for parents or community members to ask questions regarding school closure</p> <p>1 point—Parents and community members offered only one opportunity (such as one meeting) to ask questions regarding school closure</p> <p>3 points—Parents or community members offered multiple opportunities to ask questions regarding school closure</p>
<p><i>Available services</i>—A description of services to help parents and students transition to a new school</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—Plan contains no services to help parents and students transition to a new school</p> <p>1 point—Services to help parents are vague</p> <p>3 points—Services to help parents are clear but are at least one of the following:</p>

		<p>one-size-fits-all, difficult to access, or lack follow-up</p> <p>5 points—Services to help parents and students transition to a new school are well-defined, individualized, easily accessible, and ongoing throughout the transition.</p>
--	--	--

TRANSFORMATION PROPOSAL

Total Points—300 points

Points required for a grant—225 points

Note: Funds will be awarded based on availability. Meeting the minimum requirements for a grant does not guarantee funding.

I. Introduction—40 points

Element	Points	Guidance
<p><i>Descriptive Information about the Eligible School</i>—Information to include the official name of the school, the school code, Tier designation, and state accountability label; the grades served by the school; and the minimum, planned, and maximum enrollment per grade per year for the full term of the grant</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not provide this information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal is for a Tier I school, MDE may ask the LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections. • If the proposal is for a Tier II or Tier III school and MDE has not allocated all available school improvement funds for the current fiscal year, MDE may ask an LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections.
<p><i>Alignment with the Needs Assessment</i>—A description of how a transformation model addresses the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>MDE may automatically reject the school proposal if the transformation model does not clearly address the school’s needs as defined by the needs assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal is for a Tier I school, MDE may ask the LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections. • If the proposal is for a Tier II or Tier III school and MDE has not allocated all available school improvement funds for the current fiscal year, MDE may ask an LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections.
<p><i>Comprehensive Needs Assessment</i>—Evidence that the LEA conducted an annual comprehensive needs assessment. The</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not include a summary of the LEA’s process for conducting comprehensive needs</p>

<p>comprehensive needs assessment focuses on gathering data in five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization. Data must be disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency, in order to compare the achievement between subgroups.</p>		<p>assessment.</p> <p>0 points—There is no description of the LEA’s process to conduct and analyze a comprehensive needs assessment</p> <p>3 points— Description of the needs assessment is vague. It includes limited qualitative and quantitative data in some of the five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization and the data is not disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency</p> <p>7 points—Description of the needs assessment is clear but does not include qualitative and quantitative data in all of the five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization or the data is not disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency</p> <p>10 points—Description of the needs assessment is clear and includes qualitative and quantitative data in each of the five dimensions: student achievement, curriculum and instruction, professional development, family and community involvement, and school context and organization. The data is disaggregated based on gender, race and ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficiency.</p>
<p>Alignment with Intervention Requirements—An account detailing how the proposal meets</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>MDE may automatically reject the school proposal if it does not meet all of the U.S. Department of Education’s requirements</p>

<p>each of the requirements for the transformation intervention</p>		<p>for a transformation school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal is for a Tier I school, MDE may ask the LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections. • If the proposal is for a Tier II or Tier III school and MDE has not allocated all available school improvement funds for the current fiscal year, MDE may ask an LEA to re-submit the proposal with corrections.
<p>Implementation Milestones—A detailed listing of the major steps in the implementation process to include timelines, responsible individuals for accomplishing them, and a Start-up plan</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>0 points—Proposal contains no list of implementation milestones</p> <p>7 points—Implementation milestones include some of the meaningful steps toward full transformation; some milestones may not have a target date</p> <p>14 points—Implementation milestones denote most of the meaningful steps toward transformation; most milestones have a target date</p> <p>20 points—Implementation milestones denote all meaningful steps toward full transformation; all milestones have a target date</p>
<p>Start-up Plan—A detailed school start-up plan, identifying tasks, timelines and responsible individuals</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>0 points—Plan lacks tasks, timelines, <i>or</i> responsible individuals</p> <p>3 points—Tasks <i>and/or</i> timelines are vague</p> <p>7 points—Tasks and timelines are clear; individuals responsible are not assigned to specific tasks</p> <p>10 points—Plan includes clear tasks and timelines; individuals responsible are assigned to specific tasks</p>

II. Teaching and Learning—100 points

Element	Points	Guidance
<p>Curriculum—A description of the academic program (courses, curriculum overview, and pacing guides) aligned with the state standards</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>0 points—LEA does not provide two or more of the following: list of courses, a curriculum overview, and/or pacing guides for each subject/grade or the curriculum overview and/or pacing guides are not aligned with state standards</p> <p>8 points—LEA does not provide one of the following: list of courses, a curriculum overview, and/or pacing guides for each subject/grade</p> <p>15 points—Description of the academic program is complete but description is vague</p> <p>20 points—Description of the academic program is clear and complete; program is aligned to state standards</p>
<p><i>Research-based</i>—Evidence that the curriculum is research-based</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>If the LEA does not provide evidence that the curriculum is research-based or the LEA’s references to research do not clearly align with the curriculum overview, MDE may automatically reject the school proposal.</p>
<p><i>Vertical alignment</i>—Evidence that the curriculum is vertically aligned year-to-year</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>If the LEA does not provide evidence that the curriculum is vertically aligned year-to-year, MDE may automatically reject the school proposal.</p>
<p>Instruction—A description of the school's instructional design, including the type of learning environment (such as classroom-based or independent study), class size and structure, teaching methods, and how this instructional design differs from previous programs.</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>0 points—No description is given for instructional design</p> <p>3 points—Description is vague and lacks one or more of the following: type of learning environment, class size and structure, teaching methods, or a new design</p> <p>5 points—Description includes all components of instructional design but at least one is vague</p>

		<p>8 points—Description is clear and detailed for all components of the school’s instructional design</p>
<p><i>Three Tier Instructional Model, Intervention Process (IP)</i>— Identification of personalized academic and non-academic support services which support the school’s IP plan</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not include an IP plan</p> <p>0 points—The IP plan is too vague to evaluate</p> <p>4 points—IP plan lacks two or more of the following: a clear and specific process for student identification, names of personnel responsible and their defined roles, school structures which support IP, and a list of available support services, including social-emotional and community-based supports</p> <p>9 points—IP plan lacks one of the following: a clear and specific process for student identification, names of personnel responsible and their defined roles, school structures which support IP, and a list of available support services, including social-emotional and community-based supports</p> <p>14 points—IP includes a clear and specific process for student identification, names of personnel responsible and their defined roles, school structures which support IP, and a list of available support services, including social-emotional and community-based supports</p>
<p><i>Data-driven decision-making</i>— Plans for data-driven decision-making for all activities relating to instructional strategies and student-level interventions</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>Eligibility—If the proposal does not provide evidence that the school promotes the continuous use of student data, MDE may automatically deny the school proposal.</p> <p>0 points—Plans are too vague to evaluate</p> <p>3 points—Intervention process or other instructional strategies reference data but do not clearly or deeply embed data</p>

		<p>in decision-making</p> <p>5 points—Use of data is clearly and deeply embedded in decision-making for some instructional strategies but not all</p> <p>16 points—Use of data is clearly and deeply embedded in decision-making processes in IP and other instructional strategies</p>
<p><i>Special populations</i>—The school's plans for identifying and successfully serving students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind, and gifted students, including but not limited to compliance with applicable laws and regulations</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>0 points—Proposal contains no plans for identifying special populations at the transformation school</p> <p>2 point—Proposal contains vague plans for identifying special populations <i>or</i> serving them at the transformation school</p> <p>5 points—Proposal contains clear plans for identifying special populations <i>and</i> serving them at the transformation school, but plans for providing new services, if needed, are vague</p> <p>7 points—Proposal contains clear plans for identifying special populations <i>and</i> serving them at the transformation school; if new services are needed, plans for providing them are clear</p>
<p><i>Increased Time</i>—Plans regarding school schedule, length of school day, length of school year</p>	<p>eligibility</p>	<p>If the proposal does not provide evidence that the school has increased learning time significantly, MDE may automatically reject the school proposal.</p>
<p>Assessments—The school's plan for using internal and external assessments to measure and report student progress on the performance framework</p> <p><i>Availability of student data</i>—Plans for the development and use of formative, interim, and summative assessments permitting immediate analysis, feedback, and targeted</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>Eligibility—If the proposal does not provide evidence that the school has assessments which allow for the continuous use of student data, MDE may automatically deny the school proposal.</p> <p>0 points—No plans for the development or use of at least one of the following: formative, interim, or summative assessments; or plans for the development and use of formative, interim, and summative assessments are</p>

<p>instruction</p>		<p>vague</p> <p>3 points—Plans may include clear timelines, tasks, and personnel responsible but internal and external assessments will not measure all of the indicators in the performance framework or quality and utility of assessments are vague</p> <p>10 points—Plans include clear timelines, tasks, personnel responsible and internal and external assessments will measure all of the indicators in the performance framework but will not produce timely student-level data linked to specific skills and objectives</p> <p>15 points—Plans include clear timelines, tasks, personnel responsible and internal and external assessments will measure all of the indicators in the performance framework and will produce timely student-level data linked to specific skills and objectives</p>
<p>Instructional Leadership and Staff—A school staffing plan to include</p> <p><i>Staffing Chart</i>—A staffing chart for the school's first year and any plans for growing or changing the staff during the term of the grant</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>0 points—Staffing chart is missing for one or more years, unclear, or will not meet stated class sizes based on enrollment projections</p> <p>3 points—Staffing chart will meet stated class sizes based on enrollment projections but serious misalignment with instructional needs described in the proposal</p> <p>7 points—Staffing chart will meet stated class sizes based on enrollment projections but some misalignment with instructional needs described in the proposal</p> <p>10 points—Staffing chart meets class sizes based on enrollment projections; aligns with instructional needs described in the proposal</p>

<p><i>Roles and Responsibilities</i>—A clear description of the roles and responsibilities for positions noted in the staffing chart, especially the school's leadership and management team</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>0 points—No description given of positions noted in the staffing chart or descriptions are vague</p> <p>3 points—Each position noted in the staffing chart has a clear role and list of responsibilities; serious misalignment between these roles and responsibilities align and the instructional needs of the transformation school</p> <p>7 points—Each position noted in the staffing chart has a clear role and list of responsibilities; slight misalignment between these roles and responsibilities align and the instructional needs of the transformation school</p> <p>10 points—Each position noted in the staffing chart has a clear role and list of responsibilities; these roles and responsibilities align with the instructional needs of the transformation school</p>
--	-----------	---

III. Operation and Support—160 points

Element	Points	Guidance
<p><i>Allocation of Financial Resources</i>—A fiscal plan which describes</p> <p><i>Budget</i>— A budget spreadsheet for the school in the format provided by MDE</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility— If an LEA budget is not provided for FY11, FY12, and FY13 or SIG funds are used for improper purposes, the MDE may automatically reject the proposal</p> <p>If budget does not clearly delineate the use of SIG funds or SIG funds are used for improper purposes, MDE may automatically deny the proposal.</p> <p>0 points—SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes but the budget is not complete and does not follow funding guidelines</p> <p>1 point—SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes but the</p>

		<p>budget does not follow funding guidelines or is not complete</p> <p>3 points—SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes and budget is complete but does not follow funding guidelines</p> <p>5 points—SIG funds are clearly delineated and used for proper purposes; budget follows funding guidelines, and budgets are complete for the school</p>
<p><i>Budget Narrative</i>— Description of the budget items in the format provided by MDE</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>0 points—Budget narrative does not address each line item</p> <p>3 points—All budget items are addressed but some budget items are not clearly explained</p> <p>5 points—All budget items are addressed and only a few budget items not clearly explained</p> <p>8 points—All budget items are addressed and clearly explained</p>
<p><i>Additional Resources</i>—A description of supplemental financial resources or anticipated fundraising contributions, if necessary to fully fund the LEA’s plans</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—Supplemental resources required by the budget are not identified</p> <p>1 point—Supplemental resources are identified but not immediately available</p> <p>3 points—Available supplemental resources identified are not in amounts that align with budget</p> <p>5 points—Identification of available supplemental financial resources in amounts that align with budget or no additional resources required</p>
<p><i>Alignment</i>—Evidence of alignment of the budget with the information detailed in the School Transformation Proposal</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—Elements of the proposal are missing from the budget or SIG funds are expended on items missing from the proposal</p> <p>1 point—Each element of the proposal may be referenced in the budget but more than a few references are unclear</p>

		<p>3 points—Each element of the proposal is referenced in the budget; only a few references are unclear</p> <p>5 points—Each element of the proposal is clearly referenced in a budget line item</p>
<p>Human Resource Systems</p> <p><i>Recruiting and Hiring New Staff</i>—Plans for recruiting new school leadership and staff, including reliance on any Lead Partners</p>	5	<p>0 points—Plans for recruiting and hiring staff not given</p> <p>1 point—Plans for recruiting and hiring staff are vague</p> <p>3 points—Plans for recruiting and hiring staff may lack one of the following: timelines, personnel responsible, role of identified Lead Partners, or recruitment strategies</p> <p>5 points—Plans for recruiting and hiring staff include timelines, personnel responsible, role of Lead Partners, and recruitment strategies</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Transformation School Leader</i>—A copy of the proposed job description as well as the process for evaluating applicants to select for a strong leader with a proven-track record of success in raising student achievement and, if applicable, increasing graduation rates 	15	<p>Eligibility—If the proposal does not provide evidence that the school has replaced or will replace the principal, MDE may automatically deny the school proposal.</p> <p>0 points—Proposal lacks a copy of the proposed job description or a description of the process for evaluating applicants</p> <p>5 points—Proposal includes a copy of the proposed job description and the process for evaluating applicants but both are vague</p> <p>10 points—Copy of the proposed job description is clear and high-quality but the process for evaluating applicants is vague</p> <p>15 points—Copy of the proposed job description is clear and high-quality; the process for evaluating applicants to select for a strong leader with a proven-track record of success in raising student achievement and, if applicable, increasing</p>

		graduation rates is likely to produce quality outcomes; and a list of finalists and their qualifications is provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Instructional Staff</i>—A process for evaluating applicants to select for effective teachers with a record of success in raising student achievement who also possess qualities that equip them to succeed in the transformation environment 	10	<p>0 points—Proposal lacks a description of the process for evaluating applicants</p> <p>3 points—Process for evaluating applicants may be vague, criteria for hiring do not set high standards, or criteria are not aligned to the needs of the transformation</p> <p>7 points—Process for evaluating applicants is clear, criteria for hiring set high standards; some misalignment between criteria and the needs of the transformation</p> <p>10 points—Process for evaluating applicants is clear; criteria for hiring set high standards and are aligned to the needs of the transformation</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Financial Incentives</i>—A description of financial incentives (such as signing bonuses, moving reimbursement, or loan repayment) that the LEA may use to recruit staff 	5	<p>Eligibility—Proposal must include <i>either</i> financial incentives or opportunities for promotion and career growth (see below). MDE may automatically reject the proposal if it fails to speak to these two strategies.</p> <p>0 points—No financial incentives provided</p> <p>1 point—Only one type of financial incentive offered</p> <p>3 points—Multiple financial incentives offered; signing bonuses or loan repayment in amounts less than \$1,000</p> <p>5 points—Multiple financial incentives offered; signing bonuses or loan repayment at least \$1,000</p>
<p><i>Employment Policies</i>—The school’s leadership and teacher employment policies which address</p>	5	<p>0 points—No process for placing teachers given</p> <p>1 point—Placement process is vague or determined by seniority</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Placement</i>—Process for assigning teachers to work with specific grades, subjects, and/or groups of students 		<p>3 points—Placement process is clear but may be overly influenced by teacher preference</p> <p>5 points—Placement process is clear and driven by matching student need to teacher effectiveness; teacher preference taken into consideration but not as the most important factor</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Financial rewards</i>—Plans for financially rewarding staff for student achievement by providing individual, team, or school-wide salary bonuses or raises or loan repayment 	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if it contains no plans to reward staff for student achievement.</p> <p>0 points—Plans for rewarding staff are vague</p> <p>1 point—Plans for rewarding staff are clear but may not be equitable</p> <p>3 points—Plans for rewarding staff are clear and equitable; rewards in amounts greater than \$1,000</p> <p>5 points—Plans for rewarding staff are clear and equitable; rewards in amounts greater than \$1,000</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Opportunities for promotion and career growth</i>—A description of available career ladders for teachers and leadership or a description of opportunities for highly effective teachers to help shape and implement the reform effort 	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility—Proposal must include <i>either</i> financial incentives (see above) or opportunities for promotion and career growth. MDE may automatically reject the proposal if it fails to speak to either of these two strategies.</p> <p>0 points—No opportunities for promotion and involvement in reform described</p> <p>1 point—Opportunities for promotion are limited and opportunities for involvement in reform are shallow or description is vague</p> <p>3 points—Opportunities for promotion are clear but opportunities for involvement in reform may be shallow</p> <p>5 points—Opportunities for promotion or involvement in the reform effort are clear</p>

		and substantive
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Termination</i>—Process for staff termination (post-transformation) after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice 	5	<p>0 points—No process for termination</p> <p>1 point—Process for termination is vague</p> <p>3 points—Process for termination is clear but the school does not define “ample opportunities”</p> <p>5 points—Process for termination is clear, including the school’s definition of “ample opportunities”</p>
<p><i>Organizational Structures and Management</i></p> <p><i>Governance</i>— An organization chart that clearly presents the school’s governance structure, including lines of authority and reporting between the school and the governing board, district-level staff, any related bodies (such as advisory bodies or parent and teacher councils), and any external organizations that will play a role in managing the school</p>	5	<p>0 points—Lines of authority and reporting are vague or confusing</p> <p>1 point—Lines of authority and reporting are clear; serious misalignment between governance structure and the needs of the school</p> <p>3 points— Lines of authority and reporting are clear; some misalignment between governance structure and the needs of the school</p> <p>5 points—Lines of authority and reporting are clear; governance structure is aligned with the needs of the school</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>District-Level Staff</i>—A description of the district-level staff or structures that provide services or oversee the transformation school; this description should provide the roles and responsibilities of relevant district-level staff as well as the qualifications required for these positions 	5	<p>Eligibility--If the proposal does not provide evidence that the school will receive on-going technical assistance, MDE may automatically reject the school proposal.</p> <p>0 points—No description of the roles and responsibilities of relevant district-level staff</p> <p>1 point—Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of district-level staff are vague; no qualifications provided</p> <p>3 points—Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of district-level staff are clear; no qualifications provided or some misalignment between the roles and responsibilities of district-level staff and</p>

		<p>the needs of the transformation school</p> <p>5 points— Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of district-level staff are clear; these roles and responsibilities align with the needs of the transformation school; qualifications provided</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>School Autonomy</i>—A description of the school’s autonomy in making decisions related to such items as staffing, calendars/time, procedures, and budgeting or other important operations as well as how such autonomy is tied to accountability measures 	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if school leaders lack autonomy in at least one of the following: staffing, calendars/time, procedures, or budgeting</p> <p>0 points—School leaders offered “autonomy” that is very restricted</p> <p>1 point—School leaders offered some autonomy but serious misalignment between autonomy and the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>3 points—School leaders offered some autonomy but some misalignment between autonomy and the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>5 points—School leaders offered substantive autonomy that is fully aligned with the needs of the school proposal</p>
<p><i>Lead Partners</i>—Explanations of any partnerships or contractual relationships central to the school’s operations or mission, including how these partnerships align with the school proposal and the scope of work of each external partner</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0 points—Lead Partners are identified as serving a role in the school but a description of their role, scope of work, or their alignment with the school proposal is not provided</p> <p>1 point—Role and scope of work of Lead Partners is vague <i>or</i> serious misalignment with the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>3 points—Role and scope of work of identified Lead Partners is clear; some misalignment with the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>5 points—Role and scope of work of identified Lead Partners is clear; full alignment with the needs of the school</p>

		proposal
<i>Operational Services</i> —The school’s plans for providing transportation, food service, and all other significant operational or ancillary services related to extended time outside the regular school day	5	<p>0 points—Proposal does not contain a transportation plan</p> <p>1 point—Transportation plan <i>or</i> other service plans are vague</p> <p>3 points—Transportation plan <i>and</i> other service plans are clear and specific but may not meet the needs of the school proposal</p> <p>5 points—Transportation plan <i>and</i> other service plans are clear and specific and adequate for the needs of the school proposal</p>
<i>Discipline</i> —The school’s student discipline policies, including those for students with disabilities	5	<p>0 points—Not discipline policies provided</p> <p>1 point—Discipline policies are vague or do not hold high standards for student behavior</p> <p>3 points—Discipline policies are clear and hold high standards for student behavior but do not address students with disabilities</p> <p>5 points—Discipline policies are clear, hold high standards for student behavior, and include policies for students with disabilities</p>
<p>Support for Teaching and Learning</p> <p><i>Professional Development</i>—Plans for creating targeted, job-specific and job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s 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</p>	15	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if the proposal does not offer plans for “job-embedded” professional development.</p> <p>0 points—Plans for professional development are vague</p> <p>5 points—Plans for professional development are clear but PD opportunities not tied to evaluation</p> <p>10 points—Plans for professional development are clear; PD opportunities tied to evaluation; some misalignment between PD opportunities and the needs</p>

strategies		of staff and the school proposal 15 points —Plans for professional development are clear; PD opportunities tied to evaluation and designed to align with the needs of staff and the school proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Role of Lead Partners</i>—If applicable, a description of the role of Lead Partners in creating or delivering professional development 	2	0 points —Lead Partners are identified as serving a role in professional development but a description of their role is not provided or the description is vague 2 points —Role of identified Lead Partners is clear; full alignment with the needs of the school proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Integration of existing professional development activities</i>—Plans for integrating or eliminating professional development programs currently impacting the school 	5	0 points —No plans to analyze existing professional development activities 1 point —Vague plans to analyze existing PD activities in order to integrate or eliminate them 3 points —Clear plans to analyze existing professional development activities with intent to integrate or eliminate them; some misalignment between process of integration/elimination and school/teacher needs or the PD plan 5 points —Clear plans to analyze existing professional development activities with intent to integrate or eliminate them based on school and teacher needs and the professional development plan
<i>Time for Faculty Collaboration</i> —Evidence of adequate time for regular, frequent, faculty meetings and/or meetings with teams of teachers, i.e. grade level, department level, special services to discuss individual student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching	5	0 points —No evidence of time for faculty collaboration 1 point —Evidence of time for faculty collaboration but time is not adequate (at least 30 minutes) and/or frequent (at least once a week) 3 points —Evidence of time for faculty collaboration adequate and frequent but not for the purpose of discussing

<p>approaches and other reforms, and school-wide efforts in support of the school proposal</p>		<p>individual student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches and other reforms, and school-wide efforts in support of the school proposal</p> <p>5 points—Clear evidence of adequate time for regular, frequent, faculty meetings and/or meetings with teams of teachers, i.e. grade level, department level, special services to discuss individual student progress, curricular or grade-level teaching approaches and other reforms, and school-wide efforts in support of the school proposal</p>
<p><i>Evaluation Policies</i>— Plans for rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for instructional staff and leadership which incorporate</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Eligibility—If the proposal does not provide evaluation policies, MDE may automatically deny the school proposal.</p> <p>3 points—Plans for evaluation systems are vague</p> <p>7 points—Plans are clear but may lack one of the following: rigor, transparency, or equity</p> <p>10 points—Plans are clear, rigorous, transparent, and equitable</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Student growth</i>—Evidence that evaluation systems 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 	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility—No evidence that student growth is a significant factor in evaluation</p> <p>1 point—Student growth is taken into account in evaluation but not as a significant factor</p> <p>3 points—Student growth is a significant factor in evaluation but growth measure is not adequate or is not explained</p> <p>5 points—Student growth is a significant factor in evaluation; growth measure is adequate</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Staff input</i>—Description of how systems have been designed and developed with teacher and principal 	<p>5</p>	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if evaluation policies are not designed with staff input.</p>

involvement		<p>0 points—Description of teacher and principal involvement is vague</p> <p>1 point—Shallow involvement of teachers and principals</p> <p>3 points—Evidence of substantive involvement of teachers <i>or</i> principals</p> <p>5 points—Evidence of substantive involvement of teachers <i>and</i> principals</p>
<p><i>Parent and Community Outreach</i>— A description of ongoing opportunities and structures for parent and community engagement such as the establishment of organized parent groups, public meetings involving parents and community members to review school performance and help develop school improvement plans, surveys to gauge parent and community satisfaction and support for local public schools, complaint procedures for families, coordination with local social and health service providers to help meet family needs, and parent education classes (including GED, adult literacy, and ESL programs)</p>	5	<p>Eligibility—MDE may automatically reject the proposal if it contains no opportunities for parent and community engagement.</p> <p>0 points—Opportunities for engagement are vague</p> <p>1 point—Opportunities for engagement are clear but may be limited or shallow</p> <p>3 points—Opportunities for engagement are clear and numerous but may lack substance</p> <p>5 points—Opportunities for engagement are clear, substantive, and numerous</p>

