

School Improvement Grants

New Awards Application

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

Fiscal Year 2011

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Massachusetts

March 2, 2012 Resubmission



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

OMB Number:
Expiration Date:

Paperwork Burden Statement

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

State and LEA Allocations

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

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2011 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

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

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

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before January 9, 2012.

For Further Information

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: 75 Pleasant St. Malden, MA 02148</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Matthew Pakos</p> <p>Position and Office: Director, School Improvement Grant Programs, Center for Targeted Assistance</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: 75 Pleasant St, Malden, MA 02148</p> <p>Telephone: 781 338 3507</p> <p>Fax: 781-335-3318</p> <p>Email address: MAtitleonedirector@doe.mass.edu</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.</p>	<p>Telephone: 781-338-3100</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X</p>	<p>Date: January 9, 2012</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>	

FY 2011 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION CHECKLIST

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

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

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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

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

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED	AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS
N/A			
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

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

SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

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

All of the information that is required for an LEA’s application for SIG funding is elicited within the LEA subgrant application, which consists of the Redesign Plan (Appendix C) and the Budget Workbook (Appendix E). ESE has attempted to integrate both state and federal requirements within its existing Framework for Accountability and Assistance to the extent possible. The specific elements related to the federal requirements, both generally and for each specific intervention model, are integrated within the Redesign Plan (see the footnotes within Appendix C). **For the FY11 competition, Massachusetts has modified its scoring rubric and LEA grant application to increase the rigor of the scoring process and gather additional information from applicants. Accordingly, Massachusetts has made several minor changes to its description of evaluation criteria. In this section, and throughout our FY11 application, changes from the FY10 application are indicated in red text.**

Each component of a district’s Redesign Plan for an eligible school will be reviewed along three rubric dimensions:

- Capacity and Commitment
- Data Analysis and Selection of Supports and Intervention Model
- Strategic and Actionable Approach

Each element within each dimension described above will be rated using the following scale.

- Strong
- Adequate
- Marginal
- Weak
- Absent

These are fully detailed in the attached Scoring Rubric (Appendix F) that ESE will use to evaluate the Redesign Plan.

Part 1: The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a

School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA’s application with respect to each of the following actions:

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

ESE will utilize the attached Scoring Rubric (see Appendix F)—in particular the dimension “Data Analysis and Selection of Supports and Intervention Model”—to assess each relevant component of the Redesign Plan to evaluate this LEA action.

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

ESE will utilize the attached Scoring Rubric (see Appendix F)—in particular the dimension “Capacity and Commitment” to assess each relevant component of the Redesign Plan to evaluate this LEA action.

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

ESE will utilize the attached Scoring Rubric (see Appendix F)—in particular the dimensions titled “Implementation Timeline and Benchmarks” and “Budget”—to assess each relevant component of the Redesign Plan to evaluate these LEA activities.

Note: Due to the number of Tier I and II schools identified in Massachusetts, we do not anticipate funding Tier III schools in this round of SIG grants. If funding is available, however, Tier III schools will be reviewed according to the same standards and process as Tier I and II schools.

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

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

ESE will utilize the attached Scoring Rubric (see Appendix F)—in particular the “Data Analysis and Selection of Supports and Intervention Model” and “Capacity and Commitment” dimensions —to assess each relevant component of the Redesign Plan to evaluate this LEA action.

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

ESE will utilize the attached Scoring Rubric (see Appendix F)—in particular the dimension “Capacity and Commitment”—to assess each relevant component of the Redesign Plan to evaluate this LEA action.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

ESE will utilize the attached Scoring Rubric (see Appendix F)—in particular the dimension “Capacity and Commitment”—to assess each relevant component of the Redesign Plan to evaluate this LEA action.

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

ESE will utilize the attached Scoring Rubric (see Appendix F)—in particular the dimension “Capacity and Commitment”—to assess each relevant component of the Redesign Plan to evaluate this LEA action.

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

ESE will utilize the attached Scoring Rubric (see Appendix F)—in particular the dimension “Capacity and Commitment”—to assess each relevant component of the Redesign Plan to evaluate this LEA action.

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

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

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

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA’s proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

ESE will utilize the attached Scoring Rubric (see Appendix F)—in particular the element line in each dimension titled “Implementation timeline and Benchmarks” and “Budget”—to assess each relevant component of the Redesign Plan to evaluate these LEA activities.

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA’s proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? (*For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.*)

ESE will utilize the attached Scoring Rubric (see Appendix F) – in particular, the element line in each dimension titled “Implementation Timeline and Benchmarks” and “Budget”—to assess each relevant component of the Redesign Plan to evaluate these LEA activities.

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

SECTION C: CAPACITY

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

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

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

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

Given the overall number of Tier I schools (40) identified in Massachusetts and several districts that have multiple Tier I schools, it is possible that districts may choose not to serve all eligible Tier I schools. In some cases, this may be simply due to the sheer number of Tier I schools that are identified for intervention. In such instances, the district will be required to describe why it lacks sufficient capacity to implement one of the four intervention models in all Tier I schools as part of its SIG application. This explanation is required within the Grant Budget Workbook (Appendix E) when an LEA indicates it will not serve one or more of its Tier I schools. Factors ESE will consider as part of its evaluation of an LEA's lack of capacity claim include:

- The district's overall response to district capacity elements described above.
- Documentation of district efforts such as unsuccessful attempts to recruit a sufficient number of new principals to implement the turnaround or transformation model;
- The unavailability of CMOs or EMOs willing to restart schools in the LEA; or
- The district's intent to serve certain Tier II schools instead of all its Tier I schools

In addition, ESE will also inquire about the district's lack of capacity during the interview of district and school leaders during the grant review process.

In an instance where ESE determines that an LEA has more capacity than it claims (and there are sufficient SIG funds remaining to support interventions at additional Tier I schools), ESE may require the LEA to include additional Tier I schools in a resubmission of its SIG application.

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

Overview

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) is preparing to conduct a comprehensive School Turnaround grant competition that will result in 3-year grant awards. (Year 2 and Year 3 funding will be contingent on sufficient progress toward measurable annual goals and implementation of intervention model selected.)

All eligible Tier I and Tier II schools can apply at the deadline. Awards will be made for interventions to begin fully in September 2012. ESE intends to prioritize our newly identified Level 4 schools for funding. The term ‘Level 4 school’ is an accountability identification under the Massachusetts school accountability framework. Statutory requirements for plan development in Level 4 schools are posted here: http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/framework/level4/ch69s1J_summary.pdf.

Should ESE have enough funds to serve Tier III schools, funding decisions and implementation will follow the timeline below.

Detailed Description of LEA Application Review Process

The Department’s goal for its grant review process is to conduct a professional, comprehensive, transparent, efficient and equitable review of federal school turnaround grant applications from districts with the persistently lowest performing schools so that those districts with approvable proposals can begin implementation of bold intervention efforts in September 2012 for the duration of three years. As mentioned previously, this grant review process is also intended to meet the requirements of state law for turnaround schools.

Guiding Principles of review process

- This process will result in an immediate review and notification to districts following submission of applications with strict timelines;
- This is a priority process and critical task for ESE; staff are available and ready; other tasks are de-prioritized for this time period;
- The process is transparent with definitions, rubrics, criteria, multi-reviewers on each application, and publicly available findings and determinations.

Participation in Review Process

ESE intends to have internal ESE staff participate in the review process. These participants may include staff from the Department’s Center for Targeted Assistance including the Office of School Redesign, the Office of Urban District Assistance and staff from the School Improvement grant programs unit. Additionally, staff from the Center for Accountability, the Center for Curriculum and Instruction (including math, ELA, English Language Learner specialists), the Office of Special Education, Secondary programs and Vocational schools and the Charter School office may be involved.

ESE's review process of LEA application will also include external participants such as non-interested consultants, practitioners and peer reviewers. We are exploring the possibility of the use of an external facilitator to lead process in order to best ensure transparency and equity.

Scoring Process

As described above, all grant applications will be scored against the rubric (see Appendix F). The minimum score to be considered eligible for funding is 90 points out of a total possible 128 points. In the event that there are more fundable applications than funds available, grants will be awarded in this priority order:

- Tier I or II Level 4 schools scoring highest on grant scoring rubric
- Tier I or II Level 4 schools meeting the initial fundability threshold (90 out of 128 points on the scoring rubric)
- Districts with more than one eligible Tier I or II Level 4 and Level 3 schools
- Other eligible Tier I, II, or III schools

If federal intervention and assurances/waivers requirements are not met (No rating), the application will be ineligible for funding.

Interview Component of Review Process

In addition to the scored review of the written application (which includes a comprehensive Redesign Plan, a 3 year budget, annual measurable goals and signed assurances), we anticipate conducting rigorous interviews of district and school leaders, with a focus on the redesign teams, as an additional component of the application and review process. Depending on the quantity of applications received, districts will be invited to these interviews if the review score of their grant application is at least 74 out of 128 points with all components completed. A potential 16 points could be awarded which would render their grant application score in the fundable range. ESE will not fund a school that receives a score of 8 or below on the interview. As indicated in the timeline below, these interviews will take place during the weeks of May 14-31, 2012.

For each application that meets the interview threshold, we would invite a district team and a school team. The district team would likely include: (1) the Superintendent (or designee); (2) a member of the School Committee; and (3) and the district leader responsible for coordinating the implementation of school redesign efforts. The school team would likely include up to five individuals: (1) the Principal (or designee); (2) two members of the school's redesign team; (3) the administrator(s) responsible for coordinating and managing school redesign effort; and (4) teachers or other individuals (e.g., parents, students) that can speak to the willingness of the school to engage in the proposed redesign effort.

During the interview, the district and school team will be asked present a brief 15-minute summary of the Redesign Plan, and then respond to a set of standard questions and others that address areas in the proposal that the review team identified as needing clarification or additional detail. A District and School Interview scoring rubric will be used during the interview process (Appendix F). The focus of the interview is to collect evidence that district and school leaders (a) understand the needs of identified schools and barriers to successful implementation of proposed intervention models, (b) display a demonstrated urgency and

willingness to engage in the hard work needed to dramatically change and improve identified schools and (c) demonstrate a thorough understanding of the proposed strategies and interventions, including the actions (e.g., policy actions, changes in structures, changes in behavior and culture, and additional initiatives) that need to occur for the district and school redesign efforts to be successful. A complete interview record will be prepared and maintained as part of the district’s grant application folder.

Timeline for LEA applications for Tier I and Tier II schools

Action	Date
LEA application for Tier I and II schools officially made available to eligible districts	March 12, 2012
ESE technical assistance to support grant application development	March – April 2012
LEA application submission deadline	Tuesday, April 24, 2012 at 12pm
ESE review process: - Reviewer evaluation of written proposals - Interviews with district and school leaders	April 25 – May 24, 2012
ESE announces SIG awards	Friday May 25, 2012
FY10 and FY11 SIG funds made available to LEA grantees – Full Implementation	September 1, 2012
Grant recipients begin pre-implementation of school turnaround grant activities	July 1, 2012
Approved LEA grant applications and summary of grant awards posted on ESE website	July 31, 2012

SECTION D (PARTS 2-8) DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

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

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

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

A cross-agency team of ESE staff formed a Measurable Annual Goals working group that has conducted empirical benchmark analysis on a variety of metrics, in order to provide clear guidance to LEAs about ambitious-but-attainable targets as they develop their grant applications.

Foremost, ESE will provide guidance for annual student achievement targets over a three-year period for eligible schools. ESE developed a formula for each eligible school to calculate its Measurable Annual Goals that was grounded in an analysis of what is “ambitious” but “achievable”.

ESE used linear regression, a statistical analysis technique, to predict how much an eligible school with a given starting point should improve over three years based on the actual improvement of schools statewide in the prior three years. Unlike those improving schools, however, the performance of Tier I and II schools remained flat or declined. Schools receiving School Improvement Grants are therefore required to reach goals that have been attained by other faster-improving schools.

Because the model uses an equation that accounts for the improvement made by hundreds of aggregate and high-needs³ groups, ESE can set goals for student groups at every performance level with a degree of precision that is not possible using other approaches, even though those other approaches may be simpler to understand.

Current guidance provided to LEAs for measurable annual goals for student achievement on the state’s assessments in both English language arts and mathematics centers around the following metrics in the aggregate and for students identified as high-needs. See Appendix C (LEA application) for Massachusetts’ guidance to School Improvement Grant applicants regarding the requirements for setting Measurable Annual Achievement Goals, including a template displaying Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3 targets. **Please note that this guidance has changed from Massachusetts’ FY10 submission.**

ESE has established a process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals that does the following (a) provides timely analysis and reporting of annual goals for which the Department has the relevant and appropriate data; (b) does not burden districts by doing internal analysis of data that ESE has access to; (c) is done in a timely fashion so as to report back to districts results of the analysis; (d) is submitted by districts in an electronic reporting manner that is consistent across all grantees; and (e) allows for an appeal process in cases where the recommendation is to end the grant award.

Specifically, once statewide assessment (MCAS) scores are available in August, ESE will review each of the awarded schools’ performance to determine if the schools’ “ambitious but achievable” measurable annual

³ A high-needs student is defined as a student belonging to one or more of the following groups: special education, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch, and limited English proficient (LEP) or formerly LEP. The academic progress of a school’s high-needs students is a key indicator of the extent to which the school has addressed achievement gaps among different groups of historically disadvantaged students and between high-needs students and all students statewide.

goals were met in each identified area. In cases where measurable annual goals are not met, ESE will assist districts in identifying reasons for the underperformance. This data, along with a) qualitative data collected every spring through site visits to the schools to assess the status of ongoing implementation benchmarks, and b) an LEA's revisions to the plan that describe mid-course corrections in plan implementation in light of failure to meet the measurable annual goals, will be used to inform decisions about renewing an LEA's School Improvement Grant for each year subsequent to the initial grant year.

In sum, ESE will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant by (1) assessing the documented progress towards full implementation of the selected intervention model; (2) progress towards meeting annual student achievement goals and other outcome measures and (3) determination of the fiscal fidelity that has been exercised by each LEA.

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

ESE does not anticipate having sufficient funds to make awards to eligible Tier III schools. However, if funds remain beyond the current estimated expenditures and ESE is able to make grant awards to LEAs with Tier III schools, **the annual review process will be the same as that outlined for Tier I and II above.**

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

MA ESE intends to monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement grant with the following approach (see Appendix G for documentation on monitoring and evaluation process)

- **Grants monitoring/fiscal review - quarterly**
- **On an annual basis, ESE will monitor the annual student achievement goals set by each school and district that is a grant recipient**
- **Annual district and school site visits for all SIG recipient schools to assess early indicators through progress monitoring of implementation benchmarks (see Appendix L)**
- **Consultation and intersection with ESE accountability work**
- **Comprehensive independent evaluation (see Administration, set aside section and Appendix G)**

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

ESE intends to prioritize the **84** schools in Tier I and Tier II by making this grant opportunity available to these schools primarily and first. (Please see #6 below in regards to Tier III.) Within the group of Tier I and Tier II schools, MA ESE intends to prioritize a subset of **6 schools** that have recently been identified as Level 4 under the state's newly adopted Accountability and Assistance framework and under the state's newly approved

legislation. These schools, under the recently passed state law, will have new authorities around staffing, collective bargaining, and other authorities that strongly position them for strategic use of federal school turnaround funds. Any eligible Tier I, II, or III school must meet the **initial** fundability threshold (90 out of **128** points on the grant scoring rubric) to **be eligible to** receive funding. In the event that there are more fundable applications than funds available, grants will be awarded in this priority order:

- Tier I or II Level 4 schools scoring highest on grant scoring rubric
- Tier I or II Level 4 schools meeting the initial fundability threshold (90 out of 128 points on the scoring rubric)
- Districts with more than one eligible Tier I or II Level 4 and Level 3 schools
- Other eligible Tier I and II schools
- Other eligible Tier III schools

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

ESE does not anticipate having sufficient funds to make awards to eligible Tier III schools. However, if funds remain beyond the current estimated expenditures, ESE would seek to prioritize Tier III schools in **Level 4, Level 3, RST, or CA** status for the aggregate student population that demonstrated a willingness to implement one of the four US ED intervention models.

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

ESE currently does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools. As part of the state's newly adopted Accountability and Assistance framework, all of these schools fall in a category that is defined by local district control.

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

At this time, ESE does not intend to provide services directly to any schools.

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

SECTION E: ASSURANCES

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

SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION

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

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

MA ESE reserved 5 percent (\$2,934,572) of our combined FY09 (\$9,017,161) and ARRA (\$49,674,274) school improvement funds. From our FY10 allocation of \$8,023,626, MA ESE reserved 5 percent (\$401,181). From our FY11 allocation of \$7,873,767, we again anticipate reserving 5 percent (\$393,688).

School Year (state fiscal year)	Amount (Anticipated)	Primary Uses
2010-11 (FY11)	\$1,467,286	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESE Personnel - Grant monitoring; oversight and renewal Technical assistance and support Evaluation – Year 1 (Cohort 1)
2011-12 (FY12)	\$1,467,286	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESE Personnel – Grant monitoring; oversight and renewal Technical assistance and support Evaluation – Year 2 (Cohort 1) and Year 1 (Cohort 2)
2012-13 (FY13)	\$401,181	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESE Personnel – Grant monitoring; oversight and renewal Technical assistance and support Evaluation – Year 3 (Cohort 1) and Year 2 (Cohort 2)
2013-14 (FY14)	\$393,688	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESE Personnel – Grant monitoring; oversight and renewal Technical assistance and support Evaluation – Year 3 (Cohort 2)

Overall, the SEA reservation will help support state administration, oversight and evaluation of grant-funded activities. The funds will support a portion of school improvement grant program staff salaries, administrative costs and state-level school intervention activities (technical assistance). These funds, along with state appropriations for targeted assistance to low performing schools, will provide for program expenses associated with state-level coordination and participant networking activities.

One key position supported by these set aside funds will be the **Program Manager for School Redesign Grants** in the Office of District and School Turnaround. This position will develop and implement policies, processes and practices to lead the Department’s implementation of SIG funds.

This position will support comprehensive turnaround efforts and address the barriers to improved student performance; ensure that all SIG funded schools receive frequent, dedicated support and feedback on their turnaround initiatives; monitor schools and districts in their implementation of SIG funds; and coordinate the distribution of federal school improvement funds and the deployment of turnaround partners.

ESE technical assistance in the early stages will help districts analyze the needs of individual schools and match them with the appropriate intervention model and support qualitative school review processes to gain insight into the causes of low performance in each school; assess the root cause of failure and internal capacity to turn the school around.

ESE personnel are preparing to provide tool kits and research packets for district officials and school-level leaders on how to implement school redesign models. Longer term, these efforts will include the screening and recruitment of providers for turnaround, transformation or restart models.

Evaluation

The Center for Targeted Assistance in partnership with ESE's Office of Strategic Planning, Research and Evaluation seeks to develop and conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the implementation, impact and outcomes of LEA school intervention activities, efforts and models in Tier I and Tier II schools that are awarded these grant funds. See Appendix G for Evaluation Overview

SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

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

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

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

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

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

Assurance

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

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

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2011 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]** 20.

Assurance

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

Waiver 3: New list waiver

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver

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

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

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

Assurances

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

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

Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver

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

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

Assurances

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

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

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

(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

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

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

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

LEA APPLICATION

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

The SEA does not need to resubmit the LEA application.

SEA has revised its LEA application form for FY 2011.

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

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

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

REQUIRED INFORMATION FOR REVISED SEA APPLICATION SECTIONS

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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

- (4) 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.
- (5) 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.
- (6) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

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

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

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

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? (*For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.*)

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

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

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

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

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. ASSURANCES

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX B

	Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier	Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier
Tier I	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” ⁴	Title I eligible ⁵ elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier II	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier III	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. ⁶	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <u>and</u> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u> • have not made AYP for two years.

⁴ “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

(a)(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

⁵ For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

⁶ Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.