

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: Minnesota



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

Legal Name of Applicant: Minnesota Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, Minnesota 55113
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Steve Dibb Position and Office: Director, Division of School Support Contact's Mailing Address: Steve Dibb Director, Division of School Support 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, Minnesota 55113 Telephone: (651) 582-8693 Fax: (651) 582-8517 Email address: steve.dibb@state.mn.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Brenda Cassellius	Telephone: (651) 582-8200
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

FY 2011 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION CHECKLIST

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

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2010	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2010	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2011

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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
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.

Part 1

All parts of Section B: Evaluation Criteria Part 1 will remain the same as the FY 2010 application with the exception of the underlined text below.

Minnesota’s Vision to turnaround the lowest-achieving schools

It is our goal to turnaround the lowest-achieving schools in Minnesota in order to increase their student achievement to levels to that of higher-performing schools. The state will use the four prescribed intervention models to set high expectations for student performance, provide a safe and supportive environment for learning; support staff and leadership through enhanced professional development programs; and provide the operational flexibility that will allow staff and teachers to help students improve.

Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools in Minnesota

Minnesota is committed to the shifts in the education system culture and mindsets that will be required to improve academic outcomes for the more than 11,000 students who attend the persistently lowest-achieving schools, and to providing a supportive, stable working environment for teachers and leaders in turnaround schools to improve their effectiveness. To that end, the state has developed a comprehensive plan that increases state oversight, changes the governance structure for turnaround schools and provides proven supports, operational flexibility, and the leadership to successfully implement turnaround programs in our persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Minnesota will primarily use the State-level funds reserved from its School Improvement Grant allocation to fund SIG staff in the Division of School Support to provide administration, evaluation and technical assistance for grantees. The Division of School Support is charged with overseeing the successful implementation of the SIG intervention models and other grant activities, and it is accountable to the Commissioner and the SEA for progress made against performance targets and other leading indicators. The Division of School Support will work collaboratively with the newly-established Regional Centers of Excellence to bring together implementation teams with specific expertise and provide technical assistance in evidence-based practices to SIG schools. Please see Section F, SEA Reservation for more information about the Division of School Support and Centers of Excellence.

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

Selecting the appropriate intervention model for each Tier I and Tier II (Priority) school identified on the LEA’s application will be critical to the success of improvement efforts. MDE is committed to providing guidelines and technical assistance for LEAs to identify the intervention model that will meet the needs of a given school. The LEA must consider its needs in the areas identified below in relation to the applicable intervention model.

Multiple sources of data are to be incorporated into the analysis of the needs of each school identified in the application.

The areas MDE will evaluate in the LEA’s application with respect to analyzing the needs of each Priority school identified in its application as well as selecting interventions include the extent to which the LEA demonstrates the following:

- An overview of the school’s continuous improvement planning model
- A process to analyze data and use results to inform instruction
- An overview of curriculum, instruction, assessments, and interventions
- A commitment to job-embedded professional development
- A positive school climate for both staff and students
- An effective model to engage parents and community partners in the school

For each area identified above, LEAs must:

- Develop evidence of challenges and needs
- Identify next steps and needed resources or supports to address the areas of deficiency
- Demonstrate a conclusive fit between the needs of the school and the intervention model

The following framework will be used by MDE to evaluate the LEA applications with respect to the needs assessment and analysis as well as the selection of an intervention model:

Not Adequately Demonstrated	Basic	Proficient*
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A few or no areas of the needs assessment have been combined into an analysis to demonstrate a fit between the needs of the school and the model chosen.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Some areas of the needs assessment have been combined into an analysis to demonstrate a general fit between the needs of the school and the model chosen.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>All areas of the needs assessment have been combined into a thoughtful analysis to specifically and conclusively demonstrate a fit between the needs of the school and the model chosen.</u>

* Note that a Proficient rating is needed for approval.

- **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 (Priority) school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.**

The comprehensive nature of the four intervention models requires the LEA to work in concert with the school to build capacity for their successful implementation. In addition to the technical assistance to be provided by MDE and the Centers of Excellence, the school will need to rely on a combination of supports and operational flexibility from the LEA in order to implement the selected intervention model.

The criteria MDE will use to evaluate the LEA’s application with respect to demonstrating capacity to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model at each school(s) identified in its application include, as applicable, the extent to which:

Capacity Factors	Model(s)
Staff has been identified with the credentials and capability to implement the selected intervention model successfully.	All
The ability of the LEA to serve the overall number of schools identified on the application has been addressed.	All

<p>A commitment to support the selected intervention model has been indicated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teachers' union • The school board • Staff • Parents • The charter school authorizer, if applicable 	All	
<p>A detailed and realistic timeline for getting the basic elements of the selected intervention model in place by the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year has been provided.</p>	All	
<p>A strategic planning process has already taken place that successfully supported the selection and implementation of the intervention model.</p>	All	
<p>The ability of the LEA to successfully align federal, state and local funding sources with grant activities and to ensure sustainability of the reform measures.</p>	Turnaround, Restart, Transformation	
<p><u>The LEA has identified plans to and barriers for providing increased learning time that is available to all students in the school, including additional time for instruction in core academic subjects, instruction in other subjects and provision of enrichment activities, and collaborative time for teachers to engage in professional development.</u></p>	Turnaround, Restart, Transformation	
<p><u>The LEA is prepared to ensure a distribution of administrative responsibilities to support the principal as an instructional leader, including a position to assist the principal in school operations, student discipline, teacher observations, and instructional facilitation. The SEA will give funding priority to LEAs that hire at least a .5 FTE Building Operations Manager (BOM), or locally-named position, with a school population of 250 students or less or hiring a 1.0 FTE Building Operations Manager (BOM), or locally-named position, with a school population over 250 students with the skills and experience to work with diverse and/or challenging student populations. The SEA strongly recommends that the Building Operations Manager (BOM) holds a Minnesota Administrative License.</u></p>	Turnaround, Restart, Transformation	
<p><u>The LEA is prepared to establish oversight of the continuous improvement cycle driving the school turnaround efforts at the school level and to support the principal and turnaround staff in the ongoing process to plan, implement, progress monitor, and reflect on student learning needs and instruction. The SEA will give funding priority to LEAs that hire a Continuous Improvement Specialist or establish a Turnaround Office that coordinates turnaround efforts at the school level and collaborates with MDE and the Regional Centers of Excellence staff. The SEA strongly recommends at least a .5 FTE Continuous Improvement Specialist or Turnaround Office staff with a school population of 250 students or less or a 1.0 FTE with a school population over 250 students.</u></p>	Turnaround, Restart, Transformation	

<u>The LEA is prepared to actively collaborate with families and community partners to engage them in academics and increase student success. The SEA will give funding priority to LEAs that hire a Family and Community Liaison responsible for empowering families to be active participants in the school, to create an environment of learning at home, and to partner with teachers for academic success.</u>	Turnaround, Restart, Transformation
<u>The LEA is prepared to ensure the principal and turnaround staff are supported with ongoing coaching around assessment practices, using data to inform instruction, and implementing instructionally-focused professional learning communities (PLCs). The SEA will give priority to LEAs that hire a 1.0 FTE Data and Instructional Coach, directly supported by MDE and the Regional Centers of Excellence, and responsible for coaching staff on the use of formative, interim, and summative data to implement effective instructional strategies.</u>	Turnaround, Restart, Transformation
The LEA has detailed plans in place to implement a teacher evaluation system for all licensed staff that includes at least three observations per year by at least two different trained reviewers and that has robust measures to ensure inter-rater reliability.	Turnaround, Transformation
The availability of CMOs and EMOs appropriate to the needs of the school to be served that could be enlisted has been described.	Restart
Access to and geographic proximity of higher achieving schools, including but not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.	School Closure

School principals are the leaders of turnaround efforts, and coaching from MDE and Centers of Excellence staff will support the work in SIG schools. Minnesota has learned that some of the principals replaced under the transformation and turnaround model could have benefited from ongoing support and coaching from MDE. MDE will work with each SIG LEA to determine if the current principal has the capacity to be an effective instructional leader and will provide assistance to LEAs in evaluating the principal under each of the options below. LEAs can select one of the two options to ensure all SIG schools have strong instructional leaders.

The two options will require all schools implementing the transformation or turnaround model to implement the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model (as submitted to Minnesota legislature 2/1/12) or a locally-adopted model that meets statute requirements. As statute clearly indicates, any district that does not use the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model can develop and adopt a local model that is an annual, performance-based evaluation, designed to improve teaching and learning. Both the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model or another locally-adopted model that meets statute requirements will be used to review the performance of the principal and provide information to the LEA about the quality of the instructional leader in the school. The principal evaluation system will be a tool for improving and enhancing leadership skills to improve teaching practices and student achievement. Under the newly-adopted State law, at least 35% of the principal evaluation system must be based on assessment results which are aligned to State academic standards.

In addition to the capacity criteria outlined above, MDE will evaluate the LEA's capacity with respect to fulfilling one of the following two options:

1. LEAs can elect to immediately remove the principal, as outlined in the SIG final requirements. MDE will provide support and oversight in the selection of a new turnaround principal for LEAs that choose to remove and replace the principal at the start of implementation. Once the principal is replaced, LEAs will collaborate

with MDE under the following conditions:

- a. MDE and Centers of Excellence staff will closely monitor the use of the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model or locally-adopted model that meets statute requirements until the end of implementation of a SIG intervention model.
 - b. MDE and Centers of Excellence staff will work directly with the Superintendent to provide assistance in utilizing the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model or locally-adopted model that meets statute requirements to review principal performance and develop the principal as the school’s instructional leader.
2. LEAs can elect to retain the principal if the school has hired a new principal within the last two years as part of a broader school reform effort and the new principal has the experience and skills needed to implement the model. LEAs will collaborate with MDE to provide ongoing monitoring and support of the principal throughout the initial year of implementation. If an LEA chooses this option, the SEA will permit the LEA to retain their current principal under the following conditions:
- a. MDE and Centers of Excellence staff will closely monitor the use of the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model or locally-adopted model that meets statute requirements until the end of implementation of a SIG intervention model.
 - b. MDE and Centers of Excellence staff will work directly with the Superintendent to provide assistance in utilizing the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model or locally-adopted model that meets statute requirements to review principal performance and develop the principal as the school’s instructional leader.

For each of the two options outlined above, MDE will evaluate the LEA’s demonstrated capacity by addressing the following factors:

- The LEA’s ability to effectively implement the Minnesota Principal Growth Evaluation Model or locally-adopted model that meets statute requirements to review the performance of the principal and enhance their instructional leadership skills.
- The LEA’s history of ability to recruit new principals with the credentials and capability to implement the intervention model.

The following guideline will be used by MDE to evaluate the LEA applications with respect to demonstrating the capacity to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model:

Not Adequately Demonstrated	Basic	Proficient*
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few or none of the above capacity criteria relevant to the school’s selected intervention model have been adequately addressed. • The LEA does not demonstrate the ability to implement the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model and ways to the model will improve the principal performance are not addressed. • The LEA does not demonstrate a history of ability to recruit new principals with credentials and capability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the above capacity criteria relevant to the school’s selected intervention model have been adequately addressed. • The LEA somewhat demonstrates the ability to implement the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model and ways the model will improve principal performance are addressed. • The LEA somewhat demonstrates a history of ability to recruit new principals with acceptable credentials and capability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the above capacity criteria relevant to the school’s selected intervention model have been adequately addressed. • The LEA adequately demonstrates the ability to effectively implement the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model or locally-adopted model that meets statute requirements and ways the model will improve principal performance are specifically addressed. • The LEA adequately demonstrates a history of ability to recruit new principals with strong

credentials and capability.

* Note that a Proficient rating is needed for approval.

- **The LEA’s budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II (Priority) 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).**

LEAs will be required to submit a separate three-year budget for each identified school that will allow for a detailed assessment as to whether sufficient funds have been requested and appropriately budgeted to implement the selected intervention model. MDE will review the projected funding amount per fiscal year to ensure the LEA budget covers the full period of availability.

With the exception of the school closure model (addressed below), the assessment of sufficiency of funds will be guided primarily by the demonstrated needs of the LEA to allow them to serve each school. LEAs will be asked to describe their needs to implement the selected intervention model(s), and they will also be asked to identify relevant areas of alignment with other federal, state and local funding sources. Considering the LEA’s demonstrated needs and identified areas of alignment with other funding sources, MDE will determine if sufficient funds have been budgeted to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model and other grant requirements, as follows:

- Implementing fully and effectively the components, as outlined in the final requirements, of the respective intervention model selected for each school to be served by the application.
- Providing increased learning time that is available to all students in the school, including additional time for instruction in core academic subjects, instruction in other subjects and provision of enrichment activities, and collaborative time for teachers to engage in professional development.
- Providing at least 90 minutes each week for each teacher dedicated to professional learning communities in identified schools to be served by the application.
- Providing training for new teachers that join turnaround schools after the process is underway in identified schools to be served by the application.

The following guideline will be used by MDE to evaluate the LEA applications with respect to demonstrating sufficiency of funds (except for schools implementing the school closure model which could be funded at the minimum \$50,000.):

Not Adequately Demonstrated	Basic	Proficient*
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A few or none of the intervention components and other grant requirements have been sufficiently funded, considering the LEA’s demonstrated needs and ability to align other resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Most of the intervention components and other grant requirements have been sufficiently funded, considering the LEA’s demonstrated needs and ability to align other resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All of the intervention components and other grant requirements have been sufficiently funded, considering the LEA’s demonstrated needs and ability to align other resources.

* Note that a Proficient rating is needed for approval.

Part 2

All parts of Section B: Evaluation Criteria Part 2 will remain the same as the FY 2010 application with the exception of the following:

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

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

All final contracts that LEAs plan to enter into with external providers must be submitted to the SEA and will be subject to SEA approval.

LEAs that propose to engage a provider through a rigorous recruitment and screening process will be reviewed closely by MDE to ensure the selection and ongoing evaluation of high-quality providers. All LEAs will need to demonstrate their commitment to selecting quality providers that will meet the specific needs of the school and explain their ongoing formal review process of external providers to ensure results. The need to engage with external providers must be grounded in data as identified in the initial comprehensive needs assessment.

LEAs that plan to work with outside providers must demonstrate its commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality by providing information about:

- a. Reasonable and timely steps it will take to recruit and screen providers that must include, but are not limited to:
 - i. Analyzing how the LEA's needs could be met by internal staff or other existing partnerships and resources.
 - ii. Analyzing how the LEA's needs could first be met by MDE or Centers of Excellence staff.
 - iii. Researching and prioritizing the external providers available to serve the school.
 1. Consider and analyze the external provider market
 2. Contact other LEAs currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding their experience.
 - iv. Engaging parents and community members to assist in the selection process.
 - v. Delineating clearly the respective responsibilities and expectations to be assumed by the external provider and the LEA.
- b. Detailed and relevant criteria for selecting external providers that take into account the specific needs of the schools to be served by external providers that may include, but are not limited to:
 - i. A proven track record of success working with a particular population or type of school. For example, success in working with high schools or English Language Learners.
 - ii. Alignment between external provider services and existing LEA services.
 - iii. Willingness to be held accountable to high performance standards.
 - iv. Capacity to serve the identified school and its selected intervention model.
 - v. Qualified staff with experience leading school turnaround efforts and available to work directly with LEAs and schools in Minnesota.
 - vi. Research-based methods and procedures for conducting the proposed service(s).
- c. A comprehensive review process for external providers to ensure accountability to quality results that may include, but are not limited to:
 - i. Formal, frequent, and routine reviews of the external provider throughout the time of the contract.
 - ii. The development of clear accountability measures and expectations to use to evaluate the services provided by the external provider.
 - iii. Timely feedback to external providers on an ongoing basis to eliminate any potential performance problems.

The following guideline will be used by the SEA to evaluate the application of any LEA that seeks to

engage with external providers with respect to commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers to ensure their quality as well as demonstrate a need outside of the support of the Centers of Excellence:

Not Adequately Demonstrated	Basic	Proficient*
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The need for support from a provider outside of MDE and the Centers of Excellence is not demonstrated.</u> • Available providers have not been researched. • The track record of the provider identified has not been addressed, or it does not have a proven track record of success. • The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has not been addressed, or has been minimally addressed. • Parents and community members have had no involvement in the selection process. • The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are minimally or not defined and aligned. • The LEA has not indicated that it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards. • <u>An evaluation process has not been developed.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The need for support from a provider outside of MDE and the Centers of Excellence is somewhat demonstrated.</u> • Available providers have been researched. • The provider identified generally has a proven track record of success. • The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has been explored. • Parents and community members have had some involvement in the selection process. • The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are broadly defined and aligned. • The LEA has indicated that it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards. • <u>An evaluation process has been partially developed.</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The need for support from a provider outside of MDE and the Centers of Excellence is specifically and conclusively demonstrated.</u> • Available providers have been thoroughly researched. • The provider identified has a proven track record of success in working with similar schools and/or student populations. • The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has been clearly demonstrated. • Parents and community members have been meaningfully involved from the beginning of the selection process. • The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are clearly defined and aligned. • The LEA has specifically planned how it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards. • <u>A formal, frequent, and routine evaluation process has been fully developed.</u>

* Note that a Proficient rating is needed for approval.

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.

N/A

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.

All parts of Section C: Capacity will remain the same as the FY 2010 application with the exception of the underlined text below.

Minnesota will place a high priority on serving each of its Tier I (Priority) schools, and claims of lack of capacity to serve any of these schools will be carefully scrutinized. The criteria and process described below will enable MDE to effectively assess and analyze the LEAs' capacity to implement one of the intervention models in their Tier I (Priority) schools.

MDE will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I (Priority) school by considering the following factors in relation to each such school, as applicable.

Capacity Factors	Model(s)
Staff has been identified with the credentials and capability to implement the selected intervention model successfully.	All
The ability of the LEA to serve the overall number of schools identified on the application has been addressed.	All
A commitment to support the selected intervention model has been indicated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teachers' union • The school board • Staff • Parents • The charter school authorizer, if applicable 	All
A detailed and realistic timeline for getting the basic elements of the selected intervention model in place by the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year has been provided.	All
A strategic planning process has already taken place that successfully supported the selection and implementation of the intervention model.	All
The ability of the LEA to successfully align federal, state and local funding sources with grant activities and to ensure sustainability of the reform measures.	Turnaround, Restart, Transformation
Plans to and barriers for providing increased learning time that is available to	Turnaround, Restart,

<p><u>all students in the school, including additional time for instruction in core academic subjects, instruction in other subjects and provision of enrichment activities, and collaborative time for teachers to engage in professional development.</u></p>	<p>Transformation</p>	
<p><u>The LEA is prepared to ensure a distribution of administrative responsibilities to support the principal as an instructional leader, including a position to assist the principal in school operations, student discipline, teacher observations, and instructional facilitation. The SEA will give funding priority to LEAs that hire at least a .5 FTE Building Operations Manager (BOM), or locally-named position, with a school population of 250 students or less or hiring a 1.0 FTE Building Operations Manager (BOM), or locally-named position, with a school population over 250 students with the skills and experience to work with diverse and/or challenging student populations. The SEA strongly recommends that the Building Operations Manager (BOM) holds a Minnesota Administrative License.</u></p>	<p>Turnaround, Restart, Transformation</p>	
<p><u>The LEA is prepared to establish oversight of the continuous improvement cycle driving the school turnaround efforts at the school level and to support the principal and turnaround staff in the ongoing process to plan, implement, progress monitor, and reflect on student learning needs and instruction. The SEA will give funding priority to LEAs that hire a Continuous Improvement Specialist or establish a Turnaround Office that coordinates turnaround efforts at the school level and collaborates with MDE and the Regional Centers of Excellence staff. The SEA strongly recommends at least a .5 FTE Continuous Improvement Specialist or Turnaround Office staff with a school population of 250 students or less or a 1.0 FTE with a school population over 250 students.</u></p>	<p>Turnaround, Restart, Transformation</p>	
<p><u>The LEA is prepared to actively collaborate with families and community partners to engage them in academics and increase student success. The SEA will give funding priority to LEAs that hire a Family and Community Liaison responsible for empowering families to be active participants in the school, to create an environment of learning at home, and to partner with teachers for academic success.</u></p>	<p>Turnaround, Restart, Transformation</p>	
<p><u>The LEA is prepared to ensure the principal and turnaround staff are supported with ongoing coaching around assessment practices, using data to inform instruction, and implementing instructionally-focused professional learning communities (PLCs). The SEA will give priority to LEAs that hire a 1.0 FTE Data and Instructional Coach, directly supported by MDE and the Regional Centers of Excellence, and responsible for coaching staff on the use of formative, interim, and summative data to implement effective instructional strategies.</u></p>	<p>Turnaround, Restart, Transformation</p>	
<p>The LEA has detailed plans in place to implement a teacher evaluation system for all licensed staff that includes at least three observations per year by at least two different trained reviewers and that has robust measures to ensure inter-rater reliability.</p>	<p>Turnaround, Transformation</p>	

The availability of CMOs and EMOs appropriate to the needs of the school to be served that could be enlisted has been described.	Restart
Access to and geographic proximity of higher achieving schools, including but not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.	School Closure

When an LEA may have more capacity than it has demonstrated on its application, the SEA will take the following action steps to evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim:

- The SEA will request clarifications using the above capacity factors.
- LEAs will resubmit a response to the SEA with clarifications.
- The SEA will assess and analyze the capacity factors again.
- If a lack of capacity is still claimed by the LEA, the SEA will engage in discussions with the LEA to elicit additional information about the capacity to implement an appropriate intervention model at each of its Tier I (Priority) schools.
- A final determination will be made by the SEA regarding the LEA's lack of capacity.

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

<u>Date</u>	<u>Process</u>
<u>May 11, 2012</u>	<u>MDE submits SEA SIG Application to DOE</u>
<u>May 11-June 11, 2012</u>	<u>DOE reviews application</u>
<u>May-June 2012</u>	<u>Letter of intent for all eligible LEAs due to MDE</u>
<u>May-June 2012</u>	<u>LEA conducts needs assessment to evaluate capacity and readiness to implement an intervention model</u>
<u>June 2012</u>	<u>Open the grant opportunity to eligible applicants on the SEA's online grants management system</u>
<u>June - July 2012</u>	<u>Application development during which time the SEA will provide intensive technical assistance to eligible grantees</u>
<u>July 23, 2012</u>	<u>Application due to MDE</u>
<u>July - August 2012</u>	<p><u>Complete application reviews by using the following process:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Identify qualified reviewers internal to the SEA</u> • <u>Assign two reviewers to each application</u> • <u>Request, collect and review clarifications to applications as needed</u>
<u>September 1, 2012</u>	<p><u>Announce final awards</u></p> <p><u>*Final awards will be announced earlier if application reviews are complete and decisions are made.</u></p>
<u>September 2012</u>	<u>SIG – Round III grantee implementation begins</u>

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.

N/A

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.

Minnesota will primarily use the State-level funds reserved from its School Improvement Grant allocation to fund SIG staff in the Division of School Support to provide administration, evaluation and leadership coaching for grantees. The Division of School Support SIG staff are charged with overseeing the successful implementation of the SIG intervention models and other grant activities, and it is accountable to the Commissioner and the SEA for progress made against performance targets and other leading indicators. The Division of School Support will work collaboratively with the newly-established Regional Centers of Excellence to bring together implementation teams with specific expertise and provide technical assistance in evidence-based practices to all Priority schools (SIG and non-SIG schools).

State-level funds reserved from the SIG allocation will be used to provide leadership and school improvement leadership and coaching to SIG-funded schools. The Regional Centers of Excellence will provide intense, direct assistance to all Priority schools delivered through regional training and group professional development. Non-SIG Priority schools are to align their 20% set-aside Title I funds to the identified interventions and professional growth needs in their School Improvement Plan. In addition to the 20% set-aside, SIG funded Priority schools will have additional dollars to enhance their professional development experiences to develop and implement more dramatic and immediate turnaround strategies. Any training that a SIG Priority school participates in would supplement the activities funded with their 20% Title I set-aside.

MDE SIG staff that are funded with the 5% SIG administration will provide support and direction to only SIG-receiving schools. The Regional Centers of Excellence are tasked with supporting **all** Priority and Focus schools, thus it is necessary to align the efforts of the MDE SIG staff and Regional Center staff. MDE will continue to strive to align the

delivery of services, both administrative and technical, for two federal school improvement programs, the NCLB Flexibility Request and the SIG program, into one aligned, cohesive and effective school support system for the state's schools.

The Division of School Support will conduct the following activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance:

- Support needs assessments and intervention planning. For all Priority and Focus schools in the state, the Division of School Support (SIG staff for SIG schools) will support a needs assessment and, in partnership with LEA, assist in planning for appropriate strategic interventions. For schools already in turnaround, the decision to continue or restart will be determined depending on progress against goals, leading indicators and school needs.
- Principal development and selection. The SIG staff of the Division of School Support will provide oversight in the implementation of the Minnesota Principal Growth and Evaluation Model or locally-adopted model that meets state requirements in SIG schools to support the principal in developing educator effectiveness. The Division of School Support SIG staff will play a role in the selection of principals in schools that choose to replace the principal and may be involved in the final removal and hiring decisions for principals. Candidates will include high-potential principals and charter school directors with demonstrated effectiveness and (ideally) previous experience turning around schools, leading struggling schools to high performance, and generating high student progress.
- Site-level hiring. MDE will also support the teacher hiring processes at the site level to ensure the process aligns with an appropriate intervention strategy. The goal will be to create a cadre of highly-effective teachers for each site, who will have high expectations for students, the ability to raise performance of low-achieving students, a high commitment to the turnaround and the ability to work collaboratively with other educators.
- School consultation, teacher development, and leader and teacher coaching. The Division of School Support SIG staff will provide direct, on-site, differentiated consultation to assist SIG schools in building capacity for rapid change that will lead to a sustained improvement in student academic outcomes. MDE will provide guidance and recommended resources for professional development of teachers in turnaround schools, based on the demographic makeup of the turnaround site. Coaching of instructional leaders and teachers will be centered on building educators' capacity to meet the needs of all learners through evidence-based instructional practices.
- The Division of School Support SIG staff will collect data to monitor the implementation of the selected intervention model at each SIG school identified to be served on approved LEA applications. This ongoing data collection will allow for the tracking of progress toward grant goals and leading indicators as well as for the identification and dissemination of successful implementation practices and lessons learned. Finally, the data collected will assist with desk reviews and on-site monitoring visits. The LEA will provide data to the Division of School Support SIG staff for the purposes of monitoring that may include, but is not necessarily limited to the following areas:
 - Site progress against achievement goals (including student achievement and academic growth).
 - The effectiveness of teaching and the quality of the learning environment.
 - Feedback from students and parents to learn if the school and staff are seen as invested in the success of every student – regardless of background or academic challenges/performance.
 - Progress toward improvement on the leading indicators.
 - Staffing decisions based on skills, qualifications and experience relevant to the selected intervention model.
 - Progress toward taking advantage of increased operational flexibility.

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

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

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

Assurance

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

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

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

Assurance

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

Waiver 3: New list waiver

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Minnesota 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:

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

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

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

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

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation 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.” ³	Title I eligible ⁴ 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. ⁵	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.

³ “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.

⁴ 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).

⁵ 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.