

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Colorado Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 201 E. Colfax Ave. Denver, Colorado 80203
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Patrick Chapman Position and Office: Executive Director, Federal Programs Unit Contact's Mailing Address: Colorado Department of Education 1560 Broadway, Suite 1450 Denver, Colorado 80202-5149 Telephone: 303-866-6780 Fax: 303-866-6637 Email address: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Robert Hammond	Telephone: 303-866-6646
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X 	Date: January 18, 2013
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.	

School Improvement Grants Application for FY 2012 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2012

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Colorado



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 "Priority" or "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 Priority or 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.

ESEA Flexibility

States that have received approval of their ESEA flexibility request will not be required to maintain a separate list of Tier I and Tier II schools. Under this flexibility, an LEA is eligible to apply for SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models defined in the SIG final requirements in a priority school even if that school is not in improvement and thus the LEA would not otherwise be eligible to receive SIG funds for the school. An SEA approved to implement this flexibility may award SIG funds above the amount needed for SIG continuation awards to an LEA with Priority schools according to the rules that apply to Tier I and Tier II schools under the SIG final requirements.

Availability of Funds

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2012, provided \$535 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2012.

FY 2012 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 2012 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2012 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 2012 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 2012 funds or any remaining FY 2009, FY 2010 and FY 2011 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 2012 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 application titled, “Continuation Awards Only Application for FY 2012 SIG Program”.

An SEA that must submit a FY 2012 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 and priority schools.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA’s FY 2012 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2012 application to the following address: OST.OESE@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, Group Leader
Office of School Turnaround
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 18, 2013.

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.

FY 2012 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Please use this checklist to indicate the changes the SEA elects to make to its FY 2012 application from its FY 2011 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 2011 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 2011	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to revise its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) for FY 2012
	<i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i> <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	<i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA is substituting the PLA list with its list of priority schools (please see Waiver 4 in Section H of SEA application)
SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012
SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012
SECTION C: CAPACITY	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012
SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012	
SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012
SECTION E: SEA RESERVATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012
SECTION F: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation with stakeholders provided	
SECTION G: WAIVERS	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2011	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2012

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its FY 2012 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 2011 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 2011	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2012 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA is substituting the PLA list with its list of priority schools (please see Waiver 4 in Section G of SEA application)
<p><i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i></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 2012 application. <input type="checkbox"/> 2. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.	<p><i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i></p> <input 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. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. SEA has generated a PLA list in accordance with their ESEA Flexibility request. List submitted below.

Directions: An SEA that elects to generate new lists or must generate new lists of Priority or 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 Priority or 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 2012 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.

Colorado has generated a PLA list in accordance with its approved ESEA flexibility request. Colorado defines priority schools as:

The list of PLA Priority schools is included in the table below:

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 2012 funds or any remaining FY 2009, FY 2010 or FY 2011 funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2012 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ²

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2012 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY	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
Pueblo County School District #60	Roncalli Middle School	Remaining funds will be added to FY 2012 funds and awarded to Cohort #4	\$737,378
Pueblo County	Freed Middle	Remaining funds will be added to FY 2012 funds and	\$687,935

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.

School district #60	School	awarded to Cohort #4	
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			\$1,425,313

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 I): Timeline*. The SEA does not need to resubmit information for any section in which it elects to use the same criteria as its FY 2011 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 2011 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2012. Updated information listed below.

Part 1

(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.

The LEA must demonstrate in its application that it has analyzed the needs of each Priority school that it plans to serve in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school. The LEA must have completed or have plans to complete a Diagnostic Review (DR) of each Priority school prior to submitting the application. Diagnostic Review materials and protocols were developed specifically with the U.S. Department of Education's school improvement grant turnaround effort in mind. Revised Colorado School Support Team standards, indicators, and protocols have been developed with the primary goal of identifying root causes of a school's poor academic performance and the best turnaround strategy for the school. After the DR, the school will select an intervention model based on the findings of the expedited diagnostic review and create a Unified School intervention plan for each site. This plan includes a data analysis worksheet to identify gaps and root causes for low student achievement. An action plan will then be developed in which root causes will be prioritized and addressed (see Attachment D of the RFP). These plans will be reviewed and scored against the rubric in the SEA Request for Proposal (RFP).

LEAs will clearly indicate which intervention is chosen for each school. (See RFP)

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

LEAs will demonstrate their capacity to support sites in Section II of the RFP by detailing specific actions the LEA has taken or will take to: (1) design and implement interventions consistent with the requirements, (2) recruit, screen and select external providers, if applicable to ensure their quality, (3) align other resources with the

proposed interventions, and (4) modify practice or policies to implement the interventions fully and effectively. Any activities or strategies the LEA proposes must be clearly outlined in the electronic budget (see rubric, RFP).

In addition, in awarding 1003(g) School Improvement funds, CDE will evaluate each district's commitment according to its dedication to implementing one of four specific interventions in each Priority School that it commits to serve. These interventions include:

- *Restart*: Close and reopen the school under the management of a charter school operator, charter management organization, or educational management organization.
- *Turnaround*: Replace the principal and at least 50 percent of staff, adopt a new governance structure and implement comprehensive, research-based instructional programs.
- *Transformation*: Replace the principal, implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, extend learning and teacher planning time, and provide operating flexibility.
- *Closure*: Close the school and enroll students in high-achieving schools in the district.

Demonstrated capacity and readiness

CDE will also consider a district's capacity and readiness to carry out proposed interventions in targeted schools, including supply of leaders, teachers and school providers; detailed dissolution and dispersal plan for school closures; capacity to administer and track interim assessments; capacity to engage in significant mid-course corrections (including by replacing key staff, leadership or external providers) if data do not indicate significant progress toward achievement benchmarks within the first year; and quality of instructional programs and standards-based curriculum.

Governance reform

CDE will consider a district's commitment and capacity to establish oversight structures for identified schools outside of normal district constraints that will ensure necessary freedom and support, such as a separate district office, staffed by a person that has been given significant autonomy to make critical decisions that impact student achievement, reports to the district superintendent and has contracting and other authorities, or a contract with a Lead Turnaround Partner.

Ensuring flexibility

CDE will consider a district's commitment to ensure necessary flexibility for identified schools. Many of these flexibilities are required elements of the intervention models outlined above. For all schools, they will include flexibility over scheduling of school day and year; principal autonomy over staff hiring, firing and placement; and greater authority over budgeting at the school level. Districts may provide these flexibilities by obtaining innovation school/zone status, converting a school to charter status, or obtaining specific waivers from district policy or negotiated agreements as necessary.

Aligned resources

CDE will consider a district's commitment to align current and future funding sources in support of improvement goals, including its commitment to identify and reallocate existing district funds for the purpose of sustaining the improvement work after federal funds expire.

Performance monitoring

CDE will consider a district's commitment and capacity to hold schools accountable for results. Specifically, districts must include in their application three year student achievement goals in reading/language arts and mathematics. Each Priority school the district commits to serve must be held accountable for meeting or being on track to meet those goals for all students and in each student disaggregated group. In addition, districts must hold schools accountable for progress on leading indicators (see step #4 below). In schools where the district proposes a "restart" model, it must also describe how it will hold the charter school operator, CMO or EMO accountable for meeting or being on track to meet student achievement goals and making progress on leading indicators.

District and community support

CDE will consider a district's demonstrated backing for necessary changes to accompany dramatic reform, as evidenced through support from the school board, superintendent, the local teachers' union, and parents.

Sustainability

Finally, CDE will consider evidence of the district's plan to sustain gains in student achievement beyond three years; and to commit one-time funds strategically to enable future interventions in other low-performing schools.

- (3) *The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Priority school identified in the LEA's application throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).*

Each LEA will submit to the CDE an electronic budget with detailed expenditures for each of the schools in which it will intervene. The budget will be scored against the RFP's rubric. An LEA's total grant may not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2,000,000 per year for each participating school. Actual allocations will be based on the intervention model chosen and SEA guidelines. Grants are renewable for 2 additional 1-year periods except in the cases of school closure. The district's rationale and justification for the grant amount request will be reviewed by the Grants Fiscal Management unit, program specialists with final approval from the Commissioner of Education. If Grants Fiscal, program specialists and the Commissioner disagree with the LEA's rationale and activities that are clearly detailed in the electronic budget form, the LEA will be required to revise and resubmit the budget to reflect the feedback provided.

Part 2

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

LEAs will develop an individual action plan for each site through a Unified Planning process where interventions consistent with the final requirements will be judged against a rubric (see RFP). LEA's will also complete an Addendum to their Unified Improvement Plan that provides a description of how each requirement will be met.

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

CDE will provide guidance through (noted in the application, timeline, and attachments):

1. An SST Diagnostic Review process that includes an orientation and ongoing support.
2. Webinars to be held for all eligible applicants.
3. CDE-provided technical assistance, support for needs assessments, and support for planning to eligible applicants.
4. Guidance, resources, and support developed and offered by the USDE, Comprehensive Centers, Regional Labs, and other organizations.

CDE will assess commitment through:

1. Questions that assess readiness and rubrics used to assess the quality of proposals and improvement plans.
2. Agreement to the conditions of the grant, including a commitment to implement one of the four intervention models.
3. Agreement to undergo a Diagnostic Review, if applicable.

(3) *Align other resources with the interventions.*

Will be answered in a narrative by LEAs and scored against a rubric in the application.

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

Will be answered in a narrative by LEAs and scored against a rubric in the application (see RFP).

(5) *Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends (see above).*

LEAs are expected to provide an action plan that provides detail for 4 years of program activities (3 years Tiered Intervention Grant funds and an additional year of sustainability supported by state and local funds). This will be scored against the rubric tied to the RFP.

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

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2011 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2012. Updated information listed below.

[Insert updated section information here. An SEA not revising this section should write "N/A" in this space.]

SECTION C: CAPACITY

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2011 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2012. Updated information listed below.

In certain cases, and LEA may indicate to CDE that it is only able to intervene in a certain number of Priority schools at one point in time. In those cases, CDE will use the following criteria to evaluate *an LEA's petition that it lacks the capacity* to intervene in each of its Priority schools:

The LEA demonstrates that it lacks the administrative or support staff to adequately support the implementation and monitoring of the intervention(s);

- 1) The LEA demonstrates that by focusing its efforts on a few schools, it will be better placed to improve the academic achievement of students in its other low performing schools.

In reviewing the petition, CDE will consider:

1. The size and geographical location of the district as well as the number and size of schools.
2. The availability of high quality external providers that have a proven track record of addressing the root causes identified in the Expedited Diagnostic Review (EDR).
3. The capacity of the BOCES serving the district to address the root causes of low performance identified in the EDR.
4. The capacity of the CDE to provide direct support to address the root causes identified in the EDR.
5. The availability of other resources and sources of support.

If CDE determines that the LEA has the capacity to intervene in more Priority schools than it plans to serve, CDE may determine, on a case by case basis, that the LEA is ineligible to receive School Improvement grant funding. If CDE determines that the LEA does have the capacity to serve all of its Priority schools, it will notify the LEA and recommend ways the LEA can manage the intervention.

CDE will evaluate the LEA's capacity *to serve* its Priority schools in the RFP. The criteria for judging capacity is found below:

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
he LEA provides little or no evidence that it has the capacity to implement the identified intervention model. The reviewer sees little evidence that the district possesses the capacity to successfully put in the specific change drivers in place.	The LEA provides evidence that it has some capacity to implement the identified intervention model it has chosen, but the evidence is lacks enough specificity to fully satisfy the reviewer. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates competency in some of the areas discussed in the RFP, but it fails to address others in sufficient detail. There is concern that the LEA lacks the capacity to ensure fidelity and sustainability.	The LEA demonstrates that it has the capacity to fully and effectively implement whatever intervention model(s) it has chosen.

As part of its RFP process, CDE will assess the readiness of districts with Priority schools to implement one of the 4 intervention models. CDE will use the following set of questions and prompts to evaluate an LEA's readiness as part of Phase 1 of the RFP process:

- a) Clearly articulate what need this grant would fulfill within your school(s) and district.
- b) Describe the role of the district leadership in communicating the importance of achieving dramatic gains, compelling action and being available to strategically support the reform effort.
- c) How is the district able to demonstrate readiness for the Tiered Intervention grant and what steps have been taken that demonstrate commitment to the specific requirements of this grant (e.g., SST Review, school board commitment, previous staffing changes)?
- d) Describe how you have made the community (SAC parents, business, foundations, etc.), aware of the performance of the school(s) for which you are applying.
- e) Describe how your community and school board has been involved in improvement planning to date.
- f) Describe how this grant opportunity fits into the district/schools overall improvement plan.
- g) Describe what makes your district/school(s) ready and capable of dramatic change at this point in time.

CDE will also conduct onsite readiness reviews of sites that have been recommended for SIG awards prior to the awarding of the grant.

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

Pending approval by the USDE of the State's FY 2012 School Improvement Grant application, CDE will release the local SIG application and will provide support and disseminate information to all eligible applicants. As part of the information to be disseminated, CDE will communicate to eligible LEAs/schools that intervention plans are to be

implemented during the 2013-2014 school year. An LEA will be able to begin drawing down SIG funds following the approval of its SIG proposal. Awardees will receive **up to three years of funding** based on meeting annual implementation benchmarks and student academic achievement targets.

The following timeline is included in the local RFP for School Improvement Grant funds:

January, 2013	Finalize list of Priority Schools. Assess readiness and capacity of eligible applicants. Provide support for local stakeholder meetings and planning and implementation.
January 18, 2013	Submit Colorado SIG application for USDE approval.
March, 2013	Release of Tiered Intervention Request For Proposal (RFP) via the CDE weekly communication “The Scoop” and posted to the CDE Web site at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/NCLB/tia.asp
March, 2013	An application training webinar will be held to detail expectations of the RFP expectations and all time for Q&A/technical assistance.
April 23, 2013	Applications due to CDE on or before 4:00 p.m.
April-May, 2013	Review of proposals by CDE Teams of CDE staff and external reviewers with expertise in school turnaround and federal grants administration will score proposals according to rubric and develop LEA feedback. CDE’s Office of Grants Fiscal Management will review proposed budget expenditures. (See scoring rubrics on pages 15 – 18 of the Tiered Intervention RFP) The review of the Tiered Intervention Grants will be a standards based process. LEAs will not be funded unless they meet each of the criteria in each section of the application. This approach will prevent a proposal that has deficiencies in one section of the plan from compensating for those deficits in other sections. In this way, the review process will ensure that funded Tiered Intervention Grants address all the critical components in a way that is aligned into a coherent whole. LEAs may be asked to submit revisions in any deficient sections to bring specific sections up to standard.
April, 2013	Scores, feedback (may include rewriting of specific sections) and notification of funding will be released contingent upon approval of Colorado’s 1003(g) Application by the USDE. If anything additional is needed from LEAs based on USDE input, it will be requested at this time. Awards will be made no later than May 31, 2013.
August, 2013	Implementation of intervention model prior to, or during, the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**June 2013 – June
2016**

Awardees will receive **up to three years of funding** based on meeting annual implementation benchmarks and student academic achievement targets.

SECTION D (PARTS 2-8) DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2011 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2012. Updated information listed below.

(1) 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.

(2)

In the overarching strategy for supporting dramatic improvement in the state's lowest-achieving schools, the Colorado Department of Education's Turnaround Office will develop detailed performance goals and specific timelines for improvement to which all turnaround schools and districts will be held. A unified plan for each individual school site will be monitored and updated annually. The unified plan must include the following components:

- The project's short-term and long-term goals and objectives.
- The project's most important activities and characteristics.
 - How the project's program activities will lead to the attainment of objectives.
- How the project will ensure that:
 - all project components are delivered as prescribed to all participants; and
 - the appropriate amount of program content will be delivered to all participants.

These goals, timelines and indicators will be encompassed in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the CDE and individual districts and will include the following:

- A common, ambitious but achievable goal that every turnaround school will be expected to meet within 3-5 years after beginning its turnaround effort. The CDE will define a school turnaround a "success" when the students it serves are performing at levels comparable to students' average performance in low-poverty schools across the state. Schools will be required to meet achievement levels in the core academic subjects that equal or

exceed the average level for the state's non-low-income students. High schools will also be required to achieve graduation rates, dropout rates, college-going rates and other key high school metrics that are equal to rates among Colorado's higher-income high schools.

- School-specific timelines and benchmarks for reaching these goals. Rather than requiring all schools to follow a simplistic linear path from their current achievement to the goals outlined above, in its MOUs with participating districts, the CDE will establish timelines and benchmarks that are individualized based on each school's current achievement, turnaround strategy, and particular needs.

First, the timelines and benchmarks will vary by each school's achievement levels when it began its turnaround effort. In addition, some schools identified for turnaround are further behind than others, and so they may require more time (e.g., 5 years as opposed to three) to meet the state's performance goals. This will be negotiated for individual schools in each district's MOU.

Second, research shows that successful turnarounds typically involve a focus on a few key goals in the first few weeks and months of the effort. This focus will be reflected in each school's individualized benchmarks. For example, if an elementary school decides to invest heavily in year one in third and fourth grade reading, its first-year benchmarks will reflect that by setting more ambitious targets for growth in reading achievement in third and fourth grade than for other grades and subjects. All schools will be required to show sufficient achievement growth in all grades and subjects by year five, but initial benchmark goals will help foster the intense focus common to successful turnarounds by setting school- and year-specific targets.

Third, research shows that "early wins," or strong and measurable gains in the first year, are common to successful turnarounds. Therefore, benchmarks for all schools will require large and measurable gains in the school's first year of turnaround, and sustained progress thereafter. Timelines will not be constructed as "balloon payments" to allow the school to remain low-performing for three to four years and then expect to make large leaps in year five.

- A set of leading indicators to inform the district and state whether each school is on-track to meet its benchmarks and ultimate goals for student achievement. The CDE Turnaround Office will invest in the creation and refinement of a research-based set of leading indicators to measure success or failure in turnaround schools. In year one, the CDE will start with three initial sets of indicators (see below), which it will develop over the course of spring 2010 and begin collecting from the first cohort of turnaround schools in early 2011. Mid-year collection and analysis of as many indicators as possible will enable the CDE, local districts and school leaders to initiate mid-course corrections or more dramatic shifts in strategy for the next school year. Consistent with Colorado's overall approach of building and collecting knowledge about what works in improving student outcomes, these indicators and results from the first cohort of turnaround schools will thereafter inform research and analysis to develop more accurate and refined sets of leading indicators for future cohorts of turnaround schools.

Leading indicators to be collected in year one will include:

- a. Title I Section 1003(g) required indicators: the number of minutes within the school year; student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup; dropout rate;

student attendance rate; number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes; discipline incidents; truants; distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system; and teacher attendance rate.

- b. Other quantitative indicators that supplement those required under 1003(g), such as: results on interim assessments of student performance; the percentage of students taught by teachers who, in prior years, achieved above average or exceptional growth with their students; other measures of time allocated to learning; and others likely to be highly-correlated with successful improvement efforts
- c. Qualitative indicators that arise from cross-sector research about successful turnarounds. The extent to which the school leader and staff have prioritized a few key goals that will lead to visible early wins; whether the school leader is engaging staff in

regular and transparent sharing of data about student performance; and evidence of positive community involvement in the turnaround effort or the leader's successful efforts to influence those who oppose dramatic change.

Every turnaround school will be expected to become a high-performing school by year five. If a school fails to be on track to becoming a high-performing school based on leading and lagging indicators, CDE will not renew and LEA's School Improvement Grant. Summative (lagging) performance will be established using Colorado's School Performance framework pursuant to the Education Accountability Act of 2009 (Article 11 of title 22, Colorado Revised Statutes). Non-summative performance under a turnaround plan will be established using leading indicators. These leading indicators will include: meeting interim performance targets and meeting implementation benchmarks. Interim targets and implementation benchmarks are established as part of Colorado's unified planning process and reflect both state and local measures and design-specific implementation activities.

For sites moving from year one to year two of their grant, the primary focus will be implementation of the approved plan. Decisions regarding year two funding will be driven largely by the degree to which sites have implemented their Tiered Intervention Grant with fidelity and supporting data suggest the school has created the conditions for success. The School Performance Framework ratings form the basis for the decision to continue funding from year two to year 3 for the Tiered Intervention Grant. Information regarding the leading indicators and additional data such as interim assessments and UIP implementation may also be considered.

The results CDE expects from all Turnaround Schools is that their annual performance evaluations will show improvement such that following year 1 the school's performance improves enough to earn a category of at least Priority Improvement Plan (improving from Turnaround Plan), and then meets annual targets leading to earning a Performance Plan category by year five, at which time it will be a high-performing school.

- (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.

CDE meets individually with awarded school and district officials in May of each year to review the above data and goals to determine the trajectory of the school's achievement data. CDE determines point whether the school is in jeopardy of meeting the targets necessary to demonstrate the adequate academic growth sufficient to justify continued funding. If a school is in jeopardy of not meeting the identified performance targets they are at that point warned that funds may be suspended if their overall School Performance Framework (SPF) shows a decrease in overall points earned. Once the SPF results become available, and the school shows a decrease in overall percent of points earned, the SIG funds will be suspended and the LEA will be given the opportunity to develop an alternative plan to address the areas of concern. If the alternative plan does not adequately demonstrate the capacity for dramatic change, SIG funds will be withdrawn from the school.

- (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.

CDE's Turnaround Office will conduct monthly onsite visits of each turnaround school and will prepare a summary report for the Commissioner of Education, the building principal and the district superintendent. Additionally, in cases where schools are using the services of an external provider, CDE's Turnaround Office will conduct monthly achievement calls for the purpose of reviewing current benchmark and formative assessment data, address current issues and identify next steps.

- (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.

In the event that the Colorado Department of Education lacks sufficient funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA apply, schools will be prioritized from lowest-achieving to highest-achieving . Note that the SEA does not expect to have sufficient funds to fund all eligible schools. In addition, an LEA may only apply for funds to serve a school from the 2013 eligibility list if they can document a commitment has already been made to implementation of one of the four intensive models at the start of the 2013-2014 school year. Indicators of demonstrated commitment and readiness include an agreement to implement the selected intervention model with fidelity and demonstration of community and parent engagement in the reform process, Board actions, and a commitment of other federal, state, and local resources to the turnaround effort.

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

The Colorado Department of Education will give priority to Priority Schools as described in #5 above.

- (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.

The State will not take over any Priority Schools in the 2013-2014 school year.

- (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.

The SEA does not intend to provide intervention services directly to Priority Schools.

SECTION E: SEA RESERVATION

SEA is using the same information in this section as in its FY 2011 application. The SEA does not need to resubmit this section.

SEA has revised the information in this section for FY 2012. Updated information listed below.

CDE will reserve 5% of the State's School Improvement grant funds in support of administrative services, fiscal services, and support services to school districts and schools as delineated in the following list of activities:

- Data collection and analyses associated with the identification and progress of low performing schools.
- Administration of school improvement grants to LEAs. Develop state and local SIG applications. Release the local RFP, provide training and technical assistance to school districts. Conduct grant reviews. Develop a data base of subgrantees, release funds and track expenditures, collect end of year reports. Maintain programmatic and fiscal records.
- Development and implementation of Diagnostic Reviews. Develop informational materials, protocols and rubrics used for the Diagnostic Reviews. Conduct orientations. Support community stakeholder meetings as necessary. Facilitate de-briefings and reports.
- Technical assistance and support to LEAs and low performing schools in the planning and implementation of intervention models. Ongoing support of partnerships with districts and low performing schools. Ongoing collection of progress data related to the implementation and impact of turnaround strategies. Development and implementation of performance indicators.
- Facilitation of partnerships between low performing LEA schools and external providers and CMOs. CDE will assign liaisons who will fill that role for districts, schools, and external providers and management companies.
- CDE will evaluate the impact of grant awards and intervention strategies. CDE will also continue to conduct research and evaluations as part of its statewide system of accountability and support.
- Tracking of school progress.
- Meeting all data collection and reporting requirements tied to the funds. Quarterly and end of year reports.

SECTION F: 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.

CDE posted notices inviting public comment and also reviewed proposed waivers with its NCLB Committee of Practitioners. See Attachment A for the Notice Inviting Public Comment and the comments received.

SECTION G: 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 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 Priority or 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 2011 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 2012 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 2011 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 2012 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 2011 competition.

Waiver 4: Priority schools list waiver

☒ In order to enable the State to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of lowest-achieving Title I-participating and Title I-eligible secondary schools as identified through the definition below, waive the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the SIG final requirements.

Colorado proposes updating the methodology for identifying schools as *priority* and *SIG eligible* to:

Definition of SIG eligible school:

School improvement grant eligible schools are schools that are either Title I schools that are low performing and/or with low graduation rates or Title I eligible high schools with low graduation rates. CDE used the following rules to determine the SIG eligible list.

SIG Eligible Title I Schools

1. Select 2012-13 Title I schools.
2. Exclude Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) that meet one or more of the following exemption criteria:
 - a. School purpose is dropout re-engagement or credit recovery
 - b. School is temporary and designed to transition students back to their home school
 - c. School is not a diploma-granting institution
3. Select schools with:
 - a. a 2012 Academic Achievement ratings of *does not meet* in reading and mathematics on the 3-year SPF (must have data for the past 3 years). (This is run at the E, M or H level individually. For a school to be identified, all EMH levels receiving Title I funding need to receive *does not meet* ratings in reading and math), and
 - b. On the 3-year SPF, the Title I schools with the lowest 5% of combined reading and math percentiles for academic achievement, and/or,
 - c. Schools with graduation rates less than 60% for all of the following: 2011 4-year, 2010 5-year, and 2009 6-year rates, and
4. Include only those schools assigned a 2012 Turnaround or Priority Improvement (or AEC-Turnaround or AEC- Priority Improvement) plan type assignments (their official plan type assignment).

SIG Eligible Title I Eligible High Schools

1. Select 2012-13 Title I eligible secondary schools (schools with H records, not currently served with Title I funds, with 2012-13 FRL % equal to or greater than 35% or at or above the 2012-13 district average for the H level)
2. Exclude Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) that meet one or more of the following exemption criteria:
 - d. School purpose is dropout re-engagement or credit recovery
 - e. School is temporary and designed to transition students back to their home school
 - f. School is not a diploma-granting institution
3. Select schools with graduation rates less than 60% for all of the following: 2011 4-year, 2010 5-year, and 2009 6-year rates
4. Include only those schools assigned a 2012 Turnaround or Priority Improvement (or AEC-Turnaround or AEC- Priority Improvement, if eligible) plan type assignments (their official plan type assignment).

Additional Criteria:

- Schools that are priority schools could not be focus schools. Focus schools could not be priority schools. (If eligible focus schools apply for and are granted a School Improvement Grant, then they will be removed from the focus school list and a replacement will be found, if necessary).
- Schools that are currently part of a TIG grant would not be eligible for TIG, but would be counted as priority schools.

Definition of Priority School:

Schools that are receiving a School Improvement Grant (1003g funded grant) and implementing one of the 4 reform models.

School Eligibility Criteria

To be included in the eligibility analyses, an educational entity must have been classified as operational with student enrollment data collected during the October 1, 2012 pupil count. Schools identified on Colorado's previous list of Priority Schools were excluded from eligibility. In order to be included in the list of SIG eligible schools based on achievement, the educational entity must have been classified as a Title I school for the 2012-2013 year. However, schools identified for low graduation included Title I and Title I eligible schools.

Another exclusion scenario arises from Colorado's identification of a subset of schools called Alternative Education Campuses (AECs), which serve special needs or high risk student populations. Based on prior approval³, AECs were exempted from the current analyses if they met one or more of the following criteria:

- School purpose is dropout re-engagement or credit recovery
- School is temporary and designed to transition students back to their home school
- School is not a diploma-granting institution

SIG Identified Schools

The final list SIG eligible schools (N = 20), includes Title I schools with low achievement (N = 15) and Title I eligible high schools with low graduation rates (N = 6⁴).

The current SIG eligibility school list includes Focus Schools previously identified on Colorado's List of Focus Schools. Currently, Colorado has 67 Focus Schools but needs 66. If two or more Focus Schools apply for and are awarded a SIG, those schools will be removed from the list of Focus Schools and it will become necessary to add new Focus Schools to bring the total to 66.

Assurance

The State assures that, through its request for ESEA flexibility, its definition of lowest-achieving Title I-participating and Title I-eligible secondary provides an acceptable alternative methodology for identifying the State's lowest-performing schools and thus is an appropriate replacement for the eligibility requirements and definition of PLA schools in the SIG final requirements.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here 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 Priority, 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 Priority or 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 Priority or Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

³ Pursuant to January 20th, 2010 federal guidance, schools designed to re-engage students who have dropped out of the system or serve populations otherwise unable to follow a traditional 4-year path to graduation, may be exempted from identification as among the lowest performing. Given these constraints, some of Colorado's AECs qualify for exemption. To determine whether an AEC should be exempted, school level information was collected on the following: the school's mission, the type of students being served (including counts of the number of students falling into each of the high risk categories described above), if the school focuses on dropout retrieval, if the school serves over-age and under-credited students, if the schools is designed to be temporary, whether the school grants diplomas, and other information which would preclude a school from expecting students to graduate in four years.

⁴ One school is identified for low achievement for its Title I middle school and for low graduation rate for its Title I eligible high school (Global Leadership Academy).

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2011 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2012 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 or 2012-2013 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 Priority or Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2013–2014 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 2013–2014 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Priority or 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 6: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2011 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2012 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 Priority, 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 Priority or 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

LEA APPLICATION

SEA is using the same FY 2011 LEA application form for FY 2012.

The SEA does not need to resubmit the LEA application.

SEA has revised its LEA application form for FY 2012.

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.

See Attachment B – Request for Proposal, Tiered Intervention Grant

APPENDIX A

REQUIRED INFORMATION FOR REVISED SEA APPLICATION SECTIONS

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 outlined in the final requirements.
- 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 Priority or 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 and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Priority, 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 Priority or Tier I and Tier II school.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

Attachment A

1003(g) Waiver Announcements

The Scoop

Weekly update for school districts from cde

Wednesday, December 19, 2012

** Action Item

This Week in *The Scoop*

- [Accountability & Improvement](#)
- [Data Systems](#)
- [Educator Effectiveness & Licensing](#)
- [Exceptional Student Services](#)
- [Federal Programs](#)
- [Innovation & Choice](#)
- [State Board of Education](#)

Accountability & Improvement

TELL How You've Made Positive Changes as a Result of the TELL Survey

The third iteration of the biennial Teaching, Empowerment, Leading and Learning (TELL) survey will run Feb. 6 - Mar. 6.

The department would like to show examples of how districts or even individual buildings used survey data from 2009 or 2011 to make positive changes. Please send examples that show how previous TELL surveys made a difference and made a district and/or building stronger in any way. Please send your success stories to Christina Larson at the contact information below.

The intent of the survey is to provide information that guides school and district improvement planning efforts and informs broader policy discussions for supporting teacher recruitment and retention, encouraging effective school leadership, and strengthening instructional efforts.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:
Christina Larson
Phone: 303-866-6811
Email: larson_c@cde.state.co.us

Submit Unified Improvement Plan by Jan. 15

Schools and districts with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type, and districts required to complete a student graduation completion plan or are identified for

improvement under Title III must submit UIPs to CDE for review by Jan. 15. Some grant programs also require submission (e.g., TIG, TDIP) as well. Plans are to be submitted through the online Tracker system, which is currently open to upload UIPs for submission to CDE. Resources for submitting UIPs are available on the UIP Submissions website.

The first of two UIP winter submissions webinars will be held on Thursday, Dec. 20 at 9 a.m. To connect to the webinar, visit: http://connect.enetcolorado.org/uiip_winter_submission/; for webinar audio, dial: 1-855-840-9121. This webinar will be recorded and posted online as a resource.

CDE is also offering an optional winter submission window for districts and/or schools to submit revised UIPs for posting on SchoolView. Districts or schools that opt to submit UIPs for posting on SchoolView this winter must submit plans through the online Tracker system. Plans submitted during the winter cycle (by Jan. 15) will replace the currently posted plans in February. All school and district plans must be submitted for public posting on SchoolView by Apr. 15.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Jamie Baker

Improvement Planning

Phone: 303-866-6108

Email: baker_j@cde.state.co.us

Data Systems

Attend a Data Pipeline Training

CDE will host two trainings on Data Pipeline in each region beginning February 2013. CDE is looking for host sites that can accommodate 200 attendees for a whole day. If you are able to host a training, please contact Jan Petro at (303) 866-6838.

Thank you to the LEAs that have volunteered to pilot Data Pipeline. Your participation ensures the best system possible. Overall, reactions to the Pipeline have been fairly positive. Those piloting the Directory found that the system was easier to use than ADE. Several enhancements were identified and have been implemented. A general observation across pilots is frustration obtaining username/passwords. One respondent summarized the pilot well by recognizing that his involvement allowed him to generate the necessary files now and become familiar with Pipeline prior to going live in 2013-14.

In January, CDE will open phase two of the pilot. All LEAs are encouraged to participate. CDE recognizes that Data Pipeline requires LEAs to revisit processes and in some cases make significant changes to those processes. Your participation in the pilot can assist in modifying processes as early as possible.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Lisa Bradley

Phone: 303.866.4902

Email: bradley_l@cde.state.co.us

Educator Effectiveness & Licensing

Print Your Educator License Online

Beginning in January, CDE's Educator Licensing Office will no longer print and mail paper copies of educator licenses, endorsements, credentials or authorizations. These documents will be available online and can be printed by the licensee.

This new process will allow licenses to become available much quicker; cutting three weeks of print time. Teachers/educators receive instant verification and licenses will be easier to keep track of.

For more information, visit the link below.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:
Theresa Marin
Educator Licensing
Phone: 303-866-3833
Email: marin_t@cde.state.co.us

See the December Educator Effectiveness E-newsletter!

Check out the Educator Effectiveness e-newsletter for important updates on Colorado's education improvement efforts and access to new resources!

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:
Katie Lams
Communications Division
Phone: 303-866-6800
Email: Lams_K@cde.state.co.us

Exceptional Student Services

Apply for the Eliminating Student Cost for Advanced Placement Exams

The deadline to submit the AP/IB ESCAPE Application to Participate has been extended to Thursday, Jan. 10.

ESCAPE grant funds will be available to pay advanced placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) exam fees for eligible students. Please notify your AP or IB coordinator and counselors about this ESCAPE grant and the deadline extension. The ESCAPE Guidance Document and application form are available at the link below.

Note: Available funds are contingent upon the limits of the annual award.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:
Tara Rolfe
Gifted Education
Phone: 303-866-6794
Email: rolfe_t@cde.state.co.us

Join the Spring Special Education Advisory Committee Forum: The Power of Partnership - Supporting the Journey

The Power of Partnership - Supporting the Journey, a Special Education Advisory Committee Forum, will be held on Friday, April 12 in metro Denver.

Representatives from local special education advisory committees will have the opportunity to hear from a panel of members; network with other local representatives and community agencies; and share strategies, ideas and resources. This event is sponsored by the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee and the Colorado Department of Education.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:
DeLinda Rose
Exceptional Student Services
Phone: 303-866-6943
Email: rose_d@cde.state.co.us

Register to Attend a Training on the Educational Identification of Autism

This training is for Child Find and evaluation teams assessing children birth to 21 who are new to the process or just thinking about educationally identifying young children and youth who are suspected of having an Autism Spectrum Disorder.

Hear from the experiences of school district and BOCES teams who have been evaluating students and making the determination of eligibility based on an Autism Spectrum Disorder for several years.

For more information, visit the link below. Scroll down to "Identifying ASD & TBI in Our Schools: Colorado's New Disability Category and Definition" to register for a training. The trainings take place Jan. - April.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:
Shannon Pfeiffer
Phone: 303-866-6969
Email: pfeiffer_s@cde.state.co.us

Submit Your Nomination for the 2013 State People First Award

The Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee is pleased to announce a call for nominations for the 2013 People First Award. This award serves to recognize individuals for their exemplary work in supporting students with disabilities. Recipients of this award go above and beyond to make a difference in another person's life. Click on the link below to read about last year's recipients of the award and to find out how to make a nomination.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

DeLinda Rose
Exceptional Student Services
Phone: 303-866-6943
Email: rose_d@cde.state.co.us

Join a Training on Categories and Changes, Traumatic Brain Injury

Exceptional Student Services would like to invite you to a Traumatic Brain Injury Definition and Eligibility Training.

The trainings are scheduled between mid-January and mid-April, 2013. Please note there is limited capacity at each training site and registrants must pre-register.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:
Heather Hotchkiss
Exceptional Student Services
Phone: 303-866-6739
Email: hotchkiss_h@cde.state.co.us

Federal Programs

Comment on State Waiver for 1003g Title I School Improvement Grants

CDE is asking for public comment regarding three waiver requests it plans to submit to the U.S. Department of Education as part of the application for Title I School Improvement Grant funds (1003(g)), as authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The state believes that the waivers will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Colorado's lowest performing schools. The three waivers are summarized below:

1. Waiver to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds to Sept. 30, 2016, extending the period of availability by one year.
2. Waiver to permit local education agencies to implement a Title I schoolwide program in a Title I participating school if that school does not meet the requisite 40 percent poverty threshold.
3. Waiver to allow the state to utilize a minimum N of 20 or fewer students in the identification of schools to increase the validity and reliability of the list of lowest performing schools by excluding those schools with very small student populations.

CDE values your input as we move ahead with the implementation of the state's school improvement efforts. Please submit any comments or concerns by close of business on Wednesday, Jan. 9, to Patrick Chapman at chapman_p@cde.state.co.us.

For More Information, Contact:
Patrick Chapman
Federal Programs
Phone: 303-866-6780
Email: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us

Join Us for Title I Office Hours on Thursday, Dec. 20

The Title I office hours on Thursday, Dec. 20, from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. will include discussions about Program Quality Indicators and the annual report. Login at <http://connect.enetcolorado.org/r74mx1q8l6d/> or phone 866-601-0566.

Note: The webinar will be recorded and made available on the Title IA web page within a few days following the event.

For More Information, Contact:

Kathryn Smukler

Federal Programs

Phone: 303-866-6842

Email: smukler_k@cde.state.co.us

**** Submit Your Post Award Revision Request by Friday, Dec. 21**

This is a reminder that the first window for the 2012-2013 NCLB Post Award Revision Request will close Friday, Dec. 21.

The Post Award Revision Request System is available at:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/scriptscfpu/consapp/index.asp>

Final allocations are posted on the Grants Fiscal Management Unit webpage at

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdefisgrant/NCLB_download.htm.

LEAs may only submit one revision request during each window. Accordingly, revisions for every applicable Title Program must be included in the request. Separate requests cannot be submitted for individual Title Programs. Program consultants will not review requests until the submission window closes.

Resources are available on the Consolidated Application Training Center to assist with the submission process (<http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/consapp/trainctr.asp>).

(1) a PowerPoint presentation with audio explains the purpose of the Post Award Revision Request System and how to submit a request

(<http://connect.enetcolorado.org/p8wsnay0z39/>)

(2) a step-by-step instruction list for submitting a request.

For programmatic questions, please contact the Title program consultant who read your application. For general questions, you can email consolidatedapplications@cde.state.co.us and your inquiry will be directed to a consultant who can assist.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Cheryl Miller

Federal Programs

Phone: 303-866-6214

Email: miller_c@cde.state.co.us

Innovation & Choice

View Resources for Online and Blended Learning

The Office of Online and Blended Learning has compiled lists of vendors and resources for districts and schools interested in implementing online or blended learning for their students. Each list contains the vendor name, description of the services/uses and the link to the resource website.

CDE does not endorse any of these vendors. It is the responsibility of the user to verify the validity of the resources and that they meet Colorado Academic Standards and/or any statutory requirements. The list has been categorized by type of resources and can be found at the following links:

LMS/SIS Resources:

http://www.cde.state.co.us/onlinelearning/download/LMS_SIS_Resources.pdf

Curriculum: http://www.cde.state.co.us/onlinelearning/download/Cur_Resources.pdf

Instructional: http://www.cde.state.co.us/onlinelearning/download/Inst_Resources.pdf

Miscellaneous Online Resources:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/onlinelearning/download/MiscOnline%20Resources.pdf>

For More Information, Contact:

Renee Martinez

Office of Online & Blended Learning

Phone: 303-866-6864

Email: martinez_r@cde.state.co.us

State Board of Education

Read the State Board Resolution to Honor the Victims of the Newtown School Shooting

The Colorado State Board of Education issued a resolution to honor the victims of the Sandy Hook Elementary shooting.

[Click Here for Additional Information](#)

For More Information, Contact:

Office of the State Board of Education

Phone: (303) 866-6817

Email: state.board@cde.state.co.us



Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax Avenue
Denver, Colorado
80203-1799

Phone: 303-866-4247

Connect with us on [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#)

Do you know somebody in your school district who needs to read The Scoop each week?
Send an e-mail to: CDE_Communications_Office@cde.state.co.us with "Sign Me Up For The Scoop" in the subject line. If you are having trouble signing up, please call the communications office at the telephone numbers above.

View previous issues of The Scoop at:
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/scripts/thescooparchive/TheScoopArchive.asp>

For more information, contact the CDE Communications Division, 303-866-4247.
(<http://www.cde.state.co.us/Communications/index.html>).

This request can also be found on the CDE website in the December 19 issue at the following link.

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/scripts/thescooparchive/TheScoopArchive.asp>

CDE Received no comments in response to this invitation for public comment.

Waiver Announcement to CoP Members

CoP members,

Good morning. I hope each of you is having a good beginning to 2013. This email is a request for your feedback. Please read the information below and follow the directions for submitting your comments and/or concerns. Thank you for your help with this task.

See you in February.

Kathryn

Attn: Committee of Practitioners

CDE is asking for feedback from the Committee of Practitioners regarding the waiver requests it plans to submit to the USDE as part of the application for Title I School Improvement Grant funds (1003(g)), as authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The State believes that the waivers will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Colorado's lowest performing schools. The two waivers are summarized below:

1. Tydings Waiver

This is a waiver to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds to September 30, 2016, extending the period of availability by one year.

2. Priority schools list waiver

"In order to enable the State to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of Priority schools under ESEA flexibility, waive the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the SIG final requirements. The State assures that, through its request for ESEA flexibility, its priority school definition provides an acceptable alternative methodology for identifying the State's lowest-performing schools and thus is an appropriate replacement for the eligibility requirements and definition of PLA schools in the SIG final requirements."

CDE values your input as we move ahead with the implementation of the state's school improvement efforts. Please submit any comments or concerns by close of business on Wednesday, Jan. 16th, to Patrick Chapman at chapman_p@cde.state.co.us.

Thanks for the clarification! Appreciate your quick response. Tydings Waiver seems like the right thing to do.

Both look good!

Thanks again,
Christy

>>> On 1/16/2013 at 5:35 AM, in message

<1CA0898AD3B6EA48853CFBA6050A28491A82A055@esvr01.cde.state.co.us>, "Bylsma, Brad"

<bylsma_b@cde.state.co.us> wrote:

Hi Christy,

Thank you for catching the issue in the request. We had originally thought we needed to apply for 4 waivers but then realized that two of them were covered by our ESEA waiver. I failed to change it from four to two in the last paragraph.

The Tydings Waiver is so we can spread the grant award over 3 years so schools can create a more thoughtful plan about how they are spending the funds and rolling out the new activities. Awarding the funds over three years also helps them plan for sustainability once the funds go away. Without the Tydings Waiver the schools would only be given a large sum in a one year grant award which would be difficult to plan for and would minimize the impact since there would be no funds to support the efforts once they've started.

I hope that helps. Thanks again for catching the wording error.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

Brad

Brad Bylsma | Asst. Director of Competitive Grants & Awards | Colorado Department of Education |
1560 Broadway, Suite 1450, Denver, CO 80202 | tel 303.866.6937 | bylsma_b@cde.state.co.us |

From: Christy Bloomquist [<mailto:cbloomquist@durango.k12.co.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2013 1:33 PM
To: Smukler, Kathryn
Cc: Bylsma, Brad; Chapman, Pat
Subject: Re: Need feedback from the CoP

Pat,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the waivers. However, more questions before I can really give you specific feedback on the waivers.

It says: The four waivers are summarized below - there are only two listed. What about the other two?

1. Tydings Waiver - What is the benefit? It will extend the period available but why is this needed? What benefit is this to the student achievement and closing the gaps that exist which should be our focus. I could support this but need to know if it is truly beneficial and what is the potential outcome?
2. Priority schools list waiver - I support this and is in alignment with the work around priority school concerns.

Thanks,
Christy

Christy Bloomquist
Executive Director of Student Achievement
Durango School District 9-R
201 E 12th St
Durango, CO 81301
Phone: (970) 247-5411 x 1420
Fax: (970) 247-9581
Cell: (970) 903-1363

>>> "Smukler, Kathryn" 01/09/13 8:44 AM >>>

CoP members,

Good morning. I hope each of you is having a good beginning to 2013. This email is a request for your feedback. Please read the information below and follow the directions for submitting your comments and/or concerns. Thank you for your help with this task.

See you in February.

Kathryn

Attn: Committee of Practitioners

CDE is asking for feedback from the Committee of Practitioners regarding the waiver requests it plans to submit to the USDE as part of the application for Title I School Improvement Grant funds (1003(g)), as authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The State believes that the waivers will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Colorado's lowest performing schools. The four waivers are summarized below:

1. Tydings Waiver

This is a waiver to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds to September 30, 2016, extending the period of availability by one year.

2. Priority schools list waiver

"In order to enable the State to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of Priority schools under ESEA flexibility, waive the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the SIG final requirements. The State assures that, through its request for ESEA flexibility, its priority school definition provides an acceptable alternative methodology for identifying the State's lowest-performing schools and thus is an appropriate replacement for the eligibility requirements and definition of PLA schools in the SIG final requirements."

CDE values your input as we move ahead with the implementation of the state's school improvement efforts. Please submit any comments or concerns by close of business on Wednesday, Jan. 16th, to Patrick Chapman at chapman_p@cde.state.co.us.

Kathryn Smukler | Title I State Coordinator | Colorado Department of Education |
1560 Broadway, Suite 1450, Denver, CO 80202 | tel 303.866.6842 | smukler_k@cde.state.co.us |

Pat,

I'm fine with the statements you've asked us to review but the statement says to view 4 waivers and I only received these two. Can I get the others? Thanks

Chuy

From: BRIDGETTE MUSE [<mailto:bmuse@eaton.k12.co.us>]

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2013 7:55 AM

To: Chapman, Pat

Subject: CoP feedback on (10003(g)) waiver requests

Patrick,

Both of these waiver requests seem logical. I recommend the state proceed with the requests.

Bridgette Muse
Director of Curriculum & Assessment,

Eaton School District RE-2
200 Park Avenue Eaton, CO. 80615
(970) 454-3402 Fax (970) 454-5193

From: Mark Rangel [<mailto:mrangel@cboces.org>]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2013 9:30 AM
To: Chapman, Pat
Subject: Waivers

Pat, I would support the waivers as presented.



CENTENNIAL
BOCES

Board of Cooperative Educational Services

Mark Rangel
Instructional Program Coordinator
Centennial BOCES
2020 Clubhouse Drive
Greeley, CO. 80634
970-352-7404 ext 1122
Cell 970-302-7180
Skype – mark.rangel1
<http://markrangel.weebly.com/>
<http://menamorganre3.weebly.com>
[Twitter@ RangelMark](https://twitter.com/RangelMark)
<http://markrangel.wordpress.com>
<http://www.slideshare.net/markrangel24/presentations>

From: BRIDGETTE MUSE [<mailto:bmuse@eaton.k12.co.us>]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2013 07:55 AM
To: Chapman, Pat
Subject: CoP feedback on (10003(g)) waiver requests

Patrick,

Both of these waiver requests seem logical. I recommend the state proceed with the requests.

Bridgette Muse
Director of Curriculum & Assessment,
Eaton School District RE-2

200 Park Avenue Eaton, CO. 80615
(970) 454-3402 Fax (970) 454-5193

From: Dianna Hulbert [<mailto:dhulbert@summit.k12.co.us>]

Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2013 5:46 PM

To: Chapman, Pat

Subject: Waiver input

Hello Patrick,

I support extending the funds until 2016, and am confident that the methodology the department has created to identify the lowest performing schools will be acceptable.

Dianna

Dr. Dianna Hulbert
Principal
Silverthorne Elementary
PO Box 1039
0101 Hamilton Creek Road
Silverthorne, CO 80498
970-368-1601

From: Mary Ellen Good [<mailto:meg@cbores.org>]

Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2013 9:27 AM

To: Smukler, Kathryn; Chapman, Pat

Subject: RE: Need feedback from the CoP

Hi Pat,

I have no concerns about the waiver requests and am in support of these efforts.

ME Good

Dr. Mary Ellen Good
Director of Federal Programs
CBOCES
2020 Clubhouse Dr.
Greeley, CO 80634
Office (970) 352-7404 ext. 1110
Cell (970) 381-9878

From: Andrea Perras [<mailto:ac.perras@goalac.org>]

Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2013 12:29 PM

To: Chapman, Pat

Subject: FW: Need feedback from the CoP

I approve of the waiver requests as outlined in the below email.

Andrea Perras
Director of Finance
G.O.A.L. Academy
(720)381-2957 Office



COLORADO DEPARTMENT of EDUCATION

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Proposals due: Tuesday, April 23, 2013 by 4 p.m.

Application Webinar: Wednesday, March 20, 2013 from 1:00 – 2:00 p.m.

Required Intent to Apply due: Thursday, March 23, 2012 by 4 p.m.

Tiered Intervention Grant

2013

For program questions contact:

Brad Bylsma (bylsma_b@cde.state.co.us or 303-866-6937)

For fiscal/budget questions contact:

Martin Petrov (petrov_m@cde.state.co.us or 303-866-6389)

For RFP specific questions contact:

Lynn Bamberry (bamberry_l@cde.state.co.us or 303-866-6813)

2013 Tiered Intervention Grant – Overview

Request For Proposal

Proposals Due: Tuesday, April 23, 2013

Introduction	<p>The intent of this grant is to provide funding for districts (on behalf of eligible schools) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Partner with the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) in the implementation of one of the school intervention models provided in the draft guidance for the use of Federal Title I 1003(g) funds (To view the final requirements/program guidance, please visit: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance02232011.pdf); ▪ Increase the academic achievement of all students attending chronically low performing schools as measured by the state’s assessment system; and ▪ Utilize the support and services of an external provider in their efforts to accomplish the above.
Purpose	<p>The Office of Federal Program Administration at the Colorado Department of Education has Title I 1003 (g) funds to support schools identified as chronically low performing schools as indicated by state assessments.</p>
Available Funds	<p>Approximately \$7 million is available for distribution to LEAs. An LEA may request no less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year over the three year grant period for each participating school. Subsequent years funding (except in the case of closure) is contingent upon CDE approval and continued 1003(g) allocations from the USDE. Actual allocations will be based on the intervention model chosen and SEA guidelines. CDE expects to fund approximately 6 applications.</p>
Eligible Applicants	<p><u>Eligible schools are listed in Attachment A. The eligible schools were identified as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Title I eligible School; • Has a 2012 Academic Achievement ratings of <i>does not meet</i> in reading and mathematics on the 3-year SPF (must have data for the past 3 years). (This is run at the E, M or H level individually. For a school to be identified, all EMH levels need to receive <i>does not meet</i> ratings in reading and math); and • On the 3-year SPF, schools with the lowest 5% of combined reading and math percentiles for academic achievement; and/or • A school with a best-of graduation rate less than 60% over 3 years (2011, 2010, and 2009); and • Schools assigned a 2012 Turnaround (or AEC-Turnaround, if eligible) plan type assignments (their official plan type assignment). <p>SIG Eligible Title I Eligible Secondary Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012-13 Title I eligible secondary schools (schools with High School records, not currently served with Title I funds, with 2012-13 FRL % equal to or greater than 35% or at or above the 2012-13 district average for H level) Of those schools, select only those with: • Schools with a best-of graduation rate less than 60% over 3 years (2011, 2010, and 2009-meet minimum N each individual year), and Include only those schools assigned a 2012 Turnaround (or AEC-Turnaround, if eligible) plan type assignments (their official plan type assignment). <p>Please Note: Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) that meet one or more of the following criteria will be exempted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School purpose is dropout re-engagement or credit recovery • School is temporary and designed to transition students back to their home school

Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School is not a diploma-granting institution <p>Schools that are priority schools may not be focus schools. Focus schools may not be priority schools.</p>
	<p>In the overarching strategy for supporting dramatic improvement in the state’s lowest-achieving schools, CDE will work collaboratively with LEAs to develop meaningful detailed performance targets and specific timelines. These targets and timelines will be used when making Year 2 funding determinations. A Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) for each individual school site will be monitored at school and district on-site reviews and updated as necessary, with final revisions annually. The UIP and grant budget expenditures must be aligned to the UIP Quality Criteria and chosen reform model.</p>
	<p>Awardees will be expected to collect the following leading indicators, report them to CDE and include them in the data analysis portion of the UIP (where possible):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Title I Section 1003(g) required indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of minutes within the school year; • Student participation rate on State assessments in reading, writing, math, and science, by student subgroup; • Dropout rate; • Student attendance rate; • Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), • Early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes; • Discipline incidents; • Truants; • Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA’s teacher evaluation system; and • Teacher attendance rate. b. Quantitative indicators that supplement those required under 1003(g): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proficiency results on interim assessments of student performance in reading, writing, math, and science; • The percentage of students taught by teachers who, in prior years, achieved above average or exceptional growth with their students; • Other measures of time allocated to learning and intervention; • Annual collection data and improvement in catch up, keep up, and moving up categories in reading, writing, and math; • Annual collection data and improvement in all proficiency data in reading, writing, math, and science; and • Others likely to be highly-correlated with successful improvement efforts. c. Qualitative indicators that arise from cross-sector research about successful reform models. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused and prioritized improvement strategies that will lead to visible early wins. • Whether the school leader is engaging staff in regular and transparent data dialogues surrounding student performance. • Evidence of positive community involvement in the reform effort. • The leader’s successful efforts to influence those who oppose dramatic change. • Evidence of district leadership and support.

<p>Evaluation (Continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional resources on successful reform models can be found at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/TurnaroundSupport.asp. <p>d. Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs (SASA) Monitoring Plan for School Improvement Grants. Tools can be found at: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html</p> <p>Tiered Intervention Grants are intended to yield rapid increases in student achievement and funded sites that have a flat or declining performance framework profile over the life of the grant are unlikely to be funded for a third year.</p> <p>For continuation of funding into Year 2, CDE will consider achievement data, with a strong emphasis on implementation data including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An indication that the district and school desire to continue Tiered Intervention Grant funding in the school and have a willingness and readiness to revisit the strategies necessary to significantly improve the school’s performance • An indication of the willingness of the district and school to create an implementation plan that is consistent with Title I, section 1003(g) requirements. <p>For continuation of funding into Year 3, emphasis will be placed on school achievement gains, as well as implementation data.</p>
<p>Allowable Use of Funds</p>	<p>Awarded funds may be used for the following purposes: Pre-Implementation costs (identified costs that are absolutely necessary to implement the model fully and effectively) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Family and community engagement; ▪ Rigorous review of external providers; ▪ Staffing; ▪ Instructional programs; ▪ Professional development and support; and/or ▪ Preparation for accountability measures (see attachment B for additional guidance on pre-implementation funds). ▪ Implementation of any of the school intervention models provided in the USDE guidance for the use of Federal Title I 1003(g) funds (see Attachment C for additional detail); ▪ Evaluation of implementation and/or external providers. ▪ Note: Administrative costs may be no more than 5% of the funded amount.
<p>Commitments</p>	<p>For information regarding commitments required by LEAs and by CDE, see the Certification and Assurance form (pages 11 – 13).</p>
<p>Duration of Grant</p>	<p>Funds must be expended by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 1: September 30, 2014 (May 30, 2013-September 30, 2014) <p>Years 2 and 3 contingent upon CDE approval and continued 1003(g) funding from the USDE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 2: September 30, 2015 (July 1, 2014-September 30, 2015) • Year 3: September 30, 2016 (July 1, 2015-September 30, 2016)

Technical Assistance	<p>An application training webinar will be held on Wednesday, March 20, 2013 from 9-10 a.m. To register for this technical assistance opportunity, please email Nicole Dake at: dake_n@cde.state.co.us.</p> <p>Note: If interested in applying for this grant opportunity, please complete the Letter of Intent (Attachment D) and submit by Thursday, March 21, 2013.</p>
Review	<p>Applications will be reviewed based on the rubrics to ensure they contain all required components. The review of the Tiered Intervention Grants will be a standards based process. LEAs will not be funded unless they meet each of the criteria in each section of the application. This approach will prevent a proposal that has strengths in one section of the plan from compensating for deficits in other sections. In this way, the review process will ensure that funded Tiered Intervention Grants address all the critical components necessary for a comprehensive plan. LEAs may be asked to submit revisions in any sections to more fully meet the standards.</p> <p>Each district/school identified for possible funding will be visited following the review of applications, the week of May 20th 2013. The purpose of the site visit will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm the information provided in the application; • Verify readiness; • Ensure capacity needed to successfully implement the proposed project; • Determine any technical assistance and/or support needs of each district/school; • Make final funding determinations. <p>If district/school staff are not able to verify the information provided in the application, or fail to demonstrate an understanding of the program the recommendation to fund will be withdrawn. Applicants will receive final notification of application status by May 30, 2013.</p>

Submission Process

The **original plus five copies** of the application must be received by **Tuesday, April 23, 2013** at 4:00 p.m. In addition to the six hard copies, **a copy of the proposal narrative must be submitted to: CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us and a copy of the electronic budget must be submitted via the CDE Tracker System for each school.** Please e-mail all required pieces of the narrative as one document with the Excel budget workbook. Faxes will not be accepted. Incomplete or late proposals will not be considered. Application materials and budget are available for download on the CDE Web site at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/turnaround/cde_turnaroundplan_home.htm.

Submit Proposals to:

Nicole Dake
Colorado Department of Education
1560 Broadway, Suite 1450
Denver, CO 80202

&

Submit an electronic copy of the proposal narrative and excel budget to:
CompetitiveGrants@cde.state.co.us

Also upload an electronic copy of the budget to:
The CDE Tracker System
(<https://tracker.cde.state.co.us/Security/Login.aspx?ReturnUrl=/Default.aspx>)

Required Elements

The format outlined below **must be followed** in order to assure consistent application of the review criteria (see evaluation rubric for specific details needed in Parts II –IV).

Part I:	Proposal Introduction (not scored) Cover Page Schools to be Served LEA/School Information and Signature Page Assurance and Certification Form Waivers
Part II:	Narrative Section I: LEA Readiness Section II: LEA Commitment and Capacity Section III: Needs Assessment and Program Plan Section IV: Budget Narrative

Application Format:

- Applications should only include the required elements.
- The total narrative (Part II)of the application cannot exceed 15 pages.
- All pages must be standard letter size, 8-1/2" x 11" using no smaller than 12 point type.
- Use a document footer with the name of the applying entity and page numbers.
- Use 1-inch margins.
- Staple the pages of all copies including the original. Please do not use tabs, paperclips, rubber bands, binders or report covers.

2013 TIERED INTERVENTION GRANT

PART I: COVER PAGE *(Complete and attach as the first page of proposal)*

Name of Lead Local Education Agency (LEA)/Organization:			
Mailing Address:			
District Turnaround Project Manager:			
Mailing Address:			
Telephone:		E-mail:	
Signature:			
Program Contact Person (if different):			
Mailing Address:			
Telephone:		E-mail:	
Signature:			
Fiscal Manager:			
Telephone:		E-mail:	
Signature:			
Region: <i>Indicate the region(s) this proposal will directly impact</i>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Metro <input type="checkbox"/> Pikes Peak <input type="checkbox"/> North Central <input type="checkbox"/> Northwest <input type="checkbox"/> West Central <input type="checkbox"/> Southwest <input type="checkbox"/> Southeast <input type="checkbox"/> Northeast			
Total LEA Request: <i>Indicate the total amount of funding you are requesting. Please note: An individual budget will be required for each school site totaling to the amount listed below.</i>			
Year 1 (May 30, 2013 – September 30, 2014)	Year 2 (July 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015)	Year 3 (July 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016)	Total
\$	\$	\$	\$

Please note: If the grant is approved, funding will not awarded until all signatures are in place. Please attempt to obtain all signatures before submitting the application.

In Addition: The Year 1 grant period may include pre-implementation costs from May 30, 2013 to June 30, 2013 (see Attachment B). The duration of Year 1 will be May 30, 2012 to September 30, 2014.

PART IA: SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

Complete the following information with respect to the schools that will be served with a School Improvement Grant and attach as the second page of proposal.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	INTERVENTION Model			
		Include requested amount per school			
		Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation

PART IB: LEA/School Information and Signature Page

(Complete and attach as the third page of proposal. If there are more than 3 participating schools the district may duplicate this page and attach it after page 3.)

District Signatures

District Name:

District Code:

School Board President Signature:

Superintendent Signature:

School Information

School #1 Name:

School Code:

Principal Name:

Telephone:

E-mail:

Is school currently receiving a School Improvement Grant funded through 1003(a) funds?

Yes

No

Principal Signature:

School #2 Name:

School Code:

Principal Name:

Telephone:

E-mail:

Is school currently receiving a School Improvement Grant funded through 1003(a) funds?

Yes

No

Principal Signature:

School #3 Name:

School Code:

Principal Name:

Telephone:

E-mail:

Is school currently receiving a School Improvement Grant funded through 1003(a) funds?

Yes

No

Principal Signature:

PART IC: Certification and Assurance Form

(Complete and attach as the fourth and fifth pages of proposal)

The School Board President and Board-Appointed Authorized Representative must sign below to indicate their approval of the contents of the application, and the receipt of program funds.

On _____ (date) , 2013 the Board of _____ (district) _____ hereby applies for and, if awarded, accepts the state funds requested in this application. In consideration of the receipt of these grant funds, the Board agrees that the General Assurances form for all state funds and the terms therein are specifically incorporated by reference in this application. The Board also certifies that all program and pertinent administrative requirements will be met. These include the Office of Management and Budget Accounting Circulars, and the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) requirement. In addition, the Board certifies that the district is in compliance with the requirements of the federal Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA), and that no policy of the local educational agency prevents or otherwise denies participation in constitutionally protected prayer in public schools. In addition, school districts that accept 1003(g) School Improvement funding for the **Tiered Intervention Grant** agree to the following assurances:

Federal Assurances:

- Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- Establish annual targets 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 school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its schools that receive School Improvement funds;
- (If the applicant implements a restart model in a 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;
- Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved School Improvement Grant application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken as outlined in the approved School Improvement Grant application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of School Improvement Grant funding; and
- Report to the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

State Assurances:

- Provide the Colorado Department of Education such information as may be required to determine if the grantee is making satisfactory progress toward achieving the goals of the grant (e.g., CSAP/TCAP by State Assigned Student IDs, school level non-performance data). The district will report to CDE, at least quarterly, the school level interim measures of student learning required under section III of the final requirements (program guidance can be found at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance02232011.pdf>);
- Align current and future funding sources in support of improvement goals, including commitment to identify and reallocate existing local funds for the purpose of sustaining the improvement work after federal funds expire;

- Commit to developing a Unified Improvement Plan that demonstrates how the district will increase overall student achievement in the identified schools and share that plan with CDE;
- Provide the leadership capacity to oversee the implementation of intervention models;
- Provide a district level contact whose primary responsibility is the oversight and coordination of intervention models in the school(s);
- Participate in quarterly Professional Learning Communities focused on school and district improvement;
- Monitor and evaluate the impact of all intervention models;
- Agree to participate in the federal and state evaluation of School and District Improvement Initiatives;
- Submit to CDE the most recent UIP for each identified school.
- Commit to working with CDE to monitor progress on the UIP and make adjustments to the plan accordingly;
- Provide data on attainment of performance targets to CDE to inform decision around the continuation of funding.
- Develop a detailed budget for each school and submit a revised budget at least annually, as well as an annual financial report;
- Participate fully in on-site visits conducted by CDE to every funded school during the grant cycle;
- Work collaboratively with CDE, as appropriate, in the selection of a strong school leader or partner, such as a Charter Management Organization (CMO), Education Management Organization (EMO) or other provider;
- Work cooperatively with CDE and provider(s), if applicable, in waiving district policies, procedures or practices that are deemed to be impediments to improvement, such as scheduling of the school day and year; staffing decisions; budgeting; and/or to obtain innovation school status for identified schools;
- Commit to engaging in significant mid-course corrections in the school if the data do not indicate attainment of or significant progress toward achievement benchmarks within the first year of implementation, such as replacing key staff, leadership or external providers;
- Maintain sole responsibility for the project even though subcontractors may be used to perform certain services; and
- Notify the community of the intent to submit an application and that any waiver request will be made available for public review prior to submission of the application.
- Participate in the development and submission of any reports necessary to meet statutory requirements within the time frames specified.
- Maintain appropriate fiscal and program records. Fiscal audits of funds under this program are to be conducted by the recipient agencies annually as a part of their regular audit.
- Submit budget revision(s), if applicable, to CDE on a **quarterly** basis for review and approval.
- Submit Annual Financial Reports as part of their annual review with CDE. CDE will utilize the information as a measure of performance and leading indicator of performance in subsequent year(s).
- Contracts with education providers must include a performance guarantee to increase student achievement based on services provided.

IF ANY FINDINGS OF MISUSE OF FUNDS ARE DISCOVERED, PROJECT FUNDS MUST BE RETURNED TO THE COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. The Colorado Department of Education may terminate a grant award with thirty (30) days notice if it is deemed by CDE that the applicant is not fulfilling the requirements of the funded program as specified in the approved project application, or if the program is generating less than satisfactory results.

Name of Board President	Signature of Board President
Name of District Superintendent	Signature of District Superintendent
Name of Program Contact	Signature of Program Contact

State Education Agency assurances – As a partner in the Tiered Intervention Grant, CDE agrees to provide the LEA with support and tools to foster successful implementation of the School Improvement Grant program. Specifically, CDE will:

- Provide the LEA with guidance about the specific types of changes and interventions each of the models require;
- Provide the LEA with descriptions and examples of special district governance structures that will ensure necessary freedom and support for interventions in identified schools;
- Provide the LEA with a description of the changes in policy or practice that may be required to ensure necessary flexibility for dramatic improvement in identified schools;
- Periodic review of school and district UIPs and provide feedback;
- Meet regularly with School/District to review performance data and implementation of improvement efforts, as defined in the UIP.
- Provide the LEA with a model budget and/or set of principles to guide allocation of 1003(g) and other funds in support of dramatic improvement of achievement in the school(s)
- Provide support for quarterly budget revisions;
- Provide ongoing professional development and technical assistance; and
- Define a set of leading indicators and overall performance targets that the identified school(s) and external providers, if applicable, will be required to demonstrate during the course of the reform effort; additionally interim measures and implementation benchmarks that the LEA may use to hold school(s) and provider(s) accountable.

PART ID: WAIVERS *(Complete and attach as the sixth page of proposal)*

_____ (District) requests a waiver of the requirements it has selected below.
Please note: If the district does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each participating school, then it must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Name of Board President

Signature of Board President

Name of District Superintendent

Signature of District Superintendent

Name of Program Contact

Signature of Program Contact

Budget Instructions and Budget Form

Complete the proposed budget and budget narrative at:

http://www.cde.state.co.us/turnaround/cde_turnaroundplan_home.htm

When the applications have been reviewed, final grant amounts will be determined and a more detailed budget may be required. Please remember that no grant funds can be obligated or spent until a final budget has been received and approved by CDE.

Examples of the types of expenses that may be included in each object category are listed below for guidance only. Your budget narrative should provide enough detail so that the appropriate object category can be confirmed.

Instructional Program. Instruction includes the activities dealing directly with the interactions between staff and students. Teaching may be provided for students in a school classroom, in another location such as a home or hospital, or in other locations such as those involving co-curricular activities. Instruction also may be provided through some other approved media such as television, radio, telephone or correspondence. Included are the activities of paraprofessionals (aides) or classroom assistants of any type who assist teachers in the instructional process.

Support Program. Support service programs are those activities which facilitate and enhance instruction. Support services include school-based and general administrative functions and centralized operations for the benefit of students, instructional staff, other staff, and the community.

(100) Salaries - Amounts paid for personal services for both permanent and temporary employees, including personnel substituting for those in permanent positions. This includes gross salary for personal services rendered while on the payroll of the school district/agency/organization.

(200) Employee Benefits - Amounts paid on behalf of employees; generally those amounts are not included in the gross salary, but are in addition to that amount. Such payments are fringe benefit payments and, while not paid directly to employees, never-the-less are part of the cost of personal services. Workers' compensation premiums should not be charged here, but rather to other purchased services (500).

(300) Purchased Professional and Technical Services – Services which by their nature can be performed only by persons or firms with specialized skills or knowledge. While a product may or may not result from the transaction, the primary reason for the purchase is the service provided. Included are the services of auditors, consultants, teachers, etc.

(500) Other Purchased Services – Amounts paid for services rendered by organizations or personnel not on the payroll of the district (separate from Professional and Technical Services or Property Services). While a product may or may not result from the transaction, the primary reason for the purchase is the service provided.

(600) Supplies – Amounts paid for items that are consumed, worn out, or deteriorated through use; or items that lose their identity through fabrication or incorporation into different or more complex

units or substances. Items that do not contribute to a district's fixed assets, as evaluated by the district's fixed assets policy, may be coded as supply items, or may be coded as Non-Capital Equipment. Items that contribute to a district's fixed assets must be coded as equipment. All computers must be entered as equipment. Include all supplies, food, books and periodicals, and electronic media materials here.

(800) Other Expenses – Amounts paid for goods and services not otherwise classified above. Some expenditures may cross object category lines. For example, professional development and evaluation may include salaries, purchased services (printing) and supplies/materials. The budget narrative should identify these elements so that a total cost of the activity can be determined.

Indirect Costs – Indirect costs are those costs - necessary in the provision of a service - that cannot be readily or accurately attributed to a specific grant program.

School Districts Only: School districts may budget indirect costs only if they are designated as the fiscal agent. The indirect cost rate used varies by district. Your district budget office should provide this rate to you, or you may access it by going to CDE's web page and linking to School Finance.

Tiered Intervention Grant 2013 Grant Review Rubric

Part I:	Proposal Introduction	No Points
Part II:	Narrative	
	Section I: LEA Readiness	/31
	Section II: LEA Commitment and Capacity	/59
	Section III: Needs Assessment and Program Plan	/63
	Section IV: Budget Narrative	/23
	Electronic Budget	No Points
	Total	/176

GENERAL COMMENTS: *Reviewers, please indicate support for scoring by including overall strengths and weaknesses. These comments are used on feedback forms to applicants.*

Strengths:

-
-

Weaknesses:

-
-

Required Changes:

-
-

Recommendation:

Fund _____

Fund w/ Changes _____

Do Not Fund _____

Part I: Proposal Introduction**No Points**✓ **Cover Page, Schools to be Served Page, LEA/School Information and Signature Page, Certification and Assurance Form and Waiver Form**

Complete the Cover Page, Schools to be Served Page, LEA/School Information and Signature Page, Certification and Assurance Form and Waiver Form and attach as the first six pages of the proposal.

✓ **Executive Summary**

Provide a brief description (no more than 1 paragraph) of the district and schools and the overall needs of the purposes of this grant. Use a separate sheet of paper and insert after the first six pages.

Part II: Narrative**176 Points**

The following criteria will be used by reviewers to evaluate the application as a whole. In order for the application to be recommended for funding, it must receive at least 140 of the total possible 176 points and all required parts must be addressed. An application that receives a score of 0 on any required parts within the narrative will not be funded.

Section I: LEA Readiness	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and mostly complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
h) Clearly articulate what need this grant would fulfill within your school(s) and district.	0	1	3	5
i) Describe the role of the district leadership in communicating the importance of achieving dramatic gains, compelling action and being available to strategically support the reform effort.	0	1	2	3
j) How is the district able to demonstrate readiness for the Tiered Intervention grant and what steps have been taken that demonstrate commitment to the specific requirements of this grant (e.g., SST Review, school board commitment, previous staffing changes)?	0	1	3	5
k) Describe how you have made the community (SAC parents, business, foundations, etc.), aware of the performance of the school(s) for which you are applying.	0	1	3	5
l) Describe how your community and school board has been involved in improvement planning to date.	0	1	3	5
m) Describe how this grant opportunity fits into the district/schools overall improvement plan.	0	1	2	3
n) Describe what makes your district/school(s) ready and capable of dramatic change at this point in time.	0	1	3	5
Reviewer Comments:				
TOTAL POINTS				/31

Section II: LEA Commitment and Capacity	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and mostly complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
a) What methods did the district use to consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school intervention models in its schools (e.g., stakeholder meetings (PTA, teacher unions, school board), print/web-based communication, and/or surveys)?	0	1	3	5
b) Detail how the community was given notice of intent to submit an application and how any waiver requests will be made available for public review after submission of the application (e.g., newspaper/news releases, posted on the school and/or district website).	0	1	2	3
c) What specific actions has the district taken (or will take) to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements? To view the final requirements/program guidance, please visit: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance02232011.pdf .	0	1	3	5
d) Describe the specific actions the district has taken or will take to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality (e.g., interviews, screening tools created)?	0	1	3	5
e) What specific actions has the district taken or will the district take to align other resources with the proposed interventions (e.g., Title I, local grants)?	0	1	2	3
f) What <i>specific</i> actions has the district taken (or will take) to ensure flexibility, modify its practices, policies or oversight structures, outside of normal district constraints, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively (e.g., flexible scheduling, principal autonomy over staff hiring/firing and placement, budget autonomy, obtaining innovation school/zone status, teacher/union agreements)?	0	1	3	5

<p>g) For schools that are selected, how will the district demonstrate capacity to carry out the proposed interventions (e.g., leadership, detailed strategic or dissolution plans, capacity to administer and track progress monitoring assessments, capacity to engage in significant mid-course connections)?</p> <p>If there are schools in the district that will not be served through this grant, please provide a detailed explanation for why the district lacks the capacity to serve them (e.g., lack of administrative or support staff to adequately support the implementation, improve academic achievement by focus on fewer schools).</p>	0	3	5	7
<p>h) What specific actions has the district taken (or will take) to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends (e.g., professional development, trainer of trainer models, district commitment of continuation resources)?</p>	0	1	2	3
<p>i) Set feasible, attainable, and measurable objectives for each project goal. Identify how progress will be monitored towards each objective. Identify the timeline by which progress targets should be met.</p>	0	1	3	5
<p>j) Discuss how data will be disaggregated by subgroups on a regular basis (e.g., specific evaluation methods that are feasible and appropriate to the goals and objectives of the proposed project, data reports generated monthly and reviewed at both district and school levels, assessments administered on a specific assessment schedule).</p>	0	1	3	5
<p>k) Who will monitor and evaluate the progress of the program? Who will be responsible for sharing those results (i.e., leading indicators, quantitative indicators, student performance data) with CDE on a monthly basis (e.g., name of specific company or person with expertise noted)?</p>	0	1	2	3
<p>l) How will the project strategies be modified if the progress monitoring data does not show that targets have been met?</p>	0	1	3	5
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p>				
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>				<p>___/59</p>

Section III: Needs Assessment and Program Plan	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and mostly complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
a) Submit the Unified Improvement Plan Addendum (Attachment E) for each proposed site. Use the template making sure to clearly address the needs assessment. Additional narrative detail may be added if there is not enough clarity within the Plan itself. <i>Please note:</i> To ensure success, it is imperative that specific needs are clearly delineated before an intervention model is chosen, before the plan is prepared and (if applicable) before a provider is chosen.	0	3	5	7
b) Analyze the current conditions in the proposed school(s) by providing student performance and other relevant data in relation to intervention selected for each school site.	0	3	5	7
c) Analyze the current conditions in the proposed school(s) by identifying root causes. What is preventing the school from increased academic performance? To what does the district attribute the failure of student academic growth over time?	0	3	5	7
d) Analyze the current conditions in the district by demonstrating that the LEA has the capacity to ensure that the school(s) implements the required activities of the selected school intervention model fully and effectively. (Attach relevant data: external evaluation, relevant student achievement, school performance and relevant school culture data as an appendix.)	0	3	5	7
e) Provide evidence to demonstrate that overall goals and performance targets are included by year. Annual math and reading/language arts academic goals are set for each school site the grant will serve. Expectations for growth after one year must be clear.	0	3	5	7
f) Provide evidence to demonstrate interventions are consistent with the final requirements. To view the final requirements/program guidance, please visit: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance02232011.pdf .	0	3	5	7
g) Provide evidence to demonstrate proposed plan is aligned with the district Unified Improvement Plan.	0	3	5	7
h) Provide evidence to demonstrate sustainability after the implementation of the changes.	0	3	5	7
Reviewer Comments:				
TOTAL POINTS				/63

Section IV: Budget Narrative	Inadequate (information not provided)	Minimal (requires additional clarification)	Adequate (clear and mostly complete)	Excellent (concise and thoroughly developed)
<p>Provide a 3-year electronic budget (http://www.cde.state.co.us/turnaround/cde_turnaroundplan_home.htm) in compliance with CDE’s standard fiscal rules including a budget narrative that contains the following criteria:</p>				
<p>a) All expenditures contained in the budget are described in the budget narrative and justified in connection to project goals, activities and specific model. The costs of the proposed project (as presented in the budget and budget narrative) are reasonable and the budget sufficient in relation to the objectives, design, and scope of project activities.</p>	0	3	5	7
<p>b) Amount of school improvement funds to be used for both pre-implementation (those activities which are absolutely necessary to implement the model fully and effectively) and implementation of the selected model and activities in each school the LEA commits to serve is clearly delineated.</p>	0	1	3	5
<p>c) Amount of school improvement dollars used by the LEA to <i>support</i> implementation of the selected school intervention model and activities are clearly detailed.</p>	0	1	3	5
<p>d) Demonstrates how district will align current and future funding in support of improvement goals and sustainability (e.g., specific funds identified, how will existing funds be reallocated to sustain grant after federal funding ends).</p>	0	1	2	3
<p>e) Details any portion of the plan that will be paid for by grant funds.</p>	0	1	2	3
<p>Note: A final budget and budget narrative will be required after actual allocations are determined. Upon approval of a final budget and budget narrative, funds will be released to the grantees. An LEA’s budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each school the LEA commits to serve.</p>				
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p>				
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>				<p>___/23</p>

2013 Tiered Intervention Grant Eligible Schools

Note: Shaded rows indicate schools already participating in the Tiered Intervention Grant and therefore, are not eligible to apply.

Allowable Use of Funds – Pre-Implementation

Section J from the FY 2009 Guidance, “SIG, Race to the Top, and the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund,” has been removed and replaced with this new Section J for FY 2010.

J. PRE-IMPLEMENTATION

J-1. May an LEA use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds for “pre-implementation”?

Yes. Carrying out SIG-related activities during a “pre-implementation” period enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

J-2. What are examples of SIG-related activities that may be carried out in the 2010–2011 school year in preparation for full implementation in the 2011–2012 school year?

This section of the guidance identifies possible activities that an LEA may carry out using SIG funds in the spring or summer prior to full implementation. The activities noted should not be seen as exhaustive or as required. Rather, they illustrate possible activities, depending on the needs of particular SIG schools:

- **Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.
- **Rigorous Review of External Providers:** Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity (see C-5); or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model (see H-19a).
- **Staffing:** Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.
- **Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs

with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.

- **Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.
- **Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.

As discussed in F-4, in general, SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, an LEA must continue to provide all non-Federal funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including pre-implementation activities. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

J-3. When may an LEA begin using FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds to prepare for full implementation of an intervention model in the 2011–2012 school year?

An LEA may begin using FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds after the SEA has awarded the LEA a SIG grant based on the LEA's having met all requirements for having a fully approvable SIG application, including conducting a needs assessment and identifying the model that will be implemented in each school the LEA will serve with SIG funds. (New for FY 2010 Guidance)

J-4. Is there a limit on the amount of SIG funds that an LEA may spend during the pre-implementation period that begins when it receives FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds?

There is no specific limit on the amount of SIG funds that an LEA may spend during pre-implementation. However, funds for activities that are designed to prepare for full implementation in the 2011–2012 school year come from the LEA's first-year SIG grant, which may be no more than \$2 million per school being served with SIG funds. Therefore, the LEA needs to be thoughtful and deliberate when developing its budget and should consider, at a minimum, the following:

- SIG funds awarded for the first year must cover full and effective implementation through the duration of the 2011–2012 school year, in addition to preparatory activities carried out during the pre-implementation period.

- All activities funded with SIG funds must be reasonable and necessary, directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, address the needs identified by the LEA, and advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools (see also I-30).

Allowable Use of Funds

Please note: A comprehensive list of allowable activities can be found in “Guidance on School Improvement Grants” issued by the U.S. Department of Education on February 23, 2011.

Turnaround Model

- On-going, high quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program;
- Training in data analysis to inform and differentiate instruction;
- Financial incentives to recruit, place and retain staff with skills necessary to meet the needs of students in the turnaround school;
- Appropriate social-emotional and community oriented services and supports for students;
- Stipends that provide additional time for data meetings, Review of curriculum to make sure it is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State Academic standards, establishing schedules that will provide increased learning time;
- Costs associated with developing local competencies;
- Costs associated with implementing a new school model;

Restart Model

Please Note: Any of the allowable activities in the turnaround or transformation model are allowable in the restart model.

- Services from an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process or a charter school operator (CMO).

School Closure

Please Note: The funds allocated for a school closure are not subject to renewal since it is limited to the time necessary to close the school (usually one year or less)

- Costs that are associated with general responsibilities IF the costs are directly attributable to the school closure and exceed the costs the LEA would have incurred in the absence of the closure.
- Necessary and reasonable costs associated with closing a Tier I or Tier II school , such as costs related to parent and community outreach, including , but not limited to, press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, hotlines, direct mail notices, or meeting regarding the school closures; services to help parents and students transition to a new school; or orientation activities, including open houses, that are specifically designed for students attending a new school after their prior school closes.

Transformation Model

- Costs associated with the development of a rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation system for teacher and principals that take into account student growth data, and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.
- Rewards for school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation.
- Ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.
- Financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.
- Additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a transformation school.
- Costs associated with implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model.
- Additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content.
- Technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.
- Enrollment in advanced coursework, early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers.
- Summer transition programs or freshman academies.
- Costs associated with credit recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills.
- Stipends for additional time to create early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or to graduate.
- Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff.
- Positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment.
- Costs associated with full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.
- On-going, intensive support for school site(s) from LEA or external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

**2013 Tiered Intervention Grant
Intent-to-Apply**

Name of LEA:	
AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE (LEA)	
Name:	Title:
Address:	Phone:
Fax:	E-mail:
PROGRAM CONTACT PERSON	
Name:	Title:
Address:	Phone:
Fax:	E-mail:
Eligible School(s):	
School Name:	
Model	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Which of the following reform model(s) is the district considering:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Closure</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Restart</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Transformation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Turnaround</p> <p>See Guidance: (http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/sigguidance05242010.pdf)</p>	
<p>Part 2</p> <p>Briefly describe your rationale for selecting the model above.</p> <p>Briefly describe the anticipated challenges with implementing the above identified reform model requirements:</p>	
Signatures	
<p>Superintendent Name: _____</p> <p>Superintendent Signature: _____</p> <p>Date: _____</p>	

Section V: Supporting Addenda Forms

For Schools with a Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) that Selected a Turnaround Model

Schools that participate in the Tiered Intervention Grant and selected the Turnaround Model must use this form to document grant requirements. As a part of the improvement planning process, schools are strongly encouraged to weave appropriate requirements into earlier sections of the UIP. This form provides a way to ensure all components of the program are met through descriptions of the requirements or a cross-walk of the grant program elements in the UIP.

Description of TIG (Turnaround Model) Program Requirements	Recommended Location in UIP	Description of Requirement or Crosswalk of Description in UIP Data Narrative or Action Plan (include page numbers)
Describe how the LEA has granted the principal sufficient operational flexibility in the following areas: Staffing, Calendars/Time, and budgeting.	Required TIG Addendum	
Describe the new governance structure that was adopted. This structure may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a turnaround office in the LEA, hiring a turnaround leader who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or entering into a multi-year contract with the LEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10) or Required TIG Addendum	
Describe the process for replacing the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the turnaround model (e.g., use of competencies to hire new principal).	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Describe how locally adopted competencies are used to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students. Include (a) how all existing staff were screened and not more than 50 percent rehired and (b) how new staff are selected.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	

Description of TIG (Turnaround Model) Requirements	Recommended Location in UIP	Description of Requirement or Crosswalk of Description in UIP Data Narrative or Action Plan (include page numbers)
Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;	Section III: Data Narrative (p. 7) and Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Describe the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	Section IV: Interim Measures on Target Setting Form (p. 9) and Action Plan (p. 10)	
Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	

Section V: Supporting Addenda Forms

For Schools with a Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) that Selected a Transformation Model

Schools that participate in the Tiered Intervention Grant and selected the Transformation Model must use this form to document grant requirements. As a part of the improvement planning process, schools are strongly encouraged to weave appropriate requirements into earlier sections of the UIP. This form provides a way to ensure all components of the program are met through descriptions of the requirements or a cross-walk of the grant program elements in the UIP.

Description of TIG (Transformation Model) Requirements	Recommended Location in UIP	Description of Requirement or Crosswalk of Description in UIP Data Narrative or Action Plan (include page numbers)
Describe how the LEA has granted the school sufficient operational flexibility in the following areas: Staffing, Calendars/Time, and budgeting.	Required TIG Addendum	
Describe how the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10) or Required TIG Addendum	
Describe the process for replacing the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model (e.g., use of competencies to hire new principal).	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that: (1) take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors (e.g., multiple observation-based assessments) and (2) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10) or Required TIG Addendum	
Describe the process for Identifying and rewarding school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates. Include how staff who have not improved their professional practice, after ample opportunities have been provided, are identified and removed.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10) or Required TIG Addendum	

Description of TIG (Transformation Model) Requirements	Recommended Location in UIP	Description of Requirement or Crosswalk of Description in UIP Data Narrative or Action Plan (include page numbers)
Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;	Section III: Data Narrative (p. 7) and Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Describe the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.	Section IV: Interim Measures on Target Setting Form (p. 9) and Action Plan (p. 10)	
Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	
Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.	Section IV: Action Plan (p. 10)	



Summary of Root Cause(s) this Strategy will Address (from existing UIP):

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Steps* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)
LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school					

Major Improvement Strategy : Adopt Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) *Closure* Model

Summary of Root Cause(s) this Strategy will Address (from existing UIP):



Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Steps* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)
<p>School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.</p>					
<p>LEA officials will engage in an open dialogue with families and the school community early in the closure process to ensure that they understand the data and reasons supporting the decision to close, have a voice in exploring quality options, and help plan a smooth transition for students and their families at the receiving schools.</p>					