

School Improvement Grants

Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Arkansas



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

OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2016

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. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

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

ESEA Flexibility

An SEA that has received ESEA flexibility no longer identifies Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; instead, it identifies priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools. Accordingly, if it chooses, an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request may select the "**priority schools list waiver**" in Section H of the SEA application for SIG funds. This waiver permits the SEA to replace its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of priority schools.

Through its approved ESEA flexibility request, an SEA has already received a waiver that permits its LEAs to apply for SIG funds to serve priority schools that are not otherwise eligible to receive SIG funds because they are not identified as Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The waiver offered in this application goes beyond this previously granted waiver to permit the SEA to actually use its priority schools list as its SIG list.

Availability of Funds

The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, provided \$506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2013.

FY 2013 SIG funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2015.

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 SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2013 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2013 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 SIG 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 2013 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 2014–2015 school year. New three-year awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any unobligated SIG funds from previous competitions not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

The Department will require those SEAs that will use FY 2013 funds solely for continuation awards to submit a SIG application. However, those SEAs using FY 2013 funds solely for continuation purposes are only required to complete the Continuation Awards Only Application for FY 2013 School Improvement Grants Program located at the end of this application.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2013 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to OESE.OST@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 November 15, 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.

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Part 1 (Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools): Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA’s definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this definition, as its methodology for identifying its priority schools has already been approved through its ESEA flexibility request.

Part 2 (Eligible Schools List): As part of its FY 2013 application an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State or, if it is requesting the priority schools list waiver, of each priority school in the State. (A State’s Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.

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

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

| LEA NAME | LEA NCES ID # | SCHOOL NAME | SCHOOL NCES ID# | PRIORITY (if applicable) | TIER I | TIER II | TIER III | GRAD RATE | NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹ |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| Covenant Keepers Charter | 500397 | Covenant Keepers Middle | 50039701499 | X | | | | | |
| Dermott School District | 505170 | Dermott High School | 50517000239 | X | | | | | |
| Dollarway School District | 505410 | Dollarway High School | 50541000235 | X | | | | | |
| Dollarway School District | 505410 | Morehead Middle School | 50541000252 | X | | | | | |

¹ “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.

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Earle School District | 505550 | Earle High School | 50555000266 | X | | | | | |
| Forrest City School District | 506270 | Forrest City Junior High | 50627000345 | X | | | | | |
| Fort Smith School District | 506330 | Trusty Elementary | 50633000377 | X | | | | | |
| Fort Smith School District | 506330 | Belle Point Alternative Center | 50633000354 | X | | | | | |
| Hot Springs School District | 507890 | Summitt School | 50789000949 | X | | | | | |
| Lakeside School District | 508640 | Lakeside High School | 50864000578 | X | | | | | |
| Lee Co. School District | 509360 | Lee High School | 50936000675 | X | | | | | |
| Lee Co. School District | 509360 | Anna Strong Middle School | 50936000673 | X | | | | | |
| Lee Co. School District | 509360 | Whitten Elementary School | 50936000679 | X | | | | | |
| Little Rock School District | 509000 | Geyer Springs Elementary | 50900001382 | X | | | | | |
| Little Rock School District | 509000 | Baseline Elementary | 50900001378 | X | | | | | |
| Little Rock School District | 509000 | Henderson Middle | 50900000617 | X | | | | | |
| Osceola School District | 510950 | Osceola High School | 51095000825 | X | | | | | |
| Osceola School District | 510950 | Osceola Middle School | 51095000823 | X | | | | | |
| Pine Bluff School District | 500026 | Oak Park Elementary | 50002600866 | X | | | | | |
| Pine Bluff School District | 500026 | Belair Middle | 50002600855 | X | | | | | |
| Pine Bluff School District | 500026 | Robey Junior High | 50002601338 | X | | | | | |
| Pine Bluff School District | 500026 | Pine Bluff High School | 50002600867 | X | | | | | |
| Pulaski Co. Special SD | 511850 | Harris Elementary | 51185000916 | X | | | | | |
| Pulaski Co. Special SD | 511850 | Wilbur Mills High School | 51185000945 | X | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Springdale School District | 512660 | Springdale Alternative School | 51266001495 | X | | | | | |
| Strong-Huttig School District | 512930 | Strong High School | 51293001049 | X | | | | | |
| Texarkana School District | 503110 | Arkansas High School | 51311001068 | X | | | | | |
| West Memphis School District | 508040 | Wonder Junior High | 50804000532 | X | | | | | |

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 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 2 | ## | TAYLOR MS | ## | | | | X | | X |

Part 3 (Terminated Awards): 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 the 2014-2015 school year. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds.

| LEA NAME | SCHOOL NAME | DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED | AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS |
|---|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS: | | | |

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA: An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information set forth below in an LEA’s application for a School Improvement Grant.

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

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

The Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Planning (ACSIP) model is an annual planning and fund distribution design that must be used by all Arkansas public and charter schools, as defined by Ark. Code Ann. § 6-15-419. Using the ACSIP model, each school in Arkansas develops a comprehensive school improvement plan. The plan is also used as the school’s application for all federal programs administered by the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE), under the Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA), in addition to Student Special Use Funds. ACSIP must include activities based on the school’s greatest needs and identify the

performance of student subgroups if the subgroup did not meet the achievement level necessary for Annual Measurable Objectives. Schools are required to analyze data for the following: combined population of the school; all subgroup data from state required achievement exams; local achievement assessments; attendance or graduation rates; relevant sources to determine student learning needs. Specific grade levels and/or content area information should be recognized as main concerns and achievement gaps between subpopulations should be identified. The ACSIP also serves as the LEA applications for federal and state funds. All LEA applications for funds must show how funds will support the overarching plan (i.e. how budgeted activities directly support the LEA's effort to address the needs, goals, objectives, progress targets, and strategies within the overarching plan).

Within each ACSIP the LEA must identify the following information:

1. Mission statement: A written expression of the mission of the school. The goals and activities of the plan are connected to the mission.
2. Priorities: Expressions of the areas of greatest need, based on analysis of assessment data (e.g., Math, Literacy, Special Education for Focus Schools, Character Education, etc.).
3. Data statements: Statements of the three (3) most current years of information available for each grade tested. These statements may contain the results of comprehensive needs assessments that are developed for the Combined Population, Limited English Proficiency (ELL), Economically Disadvantaged (SES), Students with Disabilities (IEP), & Racial/Ethnic groups: White, African-American, and Hispanic. The following measurements must be included:
 - Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT):
 - Math identifying weaknesses from strands and goals, open response versus multiple choice and literacy for each subpopulation.
 - Literacy identifying weaknesses from multiple-choice and open response for each subpopulation.
 - Norm Referenced Tests (NRT):
 - Attendance or Graduation Rate (Develop statement for the area on which the building AYP calculation is based.)
 - Other appropriate areas as needed.
4. Goal statements: Statements that narrow the scope of the priority by addressing specific weaknesses based on CRT and NRT data disaggregation and analysis.
5. Benchmark statements: Benchmark statements reflect the building's current AYP status and where the building should be according to the current AYP chart located in the State's Accountability Workbook.
6. Interventions: Formatted descriptions of proposed research-based programs, initiatives, or strategies to address the student academic, behavioral and social needs identified in the data analysis.

Research citations (the source, title, author, and date of publication) should be recent and include the scientifically based research upon which the interventions are developed.

The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) will require all SIG applicants to provide a more detailed needs assessment (as indicated in Part 1 below) and substantiate how the selection of each intervention model is supported by the data. The LEA must include in its application a clear identification of the intervention the applicant proposes to implement, along with a timeline for implementation with benchmarks and clearly defined roles and responsibilities associated with the selected intervention, as well as a clear justification for the selection of the intervention model. (Indicators and questions are adapted from the Center for Innovation and Improvement tool "**Selecting the Intervention Model and Partners for a Low-Achieving School: A Decision-Making and Planning Tool for the Local Education Agency**").

Part 1 of the application requires the LEAs to assess school needs. The applicant would follow an orderly progression of steps as it completes this process:

The first step in completing the needs assessment is to assemble evidence as required to develop a profile of the

school's context. This part includes the following indicators and questions:

- Grade levels;
- student enrollment;
- % free/reduced lunch;
- % special education students;
- % English language learners;
- home languages of ELL students;
- Description of the enrollment area served by school;
- List of feeder schools and recipient schools;
- Description of background and core competencies of the school's administrators;
- Description of the evaluation process for administrators;
- Summary profile of teaching staff;
- Evaluation process for teachers; and
- Description of current reform and improvement efforts over the last five years.

The LEA will then assemble evidence as required to develop a profile of the school's performance. This part includes the following indicators and questions:

- Student proficiency in all tested subjects and grades for "all students" for the past five years;
- Student proficiency in all tested subjects and grades by subgroup past three years;
- Attendance rate;
- Mobility rate; and
- Graduation Rate.

Key Questions

1. Which students are experiencing the lowest achievement?
2. Which students are experiencing the lowest graduation rates?
3. In which subjects are students experiencing the lowest achievement?
4. What characteristics of the student demographics should be taken into account in selecting a model and external partners?
5. What characteristics of the enrollment area should be taken into account in selecting a model and external partners?

The LEA must also include a detailed summary of the schools progress relative to the Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement, (ADE Scholastic Audit-**ATTACHMENT 2**). Specifically the LEA must describe:

- Specific findings that led to the "Recommendations";
- LEA (Leadership) and/or school "Recommendations" identified for implementation;
- Implementation progress;
- Timeline of prioritized "Recommendations;" and,

- Evaluation process.

How the LEA will support the building in providing continuous school improvement at the building level must be addressed by the LEA. Additionally, the LEA will specifically address those items unique to the role of the LEA (i.e., board policy, supervising and guiding building level leadership).

The school must address those items unique to the roles and responsibilities of the school for providing continuous school improvement.

In addition to the above indicators, the LEA must provide a summary of other data sources used to supplement the needs assessment and the selection of an appropriate intervention model for each priority school. (i.e. perceptual data from students, staff and parents, process data, improvement plan outcomes or results, professional development program outcomes or results, other).

The LEA and school must support its annual goals for student achievement with its current Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (ACSIP) priorities and actions. The ADE anticipates that applicants must update or otherwise adjust and amend its ACSIP to accommodate rapid transformation and to secure the input of new leadership that may come into the LEA. ACSIP Supervisors and Title I staff will be available to assist the LEA and schools with ACSIP amendments and adjustments as needed to support SIG initiatives.

A comprehensive rubric addressing each area of the school application and intervention models will be utilized to score the application and ensure that the LEA and school have the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related supports. The application is divided into six sections. Two sections require general information. The remaining four sections have a maximum point value of 150 points. The LEA must submit a separate application for each school. A team of ADE staff members will review all LEA applications and assess the adequacy and appropriateness of each component. Team members will include Title I, school improvement, accountability, curriculum and assessment, and federal finance. Each member will have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on each section of the application. **(The full ADE Title I, 1003(g) SIG Review Rubric is located in Attachment 3)**

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

Part 2 of the application requires the LEA to assess the needs and capacity of the school and district relative to each of the intervention models and which intervention model will be likely to produce the most immediate and substantial improvement in student learning. Each LEA must demonstrate the capacity to use SIG funds, 1003(a) school improvement funds, and other State and/or local funds to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention(s) identified for each school in the LEA's application.

To demonstrate capacity, the LEA is required to identify particular characteristics of school needs and capacity, district capacity, and community capacity (including supply of external partners, CMOs, EMO). These identified needs are linked to intervention models that are most appropriate given that characteristic. LEAs then rank order the intervention models based on fit and answer specific questions regarding each intervention model, to further refine the rank order. After answering the questions, the LEA must recommend and provide a rationale for its selection of an intervention model for each school.

The LEA is also required to examine any state statutes and policies, district policies, and district contractual agreements that provide support or otherwise affect each of the four intervention models. A descriptive response must be provided for each indicator. The LEA is also required to list external partners (CMOs, EMOs) that are available to assist with specific aspects of each of the four intervention models.

Additionally, the LEA will provide the following information:

1. Statement of Need - This section is a narrative description of the process the LEA utilized to complete the Needs Assessment, how the performance data informed the selection of the intervention model for each school, how the district analyzed the Scholastic Audit results and determined the resources and related support for each school. The narrative must also include a list of review team members and their positions. If the LEA has selected the Turnaround and/or Transformation models, it must explain how the LEA will assist schools in fulfilling the required activities for each school.

2. Lack of Capacity to Serve - If the LEA is choosing NOT to serve each Tier I school, please provide a detailed explanation indicating why the LEA has determined that it does not have the capacity to serve those schools. (Describe any key policies, processes, weaknesses, or issues that impact the lack of capacity.)

All LEA applicants will be required to submit evidence of their capacity for each of the indicators. Evidence may be in the form of data, district policies, district agreements, and other documentation. ADE will evaluate each LEA applicant's capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each priority school utilizing a comprehensive rubric. **(The full ADE Title I, 1003(g) SIG Review Rubric is located in Attachment 3)**

(3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application, as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools in a State that is not requesting the priority schools list waiver, throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

ADE will evaluate each LEA applicant's budget to ensure it includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each priority school throughout the period of availability of funds. LEA applicants will be required to submit a detailed budget table and narrative with supporting documentation of the cost of required and (if applicable) optional activities for the selected intervention model for each priority school. Support of school improvement strategies for which School Improvement Grant funds are proposed, must be aligned, with school improvement strategies that are identified through the Scholastic Audit and the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Planning (ACSIP) process.

ADE will evaluate each LEA applicant's budget according to the following requirements. If any requirements are not met, the application will be returned to the LEA for revision.

Budget Table Requirements

- Must include a budget table for each priority school proposed to be served
- Must identify the school name
- Must clearly reflect the proposed interventions and activities supported through the needs assessment
- Must include costs for each intervention element for Years 1-3 and the total cost for each intervention element
- Must include the specific source of funds that will be used to cover each cost identified
- Must include the total cost over the availability of the grant funds
- Must list the school improvement activities, costs for each activity over the availability of the grant funds

Budget Narrative Requirements

- Must include justification of cost estimates
- Must include description of large budget items

- Must be aligned with the budget table
- Must describe how funds from different sources will be utilized

A budget justification narrative must accompany the budget for each priority school for which funding is sought. The application will not be considered without the budget justification narrative.

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

- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;

ADE will evaluate the LEA's commitment to design and implement the selected interventions consistent with the final requirements by determining if LEA applicants have included the following information in the application:

- Detailed tasks, timelines, and responsibility for designing and implementing each required and (if applicable) optional activity for the selected interventions;
- Information to connect the tasks, timelines, and responsibility to the school's goals under ACSIP;
- LEA plan for monitoring the implementation of the intervention model;
- LEA plan for how the LEA will promote the working relationships among the groups, partners, committed to the intervention and other community stakeholders.

The ADE will assess the degree to which intervention design and implementation is consistent with the final requirements through the ACSIP process. This procedure is one with which LEAs and schools are familiar. In addition to ACSIP supervisors the ADE will also use the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) to supervise the implementation of the improvement plan.

Applicants must fully implement intervention models in the 2014-2015 school year. However, certain model components; as identified in the non-regulatory guidance, such as job-embedded professional development or identifying and rewarding teachers and principals who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates through effective implementation of a model, will occur later in the process of implementing an intervention model. For example, in the case of rewards for exemplary teachers and administrators, there must be a foundation or baseline for identifying teachers and administrators who have increased achievement and high school graduation rates. While this information may not be available on the first day of the 2014-2015 school year, it will become evident as the school year unfolds.

The ADE recommends peer review of intervention implementation with frequent reporting from the building level administrator to the superintendent; from the superintendent to the local school board; and from the local school board to the peer review committee. A peer review committee would consist of representatives from the following constituent groups:

- Higher education
- Local public school district
- Arkansas Department of Education
- Parent representative (not a school employee or employee spouse)
- Two representatives at large with expertise in grants management or administration

Monitoring of implementation may be formal or informal, on-site or through desk audits, focusing on compliance or geared toward technical assistance, and will be conducted using persons with expertise in relevant areas of

teaching, administration, school culture and climate, and finance.

- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;

ADE will evaluate the LEA's commitment to recruit, screen and select external providers by assessing, according to the rubric below, the following information contained in the LEA application.

- Identification (or process to identify) of external providers with a history of success in turning around low performing schools using the interventions selected by the applicant.
- Identification (or process to identify) of external providers that can provide a broad range of services and resources, including but not limited to:
 - Curriculum alignment and calibration
 - Evaluating and developing staff
 - Effectively implementing extended learning time
 - Developing the support of community and faith-based organizations
 - Implementing an effective parent or family involvement plan
 - Creating sustained professional development and technical assistance; and
 - Direct services to administrators, faculty and students, including modeling of pedagogical and administrative techniques proven to be effective in settings similar to that of the applicant.

If the LEA chooses to use multiple external providers (CMO, EMO), the range of services and resources can be spread across the selection of providers. No single provider will be required to provide all services. Services may be provided by one or more of the selected external providers (CMO, EMO).

*The ADE will use the following rubric to determine the extent to which the LEA's commitment to recruit, screen, and select external provider (CMO, EMO). A **rating of Satisfactory is required for all components.***

DETERMINING LEA COMMITMENT TO RECRUIT, SCREEN AND SELECT EXTERNAL PROVIDERS (CMO, EMO)

| <i>Limited</i> | <i>Basic</i> | <i>Satisfactory</i> |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles and responsibilities of the external provider (CMO, EMO), and LEA are unclear, minimally defined or not evident. • There is little or no evidence that a range of providers has been researched. • The external provider (CMO, EMO), has not shown clear success in turning schools around • The LEA has failed to include all the required services and resources in its selection of external providers (CMO, EMO), • The LEA does not have a plan for holding the external provider (CMO, EMO), accountable to specific, high standards of performance • The timeline for services is unclear, minimally detailed, or missing • Roles and responsibilities are unclear, minimally detailed, missing, or place an undue amount of responsibility on the LEA • The cost associated with using this external provider (CMO, EMO), are unreasonable or unnecessary costs are included in the budget • There is little or no evidence of involvement of parents or other stakeholder groups in the selection of the provider | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles and responsibilities of the external provider (CMO, EMO), and LEA are expressed in general terms • There is some, but not compelling, evidence that a range of providers has been researched • The success of the provider is questionable, or is not relevant • Most, but not all of the required services are included in the selection • There is a general plan for holding the provider accountable, but the standards are not sufficiently high • The timeline is not reasonable or exceeds the timeline for the grant • Roles and responsibilities of the LEA are unclear or unreasonable • Costs are generally, but not completely reasonable and/or focused on change • Parents and other stakeholders have had some involvement in choosing the provider, but their input is not clearly identified | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and reasonable • Compelling evidence that a wide range of providers has been researched • There is clear and compelling evidence that the provider has been successful in a relevant context or setting • All required services are included in the selection of provider(s) • There is a specific plan for holding the provider to high standards and consequences for failure to meet those standards are clearly stated • The timeline for services is reasonable, within the time frame of the grant • The roles and responsibilities of the LEA are clear, and reasonable • Costs are reasonable and focused on change • Parents and other stakeholders have had significant input into the selection of the provider |

- Align other resources with the interventions;

The ACSIP serves as the LEA applications for regular federal and state funds. All LEA applications for funds must show how funds will support the overarching plan (i.e. how budgeted activities directly support the LEA's effort to address the needs, goals, objectives, progress targets, and strategies within the overarching plan). Applicants will be required to document how these current-funding streams and resources will be integrated into or aligned with the use of School Improvement Grant funds. Specifically, ACSIP plans will be reflective of the intervention selected by the applicant and the intervention must, reciprocally, be reflective of the priority areas in the LEA's ACSIP plan. Because each LEA has different resources, ADE cannot always specify the other resources and non-federal funds that may be aligned with the interventions.

When the LEA submits the preliminary budget report, (LEA Attachment 5), it will also enter the source of funds and other state and local funds budgeted for each of the intervention models. The three-year budget summary will be reviewed and approved according to the alignment between the interventions outlined and other resources in the school and district.

Assessment of the LEA's commitment to align other resources may include, but will not be limited to:

- Assessing the alignment of other federal, state, and local resources based on evidence-based effectiveness and impact with the design of interventions;
 - Assessing the alignment of other federal, state, and local resources with the goals and timelines of the grant (e.g., fiscal personnel, time allotments and scheduling, curriculum, instruction, technology resources and equipment);
 - Conducting regularly scheduled reviews of the resource alignment to ensure all areas are operating fully and effectively to meet the intended outcomes or making adjustments as necessary; and
 - Redirecting resources that are not being used to support the school improvement process.
- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,

If modification of practices or policies is necessary for the full and effective implementation of the interventions, then such modification will be required of the LEA. Monitoring of the degree to which modifications are necessary and the degree to which necessary modifications have been implemented will be monitored via one or more of the following: on-site monitoring, desk audits, State Specialty Team visits, and ACSIP.

Documentation of such support could include minutes of local board meetings or other stakeholder meetings along with results of on-site monitoring or desk audits, input from State Specialty Team, and inclusion of changes in an LEA's ACSIP plans.

The LEA will identify the process to review current practices and policies, which support or impede the efforts of the intervention models to include the following:

- The district will review annually the current policies and procedures. This will provide opportunities for public input.
- The district will identify practices related to recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers and administrators.
- The district will address and identify practices and policies that include collective bargaining and fair dismissal and re-assignment for priority schools.
- Policies and procedures that provide collaborative and on-going communication between district

office and participating schools.

- Identification of alignment of current programs, practices and strategies, which may support or hinder the interventions for priority schools.
 - Will review the time structure and format of the instructional day of priority schools.
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The ADE recognizes that a plan for sustainability must be embedded in intervention implementation. Sustainability does not happen at the end of the grant period, but is an integral part of the entire process. Successful applicants will include in their application an identified mechanism for measuring and supporting capacity building of the local school board, central administration and building level administration; and a change in school culture to support the intervention implemented in the school or schools. Such mechanisms must include the use of formative evaluations to drive instruction and support the intervention; and may include differential pay for highly effective teachers. Additionally there is a requirement that sustainability must be addressed within the Implementation Plan.

The ADE will assess the LEA's commitment to sustaining reforms after the funding period ends by information:

- Process used by the LEA in selecting an intervention model and partners;
- LEA goals and objectives;
- LEA three-Year Budget;
- Developing Profiles of Available Partners;
- Selection of External Providers Process;
- ACSIP Interventions and Actions; and,
- Implementation of Scholastic Audit Recommendations

In addition to the above information the SEA will also assess the LEA by:

- Sustain the reforms by aligning funds for the continued support of those successful intervention efforts and strategies.
- Monitor targeted changes in practice and student outcomes and make adjustments as needed to meet identified goals.
- Develop a system that will measure short-term and long-term interventions as well as measure the accountability processes that provide the oversight of the interventions, school improvement activities, financial management, and operations of the school
- Develop a plan with a timeline of continued implementation of the intervention strategies that are aligned with the resources, school's mission, goals and needs.
- Identify meaningful professional development for staff and administrators as well as demonstrating a commitment to the continuous development of teacher knowledge and skills.
- Develop a process to assure effective training of school staff to ensure the understanding and analyzing data and determining the appropriate program adjustments to drive instructional changes that will ensure student achievement.

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

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

The Arkansas Department of Education will offer technical assistance in selecting activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period. Current Site Directors will be available to advise schools on what has and has not worked with previous cohort schools. Some of the activities include but are not limited to:

- Family and Community Engagement
- Staffing
- Review of External Providers
- Instructional Programs
- Professional Development and Support
- Data Analysis

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA’s proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable?

The Arkansas Department of Education will use the same criteria that it uses to evaluate all other proposed uses of SIG funds. Including activities that:

- Are directly related to the selected model.
- Are reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model.
- Are designed to address a specific need or needs identified through the LEA’s needs assessment.
- Represent a meaningful change that could help improve student achievement.
- Are research-based.
- Represent a significant reform that goes beyond the basic educational program.

² “Pre-implementation” enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014–2015 school year. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the SIG Guidance.

C. TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

[Insert the SEA’s timeline for the FY 2013 SIG competition here]

The Arkansas Department of Education released (November 5, 2013) the projected list of Priority schools to the LEA’s and posted a list to the SEA’s website (<http://www.arkansased.org/divisions/communications/pressroom>) The Arkansas Department of Education provided a draft LEA electronic application to the eligible districts with an application due date of February 12, 2014. A separate LEA application will be submitted for each eligible school. As soon as the application is approved by USDE, Arkansas will post the final version of the LEA application to its website www.arkansas.gov.

The ADE provided a review of the application process with ADE School Improvement Program Managers and the State System of Support. This review provided an opportunity for the State System of Support team members to field questions or concerns as they prepare to provide LEA technical assistance. The State System of Support will provide technical assistance during the window of

application and submission.

The ADE will pre-screen applications to determine eligibility and compliance with assurances. The SEA will convene and train a panel of grant peer reviewers to review the applications. Each SIG application will be independently reviewed by a minimum of two reviewers that will score the applications utilizing a scoring rubric to establish which LEA applications are complete and provide all of the required information. An overall score of 125 is required for approval. If the application does not reach the minimum number of points required the ADE would consult with the LEA, during the review process to get additional information. Any LEA not approved may resubmit their application during the next application period. The ADE is committed and assures that it will implement the timeline as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

| Task | Date To Be Completed |
|---|--|
| 1. Written and verbal notification to superintendents of LEAs eligible to receive a SIG 1003(g) grant. | Within a week of approval of ADE's SIG 1003(g) grant by USDOE. |
| 2. LEA's letter of intent to apply sent to SEA | December 19, 2013 |
| 3. Release LEA applications and guidelines for eligible applicants and technical assistance for applicants. | January 7, 2014 |
| 4. LEA application due for priority schools. | February 12, 2014 |
| 5. Application Review by ADE | February 17-28, 2014 |
| 6. Award 3-year sub-grant funds to LEAs so that intervention models can be implemented by the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year. | April 1, 2014 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | 7. Provide technical assistance for initial grant implementation. | April 2014 – June 2014 | |
|--|---|------------------------|--|

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth 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, or for its priority schools, as applicable, 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, or one or more priority schools, in at LEA that is not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

The LEA’s annual measurable goals for reading and mathematics on the Arkansas Benchmark Exam must align with the LEA’s ACSIP priorities, including the annual percentage gains expected based on intervention strategies implemented in the schools for which School Improvement Grant funds are being sought. Each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant will be monitored relative to its own application. The ADE recognizes that while priority schools may look very similar on paper, the school culture, resources and imperatives are often very dissimilar. For that reason, monitoring will be based on fidelity to the plan identified and detailed in the successful grant application (after any required amendments are made).

The following leading indicators will be used to hold schools receiving School Improvement Grant funds accountable:

1. Number of minutes within the school year
2. Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup
3. Dropout rate
4. Student attendance rate
5. Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early- college high schools, or dual enrollment classes
6. Discipline incidents
7. Truants
8. Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA’s teacher evaluation system
9. Teacher attendance rate

Any data not collected must be noted. This data is required to be gathered at the LEA level and reported to the Arkansas Department of Education. LEAs receiving SIG funds must comply with all reporting requirements specified in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. Quarterly and annual reports are required. Additional data reporting may be required.

The ADE proposes utilizing the expertise of members of the Title I staff, ACSIP, and/or Statewide Support Teams identified in Arkansas’s Smart Accountability System to conduct quarterly on-site technical visits during the grant-funding period. The on-site technical visits will assess the degree to which LEAs have met their

annual goals for student achievement for its priority schools. Grant recipients will receive a written report identifying areas of strength/success and weakness/concerns and will include recommendations for increasing success.

Each LEA receiving SIG funds for priority schools must annually report on the progress of meeting its goals. ADE will review required reports on an annual basis to determine if the LEAs School Improvement Grant requires revision. The LEA must demonstrate progress with appropriate increases (e.g., increased the percentage of students that are proficient on state reading assessments), or appropriate decreases (e.g., decreased the total number of tardies in grade 6) on each measurable objective described in its application. Progress on locally established goals and objectives will be reported to ADE in June of each year of funding. Student outcomes will be reviewed after state assessments are administered on an annual basis. For LEAs with schools not meeting annual goals as described in the initial application, the LEA must revise the implementation plan outlining specific steps that will be taken to ensure the success of selected interventions. Revisions and budget amendments along with annual progress reports will be reviewed to determine if the LEAs SIG funds will be renewed.

If the LEA fails to meet its goals and make progress on the indicators, the ADE reserves the right to mandate, as a State requirement, that the LEA take specific steps to meet its goals. The LEA must submit a written plan to the ADE with a reasonable, amended timeline and the identification of barriers that led to its not meeting its goal(s) in the time frame set out in the approved application. If an LEA refuses to take the mandated steps in a specific school, the ADE reserves the right to refuse to renew the grant funding for that school. If an LEA refuses to take the steps mandated across all schools receiving funding, the ADE reserves the right to refuse to renew grant funding for the LEA as a whole.

(2) 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. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

Not applicable. The ADE no longer has Tier III schools because of the approval of their priority schools list in their ESEA flexibility request.

(3) 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, or the priority schools, as applicable, the LEA is approved to serve.

The Arkansas Department of Education will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention fully and effectively in the Priority schools by placing a SIG Site Director at each LEA. The primary responsibility of the SIG Site Director will be complete oversight of the grant's implementation. Bi-weekly reports on the school's progress will be made available to the school and to the state SIG office. A monitoring team made up of at least two members from the Federal Programs Unit along with the SIG Site Director will conduct a site visit each quarter to determine progress towards

implementation of the grant.

(4) 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.

The Arkansas Department of Education will hold a competition for grants as outlined in Part C of the application. The scoring rubric will be used to rank order the applicants in determining the successful recipients.

The ADE no longer has Tier III schools because of the approval of their priority schools list in their ESEA flexibility request. Thus, those schools previously identified as Tier III will not be competing for SIG funds.

(5) Describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

Not applicable. The ADE no longer has Tier III schools because of the approval of their priority schools list in their ESEA flexibility request.

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

The Arkansas Department of Education takes over schools under the direction of the State School Chief for repeated problems with academic distress, fiscal distress, or facilities distress. At this time, it is not known if any schools will be put under state control.

(7) 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, or for priority schools, as applicable, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

Not applicable.

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

E. ASSURANCES: The SEA must provide the assurances set forth below.

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 Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, that

the SEA approves the LEA to serve.

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 provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.

If a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, as applicable, implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.

Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school or priority school, as applicable.

Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

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

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

The ADE will use the five percent set aside from the School Improvement Grant to support regular administrative costs including accounting and governance of the grant; to secure an outside evaluator to evaluate the impact of the grant on LEAs and schools and the alignment of this grant with other federal grants currently operating in Arkansas, and to support the technical assistance required to implement, monitor, evaluate, and sustain the activities resulting from the implementation of interventions at the school and LEA level.

The Arkansas Department of Education anticipates using SIG funds to support a position(s) whose function is to oversee the implementation of SIG in LEAs that have successfully applied for the funds. It is anticipated that between 1.0 FTE and 3.0 FTE personnel will be hired to fulfill these functions.

Personnel will conduct activities related to finance, administration, evaluation, and technical assistance. They may also provide guidance in the review of external providers, budget development, carrying out the strategic plan, developing capacity, planning professional development, and recruiting and retaining highly qualified personnel.

Additionally, these personnel will collect data to monitor the intervention implementation; effectiveness of

teaching strategies and the climate and culture of the school; seek feedback from parents, students, and other stakeholder groups; improvement on the leading indicators; the basis for staff decisions (skills, qualifications, and experience as well as placement of teachers); and progress toward increased flexibility of operations.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

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

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

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 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

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 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: 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 that meet the definition of “priority schools” in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility* and that were identified in accordance with its approved request for ESEA flexibility, waive the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.1 of the SIG final requirements.

Assurance

The State assures that its methodology for identifying priority schools, approved through its ESEA flexibility request, 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 persistently lowest-achieving schools in the SIG final requirements.

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2013 funds for the purpose of making three-year awards to eligible LEAs.

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2013 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2017.

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 Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more

effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already received a waiver of the requirement in section 1116(b) of the ESEA to identify schools for improvement through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014 school years cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

Waive section 1116(b) (12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 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 the 2014–2015 school year in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

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

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school wide program waiver for the FY 2012 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2013 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

An SEA that has been approved for ESEA flexibility need not request this waiver as it has already received a waiver of the school wide poverty threshold through its approved ESEA flexibility request.

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

Assurances

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

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

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

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

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the

schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

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

| SCHOOL NAME | NCES ID # | PRIORITY (if applicable) | TIER I | TIER II | TIER III | INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II/PRIORITY ONLY) | | | |
|-------------|-----------|--------------------------|--------|---------|----------|--|---------|---------|----------------|
| | | | | | | turnaround | restart | closure | transformation |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

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

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

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
- (2) The LEA must ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected;
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that receives school improvement funds including by-
 - Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,

- Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
 - (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
 - (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools or in its priority schools, as applicable.

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

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

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

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

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, or the number of priority schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 (not to exceed \$6,000,000 per school over three years).

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority 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;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG 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 SIG funding; and,
- (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.



ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

LEA APPLICATION FOR
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT FUNDS
TITLE I, SECTION 1003(g)

LEA APPLICATION FOR
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT FUNDS
SIG 1003(g)

SECTION A, Part 1: LEA Contact Information and Certification

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| LEA Name: | |
| Mailing Address (Street, P.O. Box, City/Zip) | Starting Date |
| Name, title and phone number of authorized contact person: | Ending Date |
| Amount of funds requested: | Number of schools to be served: |

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is correct. The applicant designated below hereby applies for a subgrant of Federal funds to provide instructional activities and services as set forth in this application. The local board has authorized me to file this application and such action is recorded in the minutes of the agency's meeting held on _____ (Date).

Signature: _____
Superintendent of Schools AND
Signature: _____
School Board President

Date: _____

Date: _____

| ADE USE ONLY | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Date Received: _ _ _ _ _ | Obligation Amount: _ _ _ _ _ |
| Reviewer Signature: _ _ _ _ _ | Approval Date: _ _ _ _ _ |
| Reviewer Signature: _ _ _ _ _ | Approval Date: _ _ _ _ _ |

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of 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 school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's priority schools. Priority schools are the lowest achieving 5 percent of a State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. In the priority schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

Availability of Funds

FY 2014 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through June 30, 2017.

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 2014 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2014 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements. 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 a interest in its application.

FY 2014 SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The ADE will only accept an LEA's 2014 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The LEA should submit its 2014 application to the following address:

rick.green@arkansas.gov

In addition, the LEA must submit a paper copy of page 2 signed by the LEA's superintendent and school board president to: Rick Green
Four Capitol Mall, Box 26
Little Rock, AR 72201

Application Deadline:

Applications are due on or before February 12, 2014

For Further Information:

If you have any questions, please contact Rick Green at (501) 682-4373 or by email at rick.green@arkansas.gov .

SECTION A, Part 2: Schools to be served

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

Using the list of priority schools provided by ADE, complete the information below, for all priority schools the LEA will serve. The Intervention Model must be based on the “School Needs Assessment” data.

Prior to selecting an Intervention Model, the LEA must complete all parts of section B.

| SCHOOL NAME | NCES ID# | Grade Span | Priority School | INTERVENTION Model | | | |
|-------------|----------|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | Turnaround | Restart | Closure | Transformation |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If an LEA is not applying to serve all priority schools it will need to explain why it lacks the capacity to serve these schools.

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

SECTION B, PART 1:

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: Needs Assessment

Prior to selecting an Intervention Model, the LEA must complete all parts of section B.

Complete steps 1 and 2, Develop a Profile of the School's Context and Performance. Please develop a profile for each school to be served. (Items in this section have been adapted from *Selecting the Intervention Model and Partners/Providers for a Low-Achieving School A Decision-Making and Planning Tool for the Local Education Agency*, Center on Innovation & Improvement.)

Step 1 - Develop a Profile of the School's Context

Name of School:

LEA #:

Context

1. Grade levels (e.g., 9-12):

2. Total Enrollment:

3. % Free/Reduced Lunch:

4. % Special Education Students:

5. % English Language Learners:

6. Home Languages of English Language Learners (list up to 3 most frequent:)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

7. Briefly describe the school's catchment or enrollment area (neighborhoods, communities served):

8. List the feeder schools and/or recipient schools that supply or receive most of this school's students:

| School | Grade Span | | School | Grade Span |
|--------|------------|--|--------|------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

9. Briefly describe the background and core competencies of the school's current key administrators and indicate the number of years they have held the position and the number of years they have been employed in the school and LEA.

| Position | Background and Core Competencies | Years in Position | Years in School | Years in LEA |
|----------|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

10. Describe how administrators are evaluated. By whom? How frequently? What is the process?

11. Briefly summarize the process by which teachers are evaluated. By whom? How frequently?

12. Briefly describe previous and current reform and improvement efforts, within the last five years.

Step 2 - Develop a Profile of the School's Performance

1. Enter the percentage of all students who tested as proficient or better on the state Standards assessment test for each subject available.

| Subject | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2010 | 2009 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Reading/Language/English | | | | | |
| Mathematics | | | | | |
| Science | | | | | |
| Social Studies | | | | | |
| Writing | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

2. Student analysis from the past 3 years - enter the percentage of students in each subgroup who tested proficient or better on the state standards assessment test for each subject available.

Test Year:

| Subject | White, non-Hispanic | | | Black, non-Hispanic | | | Hispanic | | | Other Ethnic | | | Special Education | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|------|------|---------------------|------|------|----------|------|------|--------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|
| | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 |
| Reading/ Language/ English | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Science | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Social Studies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

3. Student analysis from the past 3 years - enter the percentage of students at each grade level in this school who tested proficient or better on the state standards assessment test for each subject available.

Test Year:

| Subject | 3rd Gr. | 4th Gr. | 5th Gr, | 6th Gr. | 7th Gr. | 8th Gr. | 9th Gr. | 10th Gr. | 11th Gr. | 12th Gr. |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|
| Reading/Language/English | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | | | | |
| Science | | | | | | | | | | |
| Social Studies | | | | | | | | | | |
| Writing | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | | | | |

Test Year:

| Subject | 3rd Gr. | 4th Gr. | 5th Gr, | 6th Gr. | 7th Gr. | 8th Gr. | 9th Gr. | 10th Gr. | 11th Gr. | 12th Gr. |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|
| Reading/Language/English | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | | | | |
| Science | | | | | | | | | | |
| Social Studies | | | | | | | | | | |
| Writing | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | | | | |

Test Year:

| Subject | 3rd Gr. | 4th Gr. | 5th Gr. | 6th Gr. | 7th Gr. | 8th Gr. | 9th Gr. | 10th Gr. | 11th Gr. | 12th Gr. |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|
| Reading/Language/English | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | | | | |
| Science | | | | | | | | | | |
| Social Studies | | | | | | | | | | |
| Writing | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | | | | |

4. Average daily attendance percentage for the 2013-2014 school year:

5. Mobility rate for the 2013-2014 school year:

6. Graduation rate for all students for the 2012-2013 school year: —

Graduation rate percentage for past 3 years: (high schools only)

| | All Students |
|------|--------------|
| 2013 | |
| 2012 | |
| 2011 | |

Key Questions

1. Which subpopulation of students are experiencing the lowest achievement?

2. Which subpopulation of students are experiencing the lowest graduation rates?

3. In which subjects are students experiencing the lowest achievement?

4. What characteristics of the student demographics should be taken into account in selecting a model and external partners and/or providers?

5. What, if any, characteristics of the enrollment areas of the school should be taken into account in selecting a model and external partners and/or providers?

Step 3 Reviews of ADE Scholastic Audit and other School Data

1 A. Provide a detailed summary of the schools progress relative to the Arkansas Standards and Indicators for School Improvement, (ADE Scholastic Audit):

- Discuss the specific findings that led to the “Recommendations”;
- LEA (Leadership) and/or school “Recommendations” identified for implementation;
- Implementation progress;
- Timeline of prioritized “Recommendations” and the
- Evaluation process.

1B. The LEA level must address how the LEA will support the building in providing continuous school improvement at the building level. Additionally, the LEA will specifically address those items unique to the role of the LEA (i.e., board policy, supervising and guiding building level leadership).

1C. The school must address those items unique to the roles and responsibilities of the school for providing continuous school improvement.

2. Provide a summary of other data sources used to supplement the needs assessment and the selection of an appropriate intervention model for each priority school. (i.e. perceptual data from students, staff and parents, process data, improvement plan outcomes or results, professional development program outcomes or results, other).

SECTION B, PART 2:

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: LEA Capacity

The Arkansas Department of Education will use the following to evaluate LEA's capacity or lack of capacity to serve all schools. Please answer each question.

1. Is there evidence of past school improvement initiatives? If the answer is yes, what were the LEA's prior improvement, corrective action and restructuring plans? What was the success/failure rate of those initiatives?
2. Assess the commitment of the LEA, school board, school staff, and stakeholders to support the selected intervention model.
3. Does the LEA currently have a school improvement specialist? If the answer is yes, has the LEA supported the school improvement specialist efforts?
4. Is there evidence that the LEA has required specific school improvement initiatives of all schools?
5. Examine the LEA's staff organizational model to include the experience and expertise of the staff.
6. Examine the LEA's plan and ability to recruit qualified new staff and provide training to support the selected intervention model at each priority school.
7. Review the history of the LEA's use of state and federal funds.
8. Review the LEA plans to allocate necessary resources and funds to effectively implement the selected intervention model.
9. Review the narrative description of current conditions (including barriers) related to the LEA's lack of capacity to serve all schools.

If the ADE determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates using the above criteria, the ADE will contact the LEA for a consultation to identify ways in which the LEA can manage the intervention and sustainability.

The consultation will include but will not be limited to the following:

1. ADE will review the findings and collaborate with the LEA to determine what support it needs from the ADE.
2. The ADE will offer technical assistance where needed and request written clarification of application and an opportunity for the LEA to amend the application to support the claim.
3. If the LEA chooses not to submit requested clarification or an amended application then the LEA may re-apply for the SIG grant in the next funding cycle.

Closure

The LEA closes the school and enrolls the students in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.

1. State statutes and policies that address school closures, limit them, create barriers to them, or provide support for them and how:
2. District policies that address school closures, limit them, create barriers to them, or provide support for them and how:
3. District contractual agreements, including collective bargaining, that affect school closures, limit them, create barriers to them, or provide support for them and how:
4. Higher achieving schools available to receive students and number of students that could be accepted at each school:

Step 2: Develop Profiles of Available Partners

Prior to selecting an Intervention Model, the LEA must complete all parts of section B.

Transformation

The LEA replaces the principal with a highly capable principal with either a track record of transformation or clear potential to successfully lead a transformation (although the LEA may retain a recently hired principal where a turnaround, restart, or transformation was instituted in past two years and there is tangible evidence that the principal has the skills necessary to initiate dramatic change); implements a rigorous staff evaluation and development system; rewards staff who increase student achievement and/or graduation rates and removes staff who have not improved after ample opportunity; institutes comprehensive instructional reform; increases learning time and applies community-oriented school strategies; and provides greater operational flexibility and support for the school.

| External partners available to assist with transformation and brief description of services they provide and their track record of success. | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------|----------------------|---|
| Partner Organization | Lead Y/N | Support Y/N | Services Provided | Experience (Types of Schools and Results) |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Turnaround

The LEA replaces the principal with a highly capable principal with either a track record of transformation or clear potential to successfully lead a transformation (although the LEA may retain a recently hired principal where a turnaround, restart, or transformation was instituted in the past two years and there is tangible evidence that the principal has the skills necessary to initiate dramatic change) and rehiring no more than 50% of the staff; gives greater principal autonomy; implements other prescribed and recommended strategies.

| External partners available to assist with turnaround and brief description of services they provide and their track record of success. | | | | |
|---|----------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Partner Organization | Lead Y/N | Support Y/N | Services Provided | Experience (Types of Schools and Results) |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Restart

The LEA converts or closes and reopens a school under a charter/performance contract with a charter school governing board, charter management organization, or education management organization.

| Charter governing boards, charter management organizations, and potential charter school operating organizations available to start a charter school and brief description of services they provide and their track record of success. | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Charter Organization | Lead Y/N | Support Y/N | Services Provided | Experience (Types of Schools and Results) |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| EMOs available to contract with district to operate school and brief description of services they provide and their track record of success. | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| Education Management Organization | Lead Y/N | Support Y/N | Services Provided | Experience (Types of Schools and Results) |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Step 3: Determine Best-Fit Model and Partners

The chief question to answer in determining the most appropriate intervention model is: What improvement strategy will result in the most immediate and substantial improvement in learning and school success for the students now attending this school given the existing capacity in the school and the district? There is no “correct” or “formulaic” answer to this question. Rather, relative degrees of performance and capacity should guide decision-making. The following table outlines key areas and characteristics of performance and school, district, and community capacity that should be considered as part of your decision making. The checks indicate that if this characteristic is present, the respective intervention model could be an option.

| Characteristics of Performance and capacity | | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------|---------|---------|
| Characteristic | Intervention Model | | | |
| | Turnaround | Transformational | Restart | Closure |
| School Performance | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> All students experience low achievement/graduation rates. | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Select sub-groups of students experiencing low-performance | | ✓ | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Students experiencing low-achievement in all core subject areas | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Students experience low-achievement in only select subject areas | | ✓ | | |
| School Capacity | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strong existing (2 yrs or less) or readily available turnaround leader | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of pockets of strong instructional staff capacity | | ✓ | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of limited staff capacity | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of negative school culture | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> History of chronic-low-achievement | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Physical plant deficiencies | | | | ✓ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of response to prior reform efforts | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| District Capacity | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Willingness to negotiate for waiver of collective bargaining agreements related to staff transfers and removals | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to negotiate with external partners/provides | | | ✓ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ability to extend operational autonomy to school | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strong charter school law | | | ✓ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Experience authorizing charter schools | | | ✓ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to conduct rigorous charter/EMO selection process | | | ✓ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Capacity to exercise strong accountability for performance | | | ✓ | |
| Community Capacity | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strong community commitments to school | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Supply of external partners/providers | | | ✓ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other higher performing schools in district | | | | ✓ |

1. Based on a the Characteristics of Performance and Capacity table above, rank order the intervention models that seem the best fit for this school.

Best Fit Ranking of Intervention Models

A. Best Fit: _____

B. Second Best Fit: _____

C. Third Best Fit: _____

D. Fourth Best Fit: _____

2. Now answer the questions below only for the model you consider the best fit and the model you consider the second best fit. Review the questions for the other two models. Change the rankings if answering and reviewing the questions raises doubts about the original ranking.

The Transformation Model

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and competencies will the new leader be expected to possess?

2. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?

3. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?

4. What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?

5. How will the district support the new leader in determining the changes in operational practice (including classroom instruction) that must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

The Turnaround Model

1. How will the LEA begin to develop a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders to work in turnaround schools?
2. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and competencies will the new leader be expected to possess?
3. How will the LEA support the school leader in recruiting highly effective teachers to the lowest achieving schools?
4. How will staff replacement be conducted—what is the process for determining which staff remains in the school?
5. How will the language in collective bargaining agreements be negotiated to ensure the most talented teachers and leaders remain in the school?

The Restart Model

1. Are there qualified (track record of success with similar schools) charter management organizations (CMOs) or education management organizations (EMOs) interested in a performance contract with the LEA to start a new school (or convert an existing school) in this location?
2. Are there strong, established community groups interested in initiating a homegrown charter school? The LEA is best served by cultivating relationships with community groups to prepare them for operating charter schools.
3. Based on supply and capacity, which option is most likely to result in dramatic student growth for the student population to be served—homegrown charter school, CMO, or EMO?
4. How can statutory, policy, and collective bargaining language relevant to the school be negotiated to allow for closure of the school and restart?
5. How will support be provided to staff that are selected for re-assignment to other schools as a result of the restart?

School Closure Model

1. What are the metrics to identify schools to be closed?
2. What steps are in place to make certain closure decisions are based on tangible data and readily transparent to the local community?
3. How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?
4. Which higher-achieving schools have the capacity to receive students from the schools being considered for closure?
5. How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?
6. How will current staff be reassigned—what is the process for determining which staff members are dismissed and which staff members are reassigned?

7. Does the statutory, policy, and collective bargaining context relevant to the school allow for removal of current staff?

8. What supports will be provided to recipient schools if current staff members are reassigned?

9. What safety and security considerations might be anticipated for students of the school to be closed and the receiving school(s)?

10. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?

11. How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?

12. What is the impact of school closure to the school's neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?

13. How does school closure fit within the LEA's overall reform efforts?

Step 4: Define Roles and Develop Contracts

1. Briefly describe the role of each of the following groups or partners relative to the implementation of the intervention model.

| GROUP/PARTNER | ROLE WITH THIS SCHOOL IN IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERVENTION MODEL |
|------------------------------|---|
| State Education Agency | |
| Local Education Agency | |
| Internal Partner (LEA staff) | |
| Lead Partner | |
| Support Partner | |
| Support Partner | |
| Principal | |
| School Staff | |
| Parents and Community | |

2. Determine the performance expectations for the lead partner and supporting partners, with quarterly benchmarks.

Note: Developing performance expectations and benchmarks to include in the contract with each partner is one of the LEA's most important responsibilities. Please see the links to web resources at the back of the application to assist in making these decisions and in developing the appropriate contracts. Also engage LEA legal counsel in this process.

3. Describe how the LEA's will monitor implementation of the intervention model. Who will do what and when?

Step 5: Forge Working Relationships

Describe how the LEA will promote the working relationships among the groups and partners committed to this intervention—the state, the LEA, the lead partner, the support partners, the internal partner, the principal, school teams, and the parents and community.

Step 6: Intervention Models Needs Assessment Review Committee

Committee Members

| Name | Role | | Name | Role |
|------|------|--|------|------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Meetings

| Location | Date | | Location | Date |
|----------|------|--|----------|------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Step 7: Sustainability

Please tell how the LEA will continue the commitment to sustain reforms after the funding period ends.

The LEA plan for sustainability must be embedded in intervention implementation. Sustainability does not happen at the end of the grant period, but is an integral part of the entire process. The application should include an identified mechanism for measuring and supporting capacity building of the local school board, central administration and building level administration; and a change in school culture to support the intervention implemented in the school or schools. Such mechanisms must include the use of formative evaluations to drive instruction and support the intervention; and may include differential pay for highly effective teachers. Sustainability must be addressed within the Implementation Plan.

The ADE will assess the LEA's commitment to sustaining reforms after the funding period ends by:

- Review LEA goals and objectives;
- Review LEA three-year budget;
- Review ACSIP interventions and actions
- Review implementation of Scholastic Audit Recommendations
- Review alignment of funds for the continued support of those successful intervention efforts and strategies.
- Monitor targeted changes in practice and student outcomes and make adjustments as needed to meet identified goals.
- Review short-term and long-term interventions as well as review the accountability processes that provide the oversight of the interventions, school improvement activities, financial management, and operations of the school.
- Review a timeline of continued implementation of the intervention strategies that are aligned with the resources, school's mission, goals, and needs.
- Review professional development plans for staff and administrators to ensure data analysis is ongoing and will result in appropriate program adjustments to instruction.
- Monitor the staff and administrators commitment to continuous process by providing professional development to increase the capacity of the staff to deliver quality, targeted instruction for all students.

SECTION B, PART 3:

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: Annual Goals

Please complete the following goal and objective pages for each priority school being served.

School Improvement Grant - Section 1003(g)
LEA Goals and Objectives

Directions: The LEA must provide the annual goals for improving student achievement on state assessments in both reading/language arts and math. Goals must be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely (S.M.A.R.T.). Supporting objectives must be provided with measurable outcomes, evidence being used to document progress, and a target date for completion. Identify the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the goal is addressed, and the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the objective is completed.

Goal

| Objective | Measurable Outcome(s) | List Evidence to Document Improvement or Progress Toward Goal | Implementation Date | Target Completion Date | Person Responsible |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | |

School Improvement Grant - Section 1003(g)
LEA Goals and Objectives

Directions: The LEA must provide the annual goals for improving student achievement on state assessments in both reading/language arts and math. Goals must be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely (S.M.A.R.T.). Supporting objectives must be provided with measurable outcomes, evidence being used to document progress, and a target date for completion. Identify the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the goal is addressed, and the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the objective is completed.

Goal

| Objective | Measureable Outcome(s) | List Evidence to Document Improvement or Progress Toward Goal | Implementation Date | Target Completion Date | Person Responsible |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | |

School Improvement Grant - Section 1003(g)
LEA Goals and Objectives

Directions: The LEA must provide the annual goals for improving student achievement on state assessments in both reading/language arts and math. Goals must be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely (S.M.A.R.T.). Supporting objectives must be provided with measurable outcomes, evidence being used to document progress, and a target date for completion. Identify the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the goal is addressed, and the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the objective is completed.

Goal

| Objective | Measureable Outcome(s) | List Evidence to Document Improvement or Progress Toward Goal | Implementation Date | Target Completion Date | Person Responsible |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | |

School Improvement Grant - Section 1003(g)
LEA Goals and Objectives

Directions: The LEA must provide the annual goals for improving student achievement on state assessments in both reading/language arts and math. Goals must be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely (S.M.A.R.T.). Supporting objectives must be provided with measurable outcomes, evidence being used to document progress, and a target date for completion. Identify the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the goal is addressed, and the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the objective is completed.

Goal

| Objective | Measureable Outcome(s) | List Evidence to Document Improvement or Progress Toward Goal | Implementation Date | Target Completion Date | Person Responsible |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | |

School Improvement Grant - Section 1003(g)
LEA Goals and Objectives

Directions: The LEA must provide the annual goals for improving student achievement on state assessments in both reading/language arts and math. Goals must be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely (S.M.A.R.T.). Supporting objectives must be provided with measurable outcomes, evidence being used to document progress, and a target date for completion. Identify the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the goal is addressed, and the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the objective is completed.

Goal

| Objective | Measureable Outcome(s) | List Evidence to Document Improvement or Progress Toward Goal | Implementation Date | Target Completion Date | Person Responsible |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | |

School Improvement Grant - Section 1003(g)
LEA Goals and Objectives

Directions: The LEA must provide the annual goals for improving student achievement on state assessments in both reading/language arts and math. Goals must be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely (S.M.A.R.T.). Supporting objectives must be provided with measurable outcomes, evidence being used to document progress, and a target date for completion. Identify the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the goal is addressed, and the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the objective is completed.

Goal

| Objective | Measureable Outcome(s) | List Evidence to Document Improvement or Progress Toward Goal | Implementation Date | Target Completion Date | Person Responsible |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | |

School Improvement Grant - Section 1003(g)
LEA Goals and Objectives

Directions: The LEA must provide the annual goals for improving student achievement on state assessments in both reading/language arts and math. Goals must be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely (S.M.A.R.T.). Supporting objectives must be provided with measurable outcomes, evidence being used to document progress, and a target date for completion. Identify the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the goal is addressed, and the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that the objective is completed.

Goal

| Objective | Measureable Outcome(s) | List Evidence to Document Improvement or Progress Toward Goal | Implementation Date | Target Completion Date | Person Responsible |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | |

SECTION B, PART 4:

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: Proposed Activities for Priority Schools

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

- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of selected model;
- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their their quality (briefly describe their role relative to the implementation and the performance expectations with quarterly benchmarks);
- Align other resources with the interventions;
- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively (language in collective bargaining agreements and changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms); and
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

SECTION B, PART 4:

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: Proposed Activities for Priority Schools

SECTION B, PART 5:

ADE Timeline

| Task | Date To Be Completed |
|--|--|
| 1. Written and verbal notification to superintendents of LEAs eligible to receive a SIG 1003(g) grant. | Within a week of approval of ADE's SIG 1003(g) grant by USDOE. |
| 2. LEA's letter of intent to apply sent to SEA | December 19, 2013 |
| 3. Release LEA applications and guidelines for eligible applicants and technical assistance for applicants. | January 7, 2014 |
| 4. LEA application due for priority schools. | February 12, 2014 |
| 5. Application Review by ADE * Review process is on the following page. | February 17-28, 2014 |
| 6. Award funds to LEAs so that intervention models can be implemented by the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year. | April 1, 2014 |
| 7. Provide technical assistance for initial grant implementation. | April 2014 – June 2014 |

ADE REVIEW PROCESS:

A comprehensive rubric addressing each area of the school application and intervention models will be utilized to score the application and ensure that the LEA and school have the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related supports. The application is divided into six sections. Two sections require general information. The remaining four sections have a maximum point value of 150 points. If an LEA receives a score of 0 on any section funding will not be granted. LEA applications will not be revised after the final due date. In order to be considered for funding an LEA application must receive at least 100 of the 150 points available. The LEA must submit a separate application for each school. A team of ADE staff members will review all LEA applications and assess the adequacy and appropriateness of each component. Team members will include Title I, school improvement, accountability, curriculum and assessment, and federal finance. Each member will have the opportunity to comment and provide feedback on each section of the application. The number of grants awarded will be based upon funding and application reviews. Grants will be prioritized based on the final scores of the comprehensive rubric review by the ADE team

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: Timeline

YEAR ONE TIMELINE

The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each priority school identified in Part A of the application.

May 2014– June 2014 Pre-implementation

Please describe the monthly action steps the LEA will take to plan and prepare for the implementation of an intervention model.

| May | |
|------|--|
| June | |

2014-2015 School Year

Please describe the monthly action steps the LEA will take to plan and ensure full and effective implementation of the selected model.

| July | |
|-----------|--|
| August | |
| September | |
| October | |
| November | |
| December | |
| January | |
| February | |
| March | |
| April | |
| May | |
| June | |
| July | |

2015-2016 School Year

Please describe the monthly action steps the LEA will take to plan and ensure full and effective implementation of the selected model.

| July | |
|-----------|--|
| August | |
| September | |
| October | |
| November | |
| December | |
| January | |
| February | |
| March | |
| April | |
| May | |
| June | |
| July | |

2016-2017 School Year

Please describe the monthly action steps the LEA will take to plan and ensure full and effective implementation of the selected model.

| 2016-2017 School Year | |
|-----------------------|--|
| July | |
| August | |
| September | |
| October | |
| November | |
| December | |
| January | |
| February | |
| March | |
| April | |
| May | |
| June | |
| July | |

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each priority school it commits to serve.

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

- Implement the selected model in each priority school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's priority schools: and
- Implement intervention activities for each priority school it commits to serve.
- Extends the school year or day.
- Reflects a 15% limit of the grant monies awarded for the purchase and professional development concerning technology expenditures.
- Reflects a 10% limit of the grant monies awarded for the purchase of external provider supplemental services. (Arkansas Flexibility request requires all Priority Schools to have an onsite provider weekly. These funds could be used in addition to services already provided).

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

An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of priority schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000. Each school can receive no more than \$6,000,000 over three years. \$100,000 of the \$2,000,000 awarded each year will be held for a state site director.

Please note that for a given required criteria, the estimated budget amounts may differ each year depending on your needs and progress in the implementation process. These amounts may be amended in subsequent years based on your actual needs.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT 3-YEAR BUDGET REQUEST

District/School: Priority School

Total 3-Year Budget \$

Pre-Implementation:

SIG funds used for pre-implementation must be tied to the model being selected. These are some examples of potential activities.

- Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans.
- Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity; or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model
- Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.
- Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model during the 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 developing student assessments.
- Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model.
- 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.

COMPLETE THREE YEAR BUDGET FOR THE MODEL CHOSEN

All of the SIG funds an LEA uses in a priority school must be used to support the LEA’s implementation of one of the four school intervention models, each of which represents a comprehensive approach to addressing the particular needs of the students in a school as identified through the LEA’s needs assessment. Accordingly, in determining whether a particular proposed use of SIG funds is allowable, an LEA should consider whether the proposed use is directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, whether it will address the needs identified by the LEA, and whether it will advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools. In addition, in accordance with general cost principles governing the SIG program, an SEA must ensure that a proposed use of funds is reasonable and necessary. Further, an LEA must consider whether the proposed use of SIG funds would run afoul of the —supplement not supplant requirement— i.e., for a school operating a schoolwide program, the school must receive all of the non-Federal funds it would have received if it were not operating a schoolwide program, including all non-Federal funds necessary for the operation of the school’s basic educational program.

Please check any budget activity that is part of your pre-implementation and use the first column under year 1 for the budgeted amount.

| TURNAROUND MODEL | YEAR 1 | | YEAR 2 | YEAR 3 |
|---|---------|--|--------|--------|
| | Pre-Imp | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Developing teacher and school leader effectiveness | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Select a new principal | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Make staff replacements | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Support required, recommended and diagnostic strategies | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Change and sustain decision making policies and mechanisms | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Change and sustain operational practices | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Implement local evaluations of teachers and principal | | | | |
| Additional options (specify) Any of the required and permissible activities | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Subtotal | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Reforming instructional programs | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Develop data collection and analysis processes | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Use data to drive decision making | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Align curriculum vertically and horizontally | | | | |
| Additional options (specify) Any of the required and permissible activities | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increase learning time (extended day, week, or year) | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Develop community partnerships that support the model | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Implement parent and community involvement strategies for ongoing engagement and support | | | | |
| Additional options (specify) Any of the required and permissible activities | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Flexibility and Sustain Support | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Implement a comprehensive approach to school transformation | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing, intensive professional development and technical assistance from the LEA and the SEA | | | | |
| Additional options (specify) Any of the required and permissible activities | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| | Subtotal | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. LEA-activities designed to support implementation of the turnaround model | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| | Subtotal | | | |
| | Total for Transformation Model | | | |

| CLOSURE MODEL | YEAR 1 | | YEAR 2 | YEAR 3 |
|--------------------------|---|--|--------|--------|
| | Pre-imp | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Costs associated with parent and community outreach | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Costs for student attending new school | | | |
| | Subtotal | | | |

| Restart Model | YEAR 1 | | YEAR 2 | YEAR 3 |
|--|---------|--|--------|--------|
| | Pre-Imp | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Convert or close school and reopen under a charter school operator or education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous selection process | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school. | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> LEA-activities designed to support implementation of the restart model | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| Total | | | | |

| TRANSFORMATION MODEL | YEAR 1 | | YEAR 2 | YEAR 3 |
|--|-----------|--|--------|--------|
| | Pre - Imp | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Select a new principal | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assign effective teachers and leaders to lowest achieving schools | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recruit, place and retain staff | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Select new staff | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Replace staff deemed ineffective | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Negotiate collective bargaining agreements | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Support for staff being reassigned | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Retaining surplus staff | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Create partnerships to support transformation model | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Change decision-making policies and mechanisms around infusion of human capital | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adopt a new governance structure | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> High-quality, job-embedded professional development | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Implementing data collection and analysis structures | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increase learning team (extended day, week, and/or year) | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Student supports (emotional, social, and community-based) | | | | |
| Additional options (specify) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformational of new school model | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | |
| LEA-activities designed to support implementation of the transformation model | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Total | | | | |

Budget Narrative:

Requirements

- Must include justification of cost estimates
- Must include description of large budget items
- Must be aligned with the budget table
- Must describe how funds from different sources will be utilized
- Must address an extended school day or year
- Must limit external provider support at 10% of the amount of grant monies awarded
- Must limit technology and technology professional development at 15% of the grant monies awarded

D. ASSURANCES

STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES

By the signature of the Superintendent of the LEA assures that it will –

1. Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each priority school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
2. Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each priority school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its priority schools that receive school improvement funds;
3. If it implements a restart model in a priority school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
4. Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements. Applicants receiving funding under the School Improvement Grant program must report to the ADE the following school-level data:
 1. Number of minutes within the school year;
 2. Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
 3. Dropout rate;
 4. Student attendance rate;
 5. Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
 6. Discipline incidents,
 7. Truants,
 8. Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA’s teacher evaluation system; and
 9. Teacher attendance rate.

This data must be collected and reported at least annually. Data in items 2 through 7 must be disaggregated to the student subgroup level for each school within an LEA, with results for schools receiving School Improvement Funds reported in contrast to results for each other school within the LEA. Data for item 1 must be disaggregated to the grade level for each school within the LEA and reported in contrast to results for each other school within the LEA. Data for items 8 and 9 must be disaggregated to the individual teacher level for all teachers in schools receiving School Improvement Grant funding, and reported in contrast to results for each other school within the LEA.

Superintendent’s Signature

Date

Superintendent’s Printed Name

SECTION E:

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

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

Applicants must indicate which, if any, of the waivers below it intends to implement

Note: If an SEA has not requested and received a waiver of any of these requirements, an LEA may submit a request to the Secretary.

LEA Application Checklist
(Copy and complete a separate checklist for each school applying.)

School Name:

LEA #:

SECTION A, Part 1 General Information
 LEA Contact Information and Certification

SECTION A, Part 2 Schools to be Served
 Selection of Identified Schools

 Identification of Intervention Models

SECTION B, PART 1 Needs Assessment
 Develop a Profile of the School's Context

_____ Develop a Profile of the School's Performance

SECTION B, PART 2 LEA Capacities
 Selecting the Intervention Model and Partners for a Low-Achieving School

 Develop Profiles of Available Partners

 Determine Best-Fit Model and Partners

 Define Roles and Develop Contracts

 Forge Working Relationships

 Intervention Model Needs Assessment Review Committee

SECTION B, PART 3

Annual Goals

SECTION B, PART 4

Proposed Activities

SECTION B, PART 5

Timeline

SECTION B, PART 6

LEA Consultation

SECTION C

Budget

SECTION D

Assurances

SECTION E

Waivers

ATTACHMENTS (scanned or mailed):

Signature Page (page 2 in the application is to be mailed)

School Board Minutes Showing Approval of SIG 1003(g) Application

Principal's Professional Growth Plan

Additional Resources

The following is a series of resources, which might be accessed to support writing for ARRA SIG funds.

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/faq.html>

<<http://www.centerii.org>>.

<http://www.centeroninstruction.org>

http://www.cep-dc.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=document_ext.showDocumentByID <http://www.cep-dc.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=document_ext.showDocumentByID&nodeID=1&DocumentID=300>

http://www.cep-dc.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=document_ext.showDocumentByID&nodeID=1&DocumentID=300>

Reading Research Links

National Reading Panel

Publications

<http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org/Publications/publications.htm>

Center on Instruction

http://www.centeroninstruction.org/resources.cfm?category=reading&subcategory=&grade_start=&grade_end

Learning Point Associates

Focus on Adolescent Literacy instruction

<http://www.learningpt.org/literacy/adolescent/instruction.php>

International Reading Association

Adolescent Literacy focus

http://www.reading.org/resources/issues/focus_adolescent.html

The National Council of Teachers of English

A Research Brief on Adolescent Literacy available at

<http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/PolicyResearch/AdoLitResearchBrief.pdf>

The Leader in Me by Stephen R. Covey

How Schools and Parents Around the World Are Inspiring Greatness, One Child at a Time

www.TheLeaderinMeBook.com

Council of Chief State School Officers

Adolescent Literacy toolkit available at

http://www.ccsso.org/projects/secondary_school_redesign/Adolescent_Literacy_Toolkit/

Content Area Literacy Guide available at

http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/FINAL%20CCSSO%20CONTENT%20AREA%20LITERACY%20GUIDE_FINAL.pdf

Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center (ARCC)

Adolescent Literacy toolkit available at

<http://www.arcc.edvantia.org/resources.php?toolkit=63>

The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance

Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classrooms and Intervention Practices available at

http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/adlit_pg_082608.pdf

Literacy Issues in Secondary Education: An Annotated Bibliography compiled by Donna Alvermann, University of Georgia, available at

<http://www.tcdsb.org/library/Professional%20Library/AnBiblioProf.html>