

APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Arizona department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 1535 W. Jefferson St. Phoenix, AZ 85007
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant  Name: Robert Gray  Position and Office: Director of Operations for School Improvement and Intervention, School Effectiveness Division  Contact's Mailing Address:  1535 W. Jefferson St., Bin #10 Phoenix, AZ 85007   Telephone: 602-364-2202  Fax: 602-364-2334  Email address: robert.gray@azed.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): John Huppenthal	Telephone: 602-542-5460
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:   X	Date: 1/27/14
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

School Improvement Grants

# Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

---

### Arizona



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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Arizona department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 1535 W. Jefferson St. Phoenix, AZ 85007
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant  Name: Robert Gray  Position and Office: Director of Operations for School Improvement and Intervention, School Effectiveness Division  Contact's Mailing Address:  1535 W. Jefferson St., Bin #10 Phoenix, AZ 85007   Telephone: 602-364-2202  Fax: 602-364-2334  Email address: robert.gray@azed.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): John Huppenthal	Telephone: 602-542-5460
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

## 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.

We are using our approved Priority list.

**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 <sup>1</sup>

**EXAMPLE:**

<sup>1</sup> “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.

**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
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:</b>			

**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.

All LEA’s in Arizona that receive Title I funds are required to submit an annual comprehensive needs assessment along with their LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans. Priority schools must submit an annual Self-Readiness Assessment (SRA) as a mandatory component of Arizona’s Flexibility Request and the school improvement process for LEA’s and schools in Priority status. The SRA is based on the 7 Turnaround Interventions, which serve as the foundation of Arizona’s school improvement process and must be completed by a team of stakeholders. The Self Readiness Assessment is designed to engage the school community in an in-depth evaluation of these 7 Turnaround Interventions. For each intervention, there is a narrative section that allows the district and/or school to identify the most critical elements identified for each of the 7 Turnaround Interventions. In this section, primary concerns and/or successes will be identified along with statements determining the root causes of each area of concern and/or success. Action steps necessary to either maintain successes or address concerns will be recorded. The SRA’s findings are intended to direct the school’s improvement plan (SCIP) development and the LEA’s (LCIP) actions to support the implementation of the school improvement plan. Additionally, the SRA serves to guide ADE’s feedback and recommendations to LEAs and schools in Priority status. Priority schools may use the SRA as their comprehensive needs assessment or in addition to an LEA identified needs assessment. As part of the SIG application process, LEAs use data from the SRA, prior Solutions Team

Reports, Progress Monitoring Reports, Data Summary Reports and any comprehensive needs assessment the LEA has conducted to provide a summary of their findings. LEAs will describe their current conditions in regards to the following: Effective Leadership, Effective Teachers, Instructional Time, Instructional Programs, Data-Informed Instruction, Environmental/Non-Academic Factors and Stakeholder Engagement.

The external reviewers will determine if the LEA demonstrated that they conducted a thorough needs assessment with a team of stakeholders. If the LEA did not conduct a needs assessment or complete the SRA, the LEA will be deemed ineligible for funding. If the LEA demonstrates that they have conducted the SRA and/or the needs assessment, the external reviewers will evaluate the needs assessment criteria in the scoring section of the LEA application to determine if the LEA exceeds, meets, partially meets or does not meet the criteria. The needs assessment section of the application is worth 80 points of the overall application and an LEA must score a minimum of 64 points to be eligible for funding.

LEA's will use the findings from the needs assessment to inform the intervention model selected, the program plan, the program budget, and monitoring for each eligible school the LEA intends to serve. For each eligible school the LEA will describe why the selected model was chosen.

Using the Grant Scoring Ratings (exceeds, meets, partially meets, does not meet), the external reviewers will evaluate whether or not the selected intervention model(s) best meets the needs for each school and that there is a direct alignment between the needs assessment findings and the selected model.

(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.

In Section B: LEA Commitment and Capacity of the LEA application, the LEA describes the commitment and capacity the LEA (School Board and LEA leadership) will take to support and ensure full and effective implementation of the selected model.

Using the Grant Scoring Ratings (exceeds, meets, partially meets, does not meet), the external reviewers will evaluate the following criteria to determine if the LEA has demonstrated commitment and capacity to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model:

**1. Stakeholder Buy-In:**

- The LEA provides strong evidence through agendas, meeting notes, letters of support and feedback that the relevant stakeholders are committed to the implementation of the required model components.
- The LEA describes an effective system or processes for ongoing collaboration and communication with staff, community, and the school board regarding implementation of selected model and progress towards performance targets.

**2. Operational Flexibility:**

- The LEA provides compelling evidence that they are committed to creating, modifying or eliminating processes and procedures as necessary to fully and effectively implement the selected model.
- The LEA describes a detailed description of the specific changes in practice and

procedures that will allow operational flexibility at the school level to take place.

### **3. Competency-Based Selection:**

- The LEA provides compelling evidence that it has the capacity and commitment to remove principals who have a history of low achievement (i.e., students have not on the whole, experienced growth in test scores during the administrator's tenure at the school).
- The LEA describes actions to be taken by the school board and LEA to ensure the effectiveness of the school site principal in overseeing turnaround efforts.
- The LEA provides clear and specific information regarding the process for recruitment and selection of a new principal for the school or evidence that the current principal was hired within the last two years as part of school turnaround efforts and will not be replaced.
- The LEA clearly describes how the recruitment and selection process will be based the School Turnaround Leaders: Competencies for Success from Public Impact.
- The LEA provides strong evidence that it is implementing a performance based principal evaluation system.

### **4. Teacher Effectiveness:**

- The LEA has established a clear, executable plan to recruit, prioritize hiring, evaluate and support new highly qualified staff in the school.
- The LEA provides compelling evidence that it is committed to reviewing and if necessary revising recruitment, hiring, placement and retaining practices designed to identify staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the targeted school.
- The LEA provides strong evidence that it is implementing a performance based teacher evaluation system.
- The LEA provides compelling evidence that it is committed to supporting teachers based on teacher evaluation data through staff training and/or coaching in order to meet performance targets.
- The LEA has well-established policies and procedures in place to evaluate the degree to which skills taught through staff training and/or coaching lead to improved student performance.
- The LEA describes the system of support for teachers when data reveal they have demonstrated insufficient mastery of content (i.e., low student performance as assessed through multiple measures).
- The LEA describes effective strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the necessary skills and/or rewards for staff that have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates.

### **5. Instructional Infrastructure:**

- The LEA clearly describes the actions to be taken to ensure the school is using a comprehensive data system that allows for the collection of student data down to the individual student level and timely meaningful feedback for decision-making at all levels of the system throughout the school year.
- The LEA provides evidence that a formal system is in place or will be in place to train and support teachers in using data (from balanced assessment system) to drive instruction which includes formal and informal professional development and is differentiated for new to district teachers.
- The LEA provides evidence that an effective system is in place or will be in place that is part of a formal policy providing for weekly teacher collaboration time during the work day in order for teachers to work in vertical and horizontal teams for the purpose of improving instruction, including a structure for data discussions.

- The LEA clearly describes the actions to be taken by the School Board and the LEA to ensure the school is implementing a guaranteed and viable curriculum aligned with the Arizona College and Career Readiness Standards.
- The LEA provides evidence of an intervention plan for struggling students to meet the standards.
- The LEA provides compelling evidence that it is committed to establishing bold year end performance targets that are likely to substantially raise student achievement each year and will lead to attainment of the exit criteria.

#### **6. Model Implementation:**

- The LEA provides compelling evidence that it is committed to reviewing and if necessary revising its practices or policies to enable its schools to fully and effectively implement all the required model components.
- The LEA clearly describes the actions to be taken by the school board and the LEA to provide support to each school based on the specific needs of the school to be able to fully and effectively implement all the required model components.

#### **7. Evaluation:**

- The LEA effectively demonstrates that it has a comprehensive evaluation system in place to assess and monitor the overall performance of the organization over time in implementing the selected model.
- The LEA describes the evaluation system in sufficient detail, including the multiple evaluation measures to be used, instruments and method(s) for assessing each of the outcomes, the timeline for their administration, the person(s) responsible and the specific uses of the data to be gathered.
- The LEA has described the process to ensure fidelity to the evaluation timeline and the review of data to monitor progress.
- The LEA describes the plan to make mid-course corrections to modify strategies and/or action steps if data does not indicate targets have been met.

#### **8. External Providers:**

- If the LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its selected model, the LEA presents strong evidence as to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality.
- Even if the provider has not yet been identified, a proposed scope of work aligned to the school needs is provided which includes a description of what specific services the external provider will be expected to offer, deliverables and timeline for deliverables.
- The LEA clearly describes the process for monitoring and evaluating the work of the external providers as well as the process for terminating services mid-course.

#### **9. Alignment of Resources:**

- The LEA provides compelling evidence that it has prioritized resources to provide extensive supports for each targeted school by identifying the process for aligning resources necessary to fully and effectively implement all required model components.
- All funding sources that the school is eligible for are considered when developing the LEA plan (Title I, IDEA, etc.).
- The LEA has clearly considered resources other than fiscal to support implementation of selected model.

## **10. Fiscal Capacity:**

- The LEA has clearly described the expertise of the staff that will have oversight managing the funds in accordance with applicable Federal and State statutes, regulations, program plans, and General Statement of Assurance in order ensure compliance.
- The LEA has a well-documented process for wise and informed use of funds that focuses on student achievement, demonstrates expenditure of sufficient resources, including time, personnel, funding, and technology using many funding sources.
- The LEA has procedures for clearly communicating the budget to all appropriate stakeholders.

## **11. Sustainability:**

- The LEA describes the sustainability plan that clearly details the LEA's commitment and capacity to continue school improvement efforts once the grant funding is no longer available.
- The LEA clearly delineates what specific capacity is being built through this grant; outlining what this capacity looks like; and summarizing how it will sustain continuous improvement.
- The LEA provides a strong rationale to support the reduction or elimination of personnel, programs, and/or professional development and still sustain improvement efforts.

The commitment and capacity section of the application is worth 110 points of the overall application and an LEA must score a minimum of 88 points to be eligible for funding. ADE strongly believes that the commitment and capacity of an LEA to implement the selected model is critical to successful implementation resulting in the LEA meeting performance targets, and therefore has weighted this section as one of the higher sections.

In addition to the written application, LEA's that meet the minimum scores in each section of the application will receive an on-site visit to verify School Board, LEA and school readiness, commitment and capacity for implementation of the selected model.

If the LEA is not able to verify information provided in the application or fails to demonstrate readiness, or commitment and capacity to implement the selected model, the recommendation to fund will be withdrawn.

- (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).

The LEA will provide a narrative of the fiscal plan for implementing the selected model in Section D: Program Plan, Program Budget and Monitoring of the application. LEA's will use the LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plan Addendum for the selected model to describe how they will use the funds to support implementation of the strategies and action steps for selected model in the participating school as well as how the school will use the funds for implementation of the model. The LEA must demonstrate the alignment between the model implementation plan and the budget

requests.

The external reviewers will evaluate the budget alignment plan to ensure the plan for each school addresses the identified needs and will lead to progress towards the performance targets and fully addresses the allocation of resources and consists only of reasonable, necessary and allowable expenses directly related to full and effective implementation of **all** of the required model components. In addition, the LEA must demonstrate that the plan for each school consists of requested funds and/or resources that support evidence-based practices, materials and programs, improvement of instructional opportunities, increased learning time, interventions for low performing students and administrative, support and instructional staff expenses. The narrative budget alignment is part of the larger Program Section which is worth 100 points of the overall application and an LEA must score a minimum of 80 points in this section to be considered for funding.

The LEA will also provide a 3-year projected budget amount in Section E: Three-Year Preliminary Budget of the application. The LEA's three-year preliminary budget for each school must align to the budget/resource plan for the selected model and must fully address the allocation of funds needed to completely implement all of the required model components. In addition, the three-year preliminary budget requests must be within the limits of no less than \$50,000 or no more than \$2 million per year over the three year grant period for each participating school and include sufficient funds to fully and effectively implement the selected model.

The Three-Year Preliminary Budget Section of the application is worth 30 points of the overall application and the LEA must score a minimum of 24 points to be considered for funding.

**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;
- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
- Align other resources with the interventions;
- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and,
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The entire LEA application process will be used to assess the LEA's commitment to meet the above requirements. An LEA must meet the minimum scores in each section of the written application to be considered for funding. In addition to the written application, LEA's that meet the minimum scores in each section of the application will receive an on-site visit to:

- confirm information provided in the application;
- verify School Board, LEA and school readiness, commitment and capacity for implementation of the selected model;
- determine any technical assistance needs for LEA and school; and
- Make final funding determinations.

Following is the criteria that will be used to assess the LEA's commitment to meet the requirements:

**Requirement 1: Design and implement interventions consistent with final requirements**

Based on the selected model, the model implementation plan for each school must address the following:

- Restart Model: Describes in detail the proposed strategies and action steps to reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO) or charter management organization (CMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. The details of the review process are clearly delineated in the model implementation plan.
- School Closure: Describes in detail the proposed strategies and action steps of how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.
- Transformation Model: Describes in detail the evidence-based and proven effective strategies and action steps for all of the required transformation model components to be used to progress towards the performance targets.
- Turnaround Model: Describes in detail the evidence-based and proven effective strategies and action steps for all of the required turnaround model components to be used to progress towards the performance targets.
- The model implementation plan for each school is clearly aligned to the needs assessment findings, addresses the top primary concerns and root causes and will lead to attainment of exit criteria.
- The model implementation plan for each school includes a tentative timeline for implementation of the action steps during the grant period for each of the required model components. The timeline is realistic and is likely to result in full and effective implementation of the required model components.
- The monitoring/evaluation plan for each school consists of multiple evaluation measures to determine effectiveness throughout implementation of the selected model for each of the required model components.
- The monitoring/evaluation plan includes benchmarks for evaluation measures at specific times throughout implementation of the selected model.
- The monitoring/evaluation plan includes a process for progress monitoring to ensure timely review of data and mid-course corrections as necessary.

**Requirement 2: Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable to ensure their**

## quality

LEA's are responsible for managing the entire process of recruiting, screening, evaluating, and selecting School Turnaround/ Transformation External Providers. ADE will provide External Provider selection resources for the LEA's as part of the application guidance. In the readiness section of the application the LEA is required to identify any current external providers for critical purposes and if the LEA is not currently utilizing external providers the LEA must describe why they believe there is no need for an external provider and how is the LEA capable of providing the critical service internally. If the LEA has identified that they are currently utilizing the services of an external provider the LEA must provide evidence of how the services of the current provider will align to the proposed implementation plan. The LEA response must demonstrate a thorough understanding of the services being provided and how they can be used to support effective implementation of the selected model.

If the LEA intends to include additional external providers in implementing its selected model, the LEA must present strong evidence:

- As to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality.
- Of a proposed scope of work aligned to the school needs is provided which includes a description of what specific services the external provider will be expected to offer, deliverables and timeline for deliverables.
- The LEA's process for monitoring and evaluating the work of the external providers as well as the process for terminating services mid-course.

In addition, LEA's will have the option of choosing an ADE approved LEA and School Implementation Specialist who will be contracted through the ADE to provide on-site support for LEA's and schools in developing, implementing and monitoring continuous improvement plans aligned to the selected intervention models and in deepening capacity to implement processes that are systematic, systemic and sustainable and will lead to increases in student achievement. If the LEA is requesting a LEA and School Improvement Implementation Specialists (IS), the LEA will need to sign a letter authorizing ADE to utilize a portion of the LEA's school improvement grant assistance funds to assign an LEA and School Improvement Implementation Specialist.

***\*\*\*An ADE approved Implementation Specialist is an OPTIONAL resource and will not affect a LEA's ability to receive or be awarded funds.***

### **Requirement 3: Align other resources with interventions**

LEA's must demonstrate the commitment and capacity to align and provide the necessary resources to effectively and fully implement the selected intervention model. In the commitment and capacity section of the application the LEA must provide compelling evidence that it has prioritized resources to provide extensive supports for each targeted school by identifying the process for aligning resources necessary to fully and effectively implement all required model components. In addition, the LEA must provide evidence that all funding sources that the school is eligible for are considered when developing the LEA plan (Title I, IDEA, etc.) and that the LEA has clearly considered resources other than fiscal to support implementation of selected model. Finally, the LEA must provide evidence that the LEA has a well-documented process for wise and informed use of funds that focuses on student achievement, demonstrates expenditure of sufficient resources, including time, personnel, funding, and technology using many funding sources.

**Requirement 4: Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable full and effective implementation of interventions**

LEA's must demonstrate the commitment and capacity to modify practices and policies, if necessary, to effectively and fully implement the selected intervention model. The external reviewers will evaluate the criteria to determine the LEA has demonstrated following:

- Compelling evidence that they are committed to creating, modifying or eliminating processes and procedures as necessary to fully and effectively implement the selected model.
- A detailed description of the specific changes in practice and procedures that will allow operational flexibility at the school level to take place.
- Compelling evidence that the LEA is committed to reviewing and if necessary revising its practices or policies to enable its schools to fully and effectively implement all the required model components.
- Clear description of the actions to be taken by the school board and the LEA to provide support to each school based on the specific needs of the school to be able to fully and effectively implement all the required model components.

**Requirement 5: Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends**

LEA's will be required to demonstrate the commitment and capacity to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends by describing the specific actions the LEA has taken or will take as well as how the LEA will align current and future funding in support of performance targets and sustainability. External reviewers will evaluate the LEA's description to sustain the reform efforts once the funding period ends using the following criteria:

- The LEA describes the sustainability plan that clearly details the LEA's commitment and capacity to continue school improvement efforts once the grant funding is no longer available.
- The LEA clearly delineates what specific capacity is being built through this grant; outlining what this capacity looks like; and summarizing how it will sustain continuous improvement.
- The LEA provides a strong rationale to support the reduction or elimination of personnel, programs, and/or professional development and still sustain improvement efforts.

**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 period<sup>2</sup> to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

In the Program Plan, Program Budget and Monitoring section LEA's requesting to use Pre-Implementation funds in their year 1 budget will be required to provide a pre-implementation plan (Addendums) which includes the budget and/or resources needed to fully implement the pre-implementation strategies and action steps of the selected intervention model. The pre-implementation expenditures must align with Section J of the U.S. Department of Education's School Improvement Grant Guidance. External reviewers will evaluate the LEA's pre-implementation plan budget to determine if the plan clearly identifies allowable and reasonable funds and/or resources needed for pre-implementation activities. External reviewers will evaluate the program budget for pre-implementation as part of the entire pre-implementation plan. An applicant MUST Meet or

Exceed in order to be awarded pre-implementation funds. In addition, an applicant **MUST** meet the minimum points required for all sections of the application in order to receive pre-implementation funds in year 1.

(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?

In the Program Plan, Program Budget and Monitoring section LEA's requesting to use Pre-Implementation funds in their year 1 budget they will be required to provide a pre-implementation plan in addition to the selected model implementation plan, the pre-implementation plan must describe the strategies and action steps to be implemented that align to the selected intervention model requirements, the timeline for implementation of these strategies and action steps, and the plan to monitor the effectiveness of the strategies and action steps.

External reviewers will evaluate the LEA's pre-implementation plan to determine if the plan includes evidence-based strategies and action steps that directly relate to effective and full implementation of the selected intervention model in order to meet performance targets, are aligned to the needs assessment findings, a timeline for pre-implementation, a monitoring plan and clearly identifies the funds and/or resources are reasonable and needed for pre-implementation activities. An applicant **MUST** Meet or Exceed in order to be awarded pre-implementation funds. In addition, an applicant **MUST** meet the minimum points required for all sections of the application in order to receive pre-implementation funds in year 1.

<sup>2</sup> "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.**

The process for evaluating LEA applications:

- ADE will release the final LEA application upon approval of the application by the U.S. Department of Education.
- ADE will send an invitation letter to eligible schools and host a webinar to provide technical assistance and training with the grant application requirements.
- LEA's will be required to submit a letter of intent to apply for SIG funds.
- ADE will recruit qualified external reviewers to evaluate applications based on ADE-created rubrics. These reviewers will determine which school proposals qualify for an on-site readiness visit.
- A team from ADE will conduct an on-site readiness visit of recommended LEA's to:
  - ✓ *confirm information provided in the application;*
  - ✓ *verify School Board, LEA and school readiness, commitment and capacity for implementation of the selected model;*
  - ✓ *determine any technical assistance needs for LEA and school; and*
  - ✓ *make final funding determinations.*
- Based on the results of the on-site readiness visit, ADE will determine which school proposals should be recommended for funding. Scores in the application may be adjusted based on the results from the on-site readiness assessment. Recommended school proposals will then be prioritized and ranked based on the overall application score.
- Using the prioritized list grant award letters will be sent out to LEA's who have been recommended for funding.

The following timeline is tentative as it may need to be adjusted based on ADE's approval date of this application.

Month	Activities
April 11, 2014	Invitation Letter/Email to Eligible Schools to attend Arizona SIG Application Technical Assistance Webinar
April 16, 2014	Arizona SIG Application Technical Assistance Webinar
April 18, 2014	Letter of Intent to Apply Due
April 16, 2014-May 19, 2014	LEA and Schools Complete SIG Application
May 19, 2014	LEA SIG Application Due
May 19, 2014-May 26, 2014	ADE Review of Applications; Recommendations for On-site Readiness Visits
May 26, 2014-May 30, 2014	ADE On-Site Readiness Visits for Recommended LEAs/Schools
June 1, 2014	Award Notification; Pre-Implementation Budgets on Grants Management <i>*FY 2013 SIG awards are three-year awards</i>
June 2014-August 2014	Pre-Implementation Activities
August 1, 2014	Year 1 Budgets Approved by ADE in Grants Management
August 2014	Year 1 Implementation of Selected Model
August 2015	Year 2 Implementation of Selected Model
August 2016	Year 3 Implementation of Selected Model

**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.

**Annual goals:** In the LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plan Addendum, LEA's will be required to identify annual performance targets in math, reading/language arts and/or high school graduation rates for each participating school that will need to be met in order to meet the exit criteria established by ADE. External reviewers will evaluate if the annual performance targets for each school are identified for math, reading and/or graduation rate for each of the three years and are aligned to the exit criteria and needs assessment findings and are likely to substantially raise student achievement each year.

In addition, in the School Continuous Improvement Plan (SCIP) on ALEAT the LEA/school will be required to set annual performance targets for achievement and leading indicators. Following are the required indicators that must be included in the SCIP:

**Achievement Indicators**

- Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by grade and by bottom 25% subgroup

- High school graduation rate
- College enrollment
- School improvement status and AMO targets met and missed
- Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency

### **Leading Indicators**

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

### **Process for review:**

Prior to final approval of a grant award, ADE will review the LEA's proposed targets to ensure that they are ambitious yet attainable and that they will help each school meet applicable Federal and State expectations. Once both parties agree to the performance targets, they will become part of the School Improvement Grant Assurances the ADE and the LEA must sign before funds are disbursed. ADE will continuously monitor the LEA's progress on meeting these performance targets through on-site and/or desktop progress monitoring of implementation of selected intervention model on a 90 day cycle.

In addition, the ADE will monitor goals, timelines and implementation of activities and strategies reported by the LEA on its implementation plan for the selected intervention model using ALEAT. The plan includes descriptions of the goals and strategies, detailed action steps (start and end dates, person(s) responsible, specified budget allocations and expenditures), and related tasks with due dates and assignments. The ADE will review, provide feedback as necessary and approve these plans in the ALEAT system. ADE will provide templates and guidance documents for the LEA to complete their plan in the ALEAT system. As the LEA implements their plan, they record their progress in ALEAT by providing status updates of tasks and action steps, recording actual expenditures in their budgets, and uploading documentation related to activities and events to the file cabinet. The plan overview page shows the status of each goal, strategy, and action step, including when it was last updated and by whom. Action steps may be "tagged" with one or more designation set by ADE (e.g. SIG, PD, ELL, Parent) and the plan view may be filtered by a Tag, and/or by a Funding Source, and/or by the Status of Action Steps (Not Begun, In Progress, Completed). The filters provide a view of just those selected features in the Plan, so Reviewer(s) may quickly assess all of the SIG-related action steps and see the progress that has been made on each one. An

implementation report is also available, which presents a chart view of each action step, its current status, and the history of progress updates with related comments.

**Evaluating progress for renewal:** ADE will work collaboratively with LEAs and school(s) to develop meaningful detailed performance targets and timelines in order to meet school improvement exit criteria. The LEA and School(s) Continuous Improvement Plans (LCIP/SCIP) will be monitored during LEA and school on-site progress monitoring reviews and updated as necessary, with final revisions annually. Established targets and timelines will be used when making Year 2 and 3 funding determinations. School Improvement Grants are intended to yield rapid increases in student achievement.

For continuation of funding for Year 2 and 3, ADE will consider the following eligibility criteria:

**Improved Student Achievement \***

- Increasing the percent of proficient students in reading and/or math from baseline year
- Increasing the percent of bottom quartile students proficient in reading and math from baseline year
- Increasing the graduation rate from baseline year

*\*Adjustments for performance targets may occur based on newly implemented state assessment in 2014-2015 school years.*

**Progress Implementing Selected Intervention Model**

- Evidence of effective implementation of selected intervention model from Continuous Improvement Plan Monitoring Report's
- Met SCIP annual achievement goals/performance targets

**Programmatic and Fiscal Compliance**

- Accurate and timely submission of all required programmatic and fiscal reports
- Compliant with all state and federal funding requirements/programs

**Capacity to Continue the Implementation of the Selected Intervention Model**

- Renewal Application along with all evidence listed above

(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 because of approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver. Arizona is using its Priority schools list.

(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.

ADE will utilize a variety of methods to monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in its Priority schools. ADE may request certain documentation from the LEA or employ more intensive support or monitoring (e.g. more frequent on-site monitoring, fiscal monitoring, etc.) as deemed necessary by the School Improvement Section staff.

#### **Method 1: Reporting**

ADE will monitor LEA and school progress in meeting performance targets for leading and achievement indicators through ALEAT (LEA Tracker) online system. ALEAT is the web-based system that all Title I schools use to submit their Title I LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans. ADE will monitor the LEA's implementation plan using ALEAT, providing "real-time" information on implementation (status updates, comments, documentation provided) as well as review the SIG schools' plans and the LEA's interactions within the school plans (e.g. comments, LEA-provided documents, monitoring reports in the LEA plans.) The implementation of the school intervention model will be evident in both the LEA plan implementation and in their interaction with the progress of the school plans. ADE will provide feedback to the LEA and schools on the development of their plans as well as the implementation of their plans.

In addition to the LEA plans, ALEAT provides individual school Continuous Improvement Plans, accessible from the LEA Overview page. The school plans are structured like the LEA plans, and schools may "pull in" specific goals from the LEA plan, then edit them to reflect school-level implementation. The User Permission structure of ALEAT permits School users to view their LEA's Plan and other school plans within their LEA. They may only edit their own school plan. The LEA users may view and add comments to their schools' plans, and edit their LEA plan. State Administrators may view, edit, and add comments to all plans in ALEAT. The LEA and the ADE will monitor the school's progress in implementing their plan just as the ADE monitors the LEA's plan. The LEA may request specific documentation or evidence be attached to the school plan elements, such as formative assessment data, or evaluations of professional development. The school may upload the documents one time, yet provide them to anyone at the LEA who needs to see them, and attach them to multiple points within the plan, as appropriate. The LEA will report on implementation according to approved timelines, strategies and activities included in the plan and documentation of progress made or outcomes. The LEA will update status reports quarterly.

ADE will continuously monitor the LEA's progress on meeting these performance targets through on-site and/or desktop progress monitoring of implementation of selected intervention model on a 90 day cycle. If an LEA/school is not demonstrating sufficient progress of performance targets or implementation of the selected model, a mid-course adjustment to the plan or a corrective action plan may result. ADE will verify values reported for leading and achievement indicators through reports provided by ADE's Research and Evaluation department.

## **Method 2: On-Site Visits**

ADE will conduct annual on-site visits to each LEA and school that receives a School Improvement Grant to evaluate and verify the progress on meeting performance targets and full and effective implementation of the selected intervention model as well as checking for programmatic and fiscal compliance. The site visit protocol will align to the on-site readiness visit protocol and will include the following activities: stakeholder (leadership, teachers, support staff, students, parents and/or community members) focus group interviews at the school and LEA level, classroom observations, data presentations from the LEA focused on student and teacher performance and verification of fiscal compliance. In addition to the annual evaluation visit, technical assistance on-site visits will be provided based on the LEA and school need. LEA's who have requested an Implementation Specialists will have a minimum of 10 on-site technical assistance visits. The implementation specialist is optional for LEA's.

In addition, ADE as part of its accountability and technical assistance responsibilities will schedule and implement targeted compliance monitoring reviews at any time during the year that potential programmatic or fiscal concerns have become apparent.

## **Method 3: Technical Assistance**

ADE will provide on-going technical assistance for LEA's and schools receiving a School Improvement Grant. Technical assistance will be provided through on-site visits, timely phone calls and/or emails, webinars and go-to meetings, and face to face workshops throughout the year. Within the ADE School Improvement Section there will be assigned staff (turnaround specialists) to specifically support Priority schools implementing one of the 4 SIG intervention models. Technical assistance for Priority schools implementing the turnaround or transformation model will be differentiated and focus on the following:

- Identifying dramatic achievement and leading indicator performance targets that will ultimately lead to meeting the ADE established exit criteria
- Continuous Improvement Plan development, implementation and monitoring of proven effective strategies and action steps that align with the chosen model required interventions (these strategies and action steps are above and beyond the typical Title I plan) and are likely to lead to dramatic gains in improvement
- Effective system-wide infrastructure for quick, dramatic and sustainable improvement
- Developing, implementing and monitoring continuous improvement processes that are systematic, systemic and sustainable and will lead to increases in student achievement
- Resource alignment-(fiscal, human, programs) to assist LEA and school leadership in strategic decision making to support development and implementation of LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans
- Principal Turnaround Competencies
- Teacher Turnaround Competencies
- Data-driven instruction-improving a school's instructional capacity

(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.

First, applications received from LEAs with Priority schools will be reviewed using the evaluation criteria established by ADE. Applications that meet the minimum required points in all sections will be recommended for an on-site readiness visit. Based on the results of the on-site readiness visit, ADE will determine which school proposals should be recommended for funding. Scores in the application may be adjusted based on the results from the on-site readiness assessment. Recommended school proposals will then be ranked based on the overall application score.

If ADE does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies, ADE will prioritize School Improvement Grants to the LEAs that pass the application review process and on-site readiness visit based on the following criteria:

- **Priority 1:** Schools designated as “F” under the state accountability system
- **Priority 2:** Schools designated as “D” in the past two consecutive years (most at risk of an “F” designation)
- **Priority 3:** Highest score in the commitment and capacity to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model section of the application

(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 because of approved ESEA Flexibility Waiver. Since Arizona is using its Priority schools list, it will not identify Tier III schools.

(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.

ADE currently has no intention to take over any Priority schools and has not done so in the past.

(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.

ADE does not intend to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

ADE will reserve 5% of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses. Administration expenses will include positions to administer the grant, monitor the compliance with grant requirements, approve budget revisions and fund office overhead. Evaluation expenses will include ADE collaboration with external and internal staff to evaluate the ADE system of support and ensure interventions are being fully implemented with fidelity, as well as costs associated with the grant application and review process. Technical assistance expenses will include positions to provide LEA's support in fully and effectively implementing the selected intervention model, on-site and desktop monitoring of progress towards meeting performance targets

as well as travel and supplies associated with providing technical assistance.

## **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.**

Arizona Department of Education 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 schoolwide 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 schoolwide 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 schoolwide 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 subgrants 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:**

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

**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.

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

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

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

# Continuation Awards Only Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program

In the table below, list the schools that will receive continuation awards using FY 2013 SIG funds:

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	COHORT #	PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 13 ALLOCATION
	N/A		
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 13:</b>			N/A

In the table below, list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds as well as noting the explicit reason and process for reallocating those funds (e.g., reallocate to rural schools with SIG grants in cohort 2 who demonstrate a need for technology aimed at increasing student literacy interaction).

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

### **School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2013 Assurances**

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

- Use FY 2013 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards<sup>2</sup> to its LEAs.
- Use the renewal process identified in [State]'s most recently approved SIG application to determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant.
- 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 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.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

**By submitting the assurances and information above, [State] agrees to carry out its most recently approved SIG application and does not need to submit a new FY 2013 SIG application; however, the State must submit the signature page included in the full application package (page 3).**

---

<sup>2</sup> A "new award" is defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any remaining SIG funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.



# Arizona School Improvement Grant (SIG) Application

Pursuant to: Title I, Section 1003 (g) of the Elementary and  
Secondary Education Act of 1965

Application due: May 19, 2014  
Application training/webinar: April 16, 2014 from 9-11 a.m.  
Required Intent to Apply due: April 18, 2014

**For program questions contact:**

Robert Gray ([robert.gray@azed.gov](mailto:robert.gray@azed.gov)) or 602-364-2202

Laura Toenjes ([laura.toenjes@azed.gov](mailto:laura.toenjes@azed.gov)) or 602-542-5448



# Arizona School Improvement Grant 1003 (g) Application-Overview

<b>Purpose</b>	The purpose of the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant is to support LEAs and Title I schools, identified as Priority schools, with the greatest need for the funds and strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools. The 1003(g) grant money must be used in Title I identified schools to support improving the academic achievement of all students in those schools.
<b>Intent</b>	<p>The intent of this grant is to provide funding for LEAs (on behalf of eligible schools) to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partner with the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) in the implementation of one of the following school intervention models provided in the guidance for use of Federal Title I 1003(g) funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restart Model</li> <li>School Closure</li> <li>Transformation Model</li> <li>Turnaround Model</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>To view the final program guidance, please visit:  <a href="http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/legislation.html#guidance">http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/legislation.html#guidance</a></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the academic achievement of all students attending chronically low performing schools as measured by the state’s assessment system; and</li> <li>Utilize the support and services of an external provider in efforts to accomplish the above.</li> </ol>
<b>Available Funds</b>	Approximately \$10 million is available for distribution to LEAs. An LEA may request no less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year over the three year grant period for each participating school. Actual allocations will be based on the intervention model chosen, ADE guidelines and upon LEA and school needs. Grant awards will not be made to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that are out of compliance with state or federal requirements. ADE expects to fund approximately 7-10 schools.
<b>Eligible Applicants</b>	<p>Eligible schools (<i>See Attachment A for list of Eligible Applicants</i>) were identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Title I eligible school</li> <li>Schools assigned with a Priority label in FY 2013</li> <li>Any previously funded SIG school that is currently on the Priority list that is no longer receiving 1003(g) funds</li> </ul>
<b>Allowable Use of Funds</b>	<p>Awarded funds <b>must</b> be used for the following purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fully implement the selected model in each eligible school.</li> <li>Conduct LEA level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention model for each eligible school.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Allowable Use of Funds Cont.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each eligible school.</li> </ul> <p><b>See Attachment B for Allowable Use of Funds for each school Intervention Model</b></p> <p>Awarded funds <b>may</b> be used for Pre-Implementation Costs that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are directly related to the selected model;</li> <li>• Are reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model;</li> <li>• Are designed to address a specific need or needs identified through the LEA's needs assessment;</li> <li>• Represent a meaningful change that could help improve student achievement from prior years;</li> <li>• Are research-based; and</li> <li>• Represent a significant reform that goes beyond the basic educational program.</li> </ul> <p><b>See Attachment C for Allowable Use of Pre-Implementation Funds</b></p>
<p><b>Duration of Grant</b></p>	<p>Grants are funded for a 3-year grant award period. Year 2 &amp; 3 funds are contingent upon ADE approval of renewal application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Pre-Implementation:</b> Funds available no later than June 1, 2014 - August 1, 2014 (<i>Pre-Implementation Funds are a portion of the Year 1 budget</i>)</li> <li>• <b>Year 1:</b> August 1, 2014 - September 30, 2015</li> <li>• <b>Year 2:</b> August 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016</li> <li>• <b>Year 3:</b> August 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017</li> </ul>
<p><b>Commitments</b></p>	<p>For information regarding commitments required by LEAs and by ADE, see Arizona School Improvement Grant 1003(g) Assurances Section of the application. All assurances must be agreed to, signed and submitted with the grant application in order for the application to be considered for review.</p>
<p><b>Evaluation</b></p>	<p>ADE will work collaboratively with LEAs and school(s) to develop meaningful detailed performance targets and timelines in order to meet school improvement exit criteria. The LEA and School(s) Continuous Improvement Plans (LCIP/SCIP) will be monitored during LEA and school on-site progress monitoring reviews and updated as necessary, with final revisions annually. The grant budget expenditures must be aligned with the LCIP/SCIP as well as the selected intervention model.</p> <p>Established targets and timelines will be used when making Year 2 and 3 funding determinations. School Improvement Grants are intended to yield rapid increases in student achievement.</p> <p>For continuation of funding for Year 2 and 3, ADE will consider the following eligibility criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Improved Student Achievement *</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increasing the percent of proficient students in reading and/or math from baseline year</li> <li>○ Increasing the percent of bottom quartile students proficient in reading and math from baseline year</li> <li>○ Increasing the graduation rate from baseline year</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p><b>Evaluation (continued)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Progress Implementing Selected Intervention Model</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of effective implementation of selected intervention model from Continuous Improvement Plan Monitoring Report's</li> <li>○ Met SCIP annual achievement goals/performance targets</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Programmatic and Fiscal Compliance</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Accurate and timely submission of all required programmatic and fiscal reports</li> <li>○ Compliant with all state and federal funding requirements/programs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Capacity to Continue the Implementation of the Selected Intervention Model</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Renewal Application along with all evidence listed above</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>*Adjustments for performance targets may occur based on newly implemented state assessment in 2014-2015 school year.</p>
<p><b>Technical Assistance</b></p>	<p>An application training webinar will be held on <b>April 16, 2014 from 9-11 a.m.</b> To register for this technical assistance opportunity, please email Laura Toenjes (laura.toenjes@azed.gov)</p> <p>Note: If interested in applying for this grant opportunity, please complete the <b>Letter of Intent</b> (Attachment D) and submit by <b>April 18, 2014</b>.</p>
<p><b>Application Review</b></p>	<p>Applications will be reviewed pending successful completion of ALL required sections and components as specified in the grant application. LEAs will not be funded unless they meet the minimum score in each section of the application. The review process will ensure that funded Arizona School Improvement Grants address all the critical components necessary for a comprehensive plan. LEAs may be asked to submit revisions in any section to more fully meet the standards.</p> <p>Each LEA/school recommended for possible funding based on the review of the application (meeting minimum cutoff scores) will receive an <b>on-site visit during May 26, 2014 - May 30, 2014</b>. The purpose of the visit will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• confirm information provided in the application;</li> <li>• verify School Board, LEA and school readiness, commitment and capacity for implementation of the selected model;</li> <li>• determine any technical assistance needs for LEA and school; and</li> <li>• make final funding determinations.</li> </ul> <p>If LEA and school staff is not able to verify the information provided or fail to demonstrate readiness, or commitment and capacity to implement the selected model, the recommendation to fund will be withdrawn.</p> <p><b>Applicants will receive final notification of application status (award letter) by June 1, 2014.</b></p>

<p><b>Submission Process</b></p>	<p>The application for this grant is part of a rapid school improvement planning process that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assessment of LEA readiness;</li> <li>• evidence of LEA commitment and capacity;</li> <li>• assessment of LEA and school needs;</li> <li>• comprehensive implementation plan and monitoring plan; and</li> <li>• a budget rationale.</li> </ul> <p>This application is expected to be completed at the LEA level with active participation from the school leadership team.</p> <p><b>Submit hard copies of each of the forms in Part I: Application Information (Sections A-E) with ALL original signatures by <u>mail or hand deliver</u> to ADE, School Improvement and Intervention.</b></p> <p><b>Submit electronic copies of Part I: Application Information (Sections A-E) (copies with signatures) and Part II: Narrative of the application (including all attachments) by <u>email</u> to:</b>  <b>Robert Gray, Director of Operations, School Improvement and Intervention</b>  <a href="mailto:robert.gray@azed.gov">robert.gray@azed.gov</a></p> <p>The total narrative of the application cannot exceed 15 pages (not including attachments).</p> <p><b>Application Deadline:</b>  <i><b>The hard copies with all original signatures and electronic copies of entire application must be received by <u>May 19, 2014 by 4:00 pm.</u></b></i></p>	
<p><b>Timeline</b></p>	<p>April 11, 2014</p> <p>April 16, 2014</p> <p>April 18, 2014</p> <p>April 16, 2014-May 19, 2014</p> <p>May 19, 2014</p> <p>May 19, 2014-May 26, 2014</p> <p>May 26, 2014-May 30, 2014</p> <p>June 1, 2014</p> <p>June 2014-August 2014</p> <p>August 1, 2014</p> <p>August 2014</p> <p>August 2015</p> <p>August 2016</p>	<p>Invitation Letter/Email to Eligible Schools to attend Arizona SIG Application Technical Assistance Webinar</p> <p>Arizona SIG Application Technical Assistance Webinar</p> <p>Letter of Intent to Apply Due</p> <p>LEA and Schools Complete SIG Application</p> <p>LEA SIG Application Due</p> <p>ADE Review of Applications; Recommendations for On-site Readiness Visits</p> <p>ADE On-Site Readiness Visits for Recommended LEAs/Schools</p> <p>Award Notification; Pre-Implementation Budgets on Grants Management  <i>*FY 2013 SIG awards are three-year awards</i></p> <p>Pre-Implementation Activities</p> <p>Year 1 Budgets Approved by ADE in Grants Management</p> <p>Year 1 Implementation of Selected Model</p> <p>Year 2 Implementation of Selected Model</p> <p>Year 3 Implementation of Selected Model</p>

# Grant Application

## Required Elements

Each section in Part I and Part II of the application must be fully completed in order for the application to be reviewed:

**Part I: Application Information (not scored)**

Section A:	Cover Page
Section B:	LEA Level Participants/ Schools to Be Served
Section C:	LEA and School Information and Signatures
Section D:	LEA Assurance Form

**Part II: Narrative (See Evaluation Criteria for specific details)**

Section A:	LEA Readiness
Section B:	LEA Commitment and Capacity
Section C:	Needs Assessment
Section D:	Program Plan, Monitoring Plan, and Budget Alignment
Section E:	Three-Year Preliminary Budget

## Application Format

Applications must adhere to the following format:

- Applications should only include the required elements.

**Part I: Application Information**

- Fully complete all forms in Section A- D.
- Submit each of the forms in Section A-D with ALL signatures as the first 5 pages of the application.

**Part II: Narrative**

- The total narrative of the application cannot exceed 15 pages (not including attachments).
- All pages must be standard letter size, 8-1/2" x 11", using no smaller than 12 point type.
- Use document footer with the name of the applying LEA and page numbers.
- Use 1-inch margins.
- Fully complete and submit all required attachments in Section D and E of the narrative.

# Part I: Application Information

Complete the Cover Page, LEA Level Participants/Schools to be Served Page, LEA and School Information and Signature Page, Assurance Form and Waiver Form and attach as the first six pages of the application. All of these forms must be submitted as hard copies with original signatures as well as submitted electronically with entire application.

Section A: Cover Page (Complete and attach as first page of application.)				
<b>LEA Name:</b>				
<b>Mailing Address:</b>				
<b>CTDS #:</b>		<b>Entity ID #:</b>		<b>NCES ID#:</b>
<b>Superintendent:</b>				
<b>Mailing Address:</b>				
<b>Telephone #:</b>		<b>Email:</b>		
<b>Signature:</b>				
<b>Program Contact Person:</b>				
<b>Mailing Address:</b>				
<b>Telephone #:</b>		<b>Email:</b>		
<b>Signature:</b>				
<b>Fiscal Manager:</b>				
<b>Mailing Address:</b>				
<b>Telephone #:</b>		<b>Email:</b>		
<b>Signature:</b>				
<b>Total LEA Request:</b> Indicate the total amount of funding you are requesting for both LEA and School. <b>Please note:</b> An individual budget will be required for each school site totaling to the amount listed below.				
<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Total</b>	
\$	\$	\$	\$	

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

**In Addition:** The Year 1 grant period may include pre-implementation costs from June 2014-August 2014 (see Attachment C).

**Section B: LEA Level Participants/Schools to Be Served**

*(Complete the following information with respect to the LEA level participants and the schools that will be served with a School Improvement Grant and attach as second page of application.)*

**LEA Level Participants**

*Identify the LEA level team members who will have the primary responsibility for ensuring implementation and sustainability of the selected intervention model(s) for the schools to be served.*

Name	Role	Email	Telephone #

**Schools to be Served**

*In determining schools to be served and the selected intervention model for each school, ADE encourages the LEA to consider:*

- Eligible schools where the need and potential for dramatic growth is recognized (lowest performing schools).*
- Eligible schools that, with the right investments, can serve as learning labs for the LEA to pilot and implement practices that could eventually have system-wide impact.*

School Name	NCES ID#	Priority	Selected Intervention Model (Include Requested Amount per School for YR 1)			
			Restart	Closure	Transformation	Turnaround

**Section C: LEA and School Information and Signatures***(Complete and attach as third page of application. If there are more than 3 participating schools the LEA may duplicate this page and attach it after page 3.)***LEA Signatures**

<b>LEA Name:</b>	
<b>School Board President Signature:</b>	
<b>Superintendent Signature:</b>	

**School Information & Signatures**

<b>Site #1 Name:</b>			
<b>CTDS #:</b>		<b>Entity ID #:</b>	
<b>Principal Name:</b>			
<b>Telephone #:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	
<b>Is school currently receiving a School Improvement Grant funded through 1003(a) funds?</b>		YES	NO
<b>Principal Signature:</b>			

<b>Site #2 Name:</b>			
<b>CTDS #:</b>		<b>Entity ID #:</b>	
<b>Principal Name:</b>			
<b>Telephone #:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	
<b>Is school currently receiving a School Improvement Grant funded through 1003(a) funds?</b>		YES	NO
<b>Principal Signature:</b>			

<b>Site #3 Name:</b>			
<b>CTDS #:</b>		<b>Entity ID #:</b>	
<b>Principal Name:</b>			
<b>Telephone #:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	
<b>Is school currently receiving a School Improvement Grant funded through 1003(a) funds?</b>		YES	NO
<b>Principal Signature:</b>			

## Section D: LEA Assurance Form

(Complete and attach as fourth and fifth pages of application.)

**The School Board President and Superintendent must sign below to indicate their approval of the contents of the application and agreement to the following LEA assurances.**

**THIS AGREEMENT** made the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20 \_\_\_\_, by and between \_\_\_\_\_ hereafter called the LEA and Arizona Department of Education (ADE), hereafter called the SEA.

**By indicating with an X on the below items, the LEA or charter holder fully and completely assures that it will:**

### Federal Assurances:

- Use its School Improvement Grant 1003(g) funds to fully and effectively implement an intervention model in each school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with final requirements.
- Establish annual performance targets for student achievement on the state's assessment in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved School Improvement Grant application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external partners to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved School Improvement Grant application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to school(s) on how they can sustain progress without SIG funding.
- If implementing 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.
- Report to the ADE the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

### State Assurances:

- Complete and submit a needs assessment and/or Self-Readiness Assessment along with the LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plan annually.
- Develop and implement an LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plan that addresses the reason(s) for identification and establish annual goals (performance targets) for student achievement addressing the bottom quartile, based on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and high school graduation rates (if applicable).
- Provide a LEA level leadership team who will have the primary responsibility for ensuring implementation and sustainability of the selected intervention model(s) for the school(s) to be served.
- Align current and future funding sources in support of improvement efforts, especially Title I, including a commitment to reallocate existing local funds for the purpose of sustaining the improvement efforts.

- Provide data on attainment of performance targets to ADE to inform decision around continuation of funding. Complete and submit the Data Summary three times a year.
- Complete and submit ED Facts data when requested by ADE.
- Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the selected intervention model, and annually revise the LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans to reflect necessary adjustments.
- Commit to engaging in significant mid-course corrections in the school if the data does not indicate attainment of or significant progress toward achievement benchmarks within the first year of implementation.
- Identify a LEA contact person who will accompany ADE School Improvement and Intervention staff upon request at site visits at the school, oversee implementation activities, and maintain contact with the SII staff member.
- Ensure appropriate fiscal oversight over the use of sub grant funds, ensure that purchases are consistent with the terms and conditions of the School Improvement Grant and state and federal accounting requirements, and that the LEAs accounting system meets the standards required of its financial management system as detailed in 34 CFR § 80.20.
- Maintain appropriate fiscal and program records. Submit amendments for any fiscal or programmatic change. Receive approval for amendment prior to implementing any change in spending or program.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Board President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Board President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Superintendent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Superintendent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Program Contact

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Program Contact

**As a partner with the LEA in the School Improvement Grant 1003(g), ADE assures that it will:**

- Assign an ADE program staff as appropriate to the LEA.
- Provide differentiated technical assistance, professional development, progress monitoring and compliance monitoring for the LEA on development and implementation of LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans. Provide feedback on attainment of performance targets and LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans.
- Provide the LEA with guidance on any changes and interventions each of the models require.
- Meet regularly with LEA and school(s) to review performance data and implementation of selected intervention model.
- Provide technical assistance in the development of the School Improvement Grant and the renewal applications.

## Part II: Narrative

Complete each of the following 5 sections of Part II: Narrative of the application. **The total narrative may not exceed 15 pages** (not including Improvement Plan Addendums and Three Year Budget Attachment). See the following questions below for specific details to include in each section.

### Section A: LEA Readiness

*In this section, describe the readiness of LEA leadership to engage in school turnaround efforts focused on achieving dramatic gains and strategically support the reform effort.*

1. **Interest:** Based on your current knowledge of the selected intervention model(s), why is the LEA interested in implementing a School Improvement Grant?
2. **Systemic Approach:** System ownership and change is critical to the sustainable success of school turnaround. Describe how the LEA and school(s) are organized; the characteristics of the student population as well as the teaching and administrative staff; and the climate, culture, values and beliefs that are part of the LEA and school(s).
3. **Desire for Change:** Recognition of the need for change and willingness to create and implement a bold plan of action is essential to any turnaround initiative. Why do you believe the LEA is prepared for such bold action and what makes your LEA and school(s) ready and capable of dramatic change at this point in time?
4. **Barriers:** What are the barriers if any that may prevent you from supporting and ensuring implementation of the selected intervention model at the school(s) to be served?
5. **Past Turnaround Efforts:** Has the LEA participated in any other turnaround initiatives? If yes, what limited the success of the turnaround effort or what did you learn (briefly) to apply to these efforts?
6. **Continuous Improvement:** How does the School Improvement Grant opportunity align with the LEA and school(s) overall Continuous Improvement Plans?
7. **Support to Underperforming Schools:** Does the LEA currently have a system in place to provide additional support to underperforming schools? If yes, what are the most significant ways your LEA prioritizes and supports underperforming schools?

8. **External Supports:** To support the schools that have been identified to be served, does the LEA currently partner with any external providers for critical purposes (such as data usage, talent recruitment, professional development or mentoring)? If so, briefly describe their role and how they will align to the proposed implementation plan.
9. **Stakeholder Involvement:** Describe how you have consulted with relevant stakeholders (school board, parents, community members, teachers, etc.) regarding the LEAs application as well as how you have made the stakeholders aware of the performance of the school(s) for which the LEA is applying. How have the stakeholders been involved in the improvement planning to date?

## Section B: LEA Commitment and Capacity

*In this section, describe the commitment and capacity the LEA (School Board and LEA leadership) will take to support and ensure full and effective implementation of the selected intervention model.*

1. **Stakeholder Buy-In:** What specific actions has the LEA taken or will take to increase buy-in and support from staff, families, and community members in order to implement the selected intervention model?
2. **Operational Flexibility:** What specific actions has the LEA taken or will take to ensure flexibility, modify its practices, policies or oversight structures, outside of normal LEA constraints, if necessary to enable its school(s) to implement the interventions fully and effectively (e.g., flexible scheduling, principal autonomy over staff hiring/firing and placement, budget autonomy, teacher/union agreements)?
3. **Competency-Based Selection:** Effective leadership is an essential component of any successful turnaround effort. Based on the School Turnaround Leaders: Competencies for Success from Public Impact what actions has the LEA taken or will take to ensure the effectiveness of the school site principal(s) in overseeing the turnaround efforts?  
[http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCQQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.publicimpact.com%2Fpublications%2FTurnaround\\_Leader\\_Competencies.pdf&ei=E23hUqytF4rjoATgrYlo&u sg=AFQjCNEesygdEWsWaP8wKpO2jmlG1b7AVA](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCQQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.publicimpact.com%2Fpublications%2FTurnaround_Leader_Competencies.pdf&ei=E23hUqytF4rjoATgrYlo&u sg=AFQjCNEesygdEWsWaP8wKpO2jmlG1b7AVA)

4. **Teacher Effectiveness:** What actions has the LEA taken or will take to develop a strategy (prioritize hiring, evaluation, support for struggling teachers, recruitment and retention) to increase the number of highly-effective teachers in the school(s) implementing the selected intervention model? In addition, what actions has the LEA taken or will take to offer financial incentives to recruit, place and retain staff with the necessary skills and/or offer rewards for school leaders, teachers and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates?
5. **Instructional Infrastructure:** What actions has the LEA taken or will take to ensure: the school(s) are using a comprehensive data system (e.g., aligned formative and summative assessments, a data management and analysis process, tiered intervention plan) to inform instruction; the school(s) are implementing a guaranteed and viable curriculum aligned with the Arizona College and Career Readiness Standards; and the school(s) have established bold year-end targets?
6. **Model Implementation:** What specific action has the LEA taken or will take to design and implement interventions consistent with the model requirements?  
(<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/legislation.html#guidance>)
7. **Evaluation:** What specific actions has the LEA taken or will take to monitor and evaluate the progress of the selected model implementation in the school(s)? How will strategies be modified if progress monitoring data does not indicate targets have been met? Who will be responsible for collecting, analyzing and sharing the evaluation data?
8. **External Providers:** What specific actions has the LEA taken or will take to recruit, screen, and select external providers to ensure their quality?
9. **Alignment of Resources:** What specific actions has the LEA taken or will take to align other resources with the implementation of the selected intervention model?
10. **Fiscal Capacity:** What actions has the LEA taken or will take to ensure the fiscal holder's capacity to manage funds in accordance with applicable Federal and State statutes, regulations, program plans, and General Statement of Assurance?
11. **Sustainability:** What specific actions has the LEA taken or will take to sustain the school improvement efforts once the grant funding is no longer available? Describe how the LEA will align current and future funding in support of performance targets and sustainability?

## Section C: Needs Assessment

*In this section, briefly describe the LEA and school(s) needs assessment findings. Data should encompass the following areas: School Achievement Data, Programs and Structure Data (school processes), Professional Practices Data, Family and Community Data (demographics).*

1. **Current Conditions:** Using the Self-Readiness Assessment Findings, prior Solutions Team Report, Progress Monitoring of Implementation Reports, Reflective Summary, and/or needs assessments the LEA and/or school has completed, briefly describe the current conditions of the LEA and school(s) in regards to the following:
  - Effective Leadership
  - Effective Teachers
  - Instructional Time
  - Instructional Program
  - Data-Informed Instruction
  - Environmental/Non-Academic Factors
  - Stakeholder Engagement
  
2. **Student Performance:** Using the most current Achievement Profile, AIMS data and other assessment data (benchmark, formative, and summative); describe student performance including the academic needs of your most at risk students. In developing your response, consider the following:
  - How do our students perform by grade level?
  - What are the gaps between groups of students?
  - What is the progress achieved by our bottom quartile students?
  - What is the difference between performance standards?
  - How does our students' performance compare with the state and district?
  - How does our students' performance compare with demographically similar high performing schools?
  - How have our students performed over time?
  
3. **Primary Concerns/Root Causes:** What are the top 3-4 primary concerns that may be impacting student achievement? What are the top 3-4 root causes that describe what we are doing, or not doing that might contribute to how our students are performing? In developing your responses, consider the following:
  - What do you see happening?
  - What are the specific symptoms?
  - What proof do you have that the problem exists?
  - How long has the problem existed?
  - What is the impact of the problem?
  - What sequence of events leads to the problem?
  - What conditions allow the problem to occur or continue?
  - What other problems surround the occurrence of the central problem?

## Section D: Program Plan, Program Budget and Monitoring

*In this section, describe the LEA performance targets, model implementation plan, and monitoring plan and aligned budget plan for the participating school(s). The LEA must select an intervention model that aligns to the needs of the school. The LEA must design and implement activities for each intervention model, develop a timeline, identify a person/position designated to provide leadership for each requirement of the intervention. The LEA must develop a monitoring plan that encompasses multiple visits to each school and requires intermediate evidence of student academic success. The monitoring plan must clearly identify the instruments and method(s) for assessing each of the outcomes/targets, including the method for data analysis.*

1. **Submit the LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plan Addendum(s) (Attachment E) for each school the LEA proposes to serve.** The addendum(s) will include the following components:
  - **Participating School(s) Selected Model:** Identify which intervention model each of the participating schools will be implementing. Briefly describe why the selected model was chosen for the school(s).
  - **\*Performance Targets:** Describe the bold performance targets in math, reading/language arts and/or high school graduation rates for each participating school that will need to be met in order to meet the exit criteria.
  - **\*Model Implementation Plan:** Describe the strategies and action steps aligned to the intervention model requirements for each of the participating school(s).
  - **\*Monitoring Plan:** Describe the LEA plan for monitoring progress of student achievement and implementation of the selected intervention model.
  - **Aligned Budget Plan:** Describe how the LEA will use the funds to support implementation of the selected school intervention model(s) in the participating school(s). Describe how the participating school(s) will use the funds for implementation of the selected model.

***\*Performance targets, model implementation plans, and monitoring/evaluation plans may be revised annually based on most recent year performance data.***

- **Pre-Implementation Plan:** If the LEA is requesting funds in their Year 1 budget to be used for pre-implementation activities, describe the pre-implementation strategies and action steps aligned to the intervention model requirements, the timeline for pre-implementation, the monitoring plan and the budget/resource alignment plan for each of the participating school(s).

## Section E: Three-Year Preliminary Budget

*In this section, complete the LEA and school(s) **Three-Year Preliminary Planning Budget Template (Attachment F)** to support full and effective implementation of the selected school intervention model. (Please see Attachment B and C for Allowable Use of Funds.)*

- a. **External Providers:** An educational service provider may be contracted with through the LEA/school to provide support for selected school intervention model. If the LEA is requesting an External Provider, describe the scope of work that delineates the work to be performed. See **Attachment G** for list of ADE approved school improvement vendors.
  
- b. **ADE Approved Implementation Specialist:** LEA and School Improvement Implementation Specialists (IS) are approved Arizona Department of Education (ADE) vendors and will be contracted through the ADE to provide **on-site support** for LEA's and schools in developing, implementing and monitoring continuous improvement plans aligned to the selected intervention models and in deepening capacity to implement processes that are systematic, systemic and sustainable and will lead to increases in student achievement. If the LEA is requesting a LEA and School Improvement Implementation Specialists (IS), the LEA will need to sign a letter authorizing ADE to utilize a portion of the LEA's school improvement grant assistance funds to assign an LEA and School Improvement Implementation Specialist. See **Attachment H** for a description of IS roles and responsibilities. **\*\*\*An ADE approved Implementation Specialist is an OPTIONAL resource and will not affect a LEA's ability to receive or be awarded funds.**

**NOTE:** *A final Year 1 Budget and detailed line item description will be required on the ADE grants management system after actual allocations are determined. Upon approval of a final budget and detailed line item description, funds will be released to the grantees. Year 2 and 3 funding will be contingent upon yearly renewal criteria.*

# Final Scoring & Evaluation Criteria

## Final Grant Scoring Sheet

LEA Name:

Part	Section	Points Possible	Minimum Points Required Per Section	Points Received
Part I	A-D: Fully Complete with ALL Signatures	No Points	No Points	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Part II	A: LEA Readiness	90	72	
Part II	B: LEA Commitment & Capacity	110	88	
Part II	C: Needs Assessment	80	64	
Part II	D: Program Plan, Program Budget & Monitoring	110	88	
Part II	E: Three-Year Preliminary Budget	30	24	
<b>Total Points</b>		<b>420</b>		

## Grant Scoring Ratings

Exceeds	Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Met
<b>8-10</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>2-4</b>	<b>0</b>
Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information address all criteria. Provides specific, convincing, and comprehensive evidence of effectiveness. Ideas are thoroughly developed and well-conceived. No inconsistencies or weaknesses exist. No additional information is required.	Adequate information is provided and addresses most of the criteria. The information is accurate and pertinent; provides focus, detail, and evidence. Few inconsistencies or weaknesses exist. May require additional information.	Limited or minimal information is provided and addresses few of the criteria. The information lacks specificity or relevance; provides little focus, detail and/or evidence. Some inconsistencies and weaknesses exist. Requires additional information.	Information provided is incomplete and/or does not address any of the criteria.

## Grant Evaluation Criteria

### Part I: Application Information

#### Sections A - D

Fully Completed with ALL Signatures

Yes

No

### Part II: Narrative

#### A. LEA Readiness

Criteria	Exceeds	Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Meet
	8-10	5-7	2-4	0
<p><b>Interest:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA articulates an understanding of the selected model.</li> <li>The LEA clearly describes the reasons and rationale for interest in implementing a SIG grant.</li> <li>The LEA response demonstrates a thorough understanding of how the selected model will dramatically increase student performance and addresses why the school was identified as a persistently low achieving school.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Systemic Approach:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA clearly describes how the organization operates. The description includes: the characteristics of the student populations, teaching staff, and administrative staff; the climate, culture, values and beliefs that are part of the LEA system and the targeted school(s).</li> <li>The LEA's values and beliefs support dramatic turnaround are aligned to continuous improvement and will contribute to full and effective implementation of the selected model.</li> <li>The LEA response demonstrates there are some systems currently in place to support implementation of the selected model.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Desire for Change:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA provides a strong rationale for why they are ready and capable of making a dramatic change at this time.</li> <li>The LEA provides evidence that the school board is prepared for the bold actions they will need to support to allow the LEA to fully and effectively implement the requirements of the selected model.</li> <li>The LEA response demonstrates a compelling desire to change by addressing how implementing the selected model will improve LEA systems and school performance.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Barriers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA identifies barriers that may prevent them from supporting and ensuring implementation of the selected model at each school. If there are none identified, the LEA describes why they believe there are not any barriers.</li> <li>The LEA response demonstrates a thorough understanding of what systems, process, policies, etc. may hinder full and effective implementation of the selected model.</li> </ul>				

LEA Readiness Cont.	Exceeds	Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Meet
<b>Past Turnaround Efforts:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA identifies at least one past turnaround effort.</li> <li>• The LEA provides evidence of lessons learned from past turnaround efforts.</li> <li>• The LEA response demonstrates how data from the lessons learned has been used to guide further efforts or has led to this application.</li> </ul>				
<b>Continuous Improvement:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA response demonstrates an alignment between strategies and action steps in the LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans currently underway and the proposed plan to implement the selected model</li> </ul>				
<b>Support to Underperforming Schools:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA clearly describes, with detail, the actions taken to currently support underperforming schools. If no actions have been taken, the LEA describes why not.</li> <li>• The LEA provides evidence that there is a process in place for prioritizing underperforming schools.</li> <li>• The LEA response demonstrates an understanding of proven effective, evidence-based strategies and action steps for supporting underperforming schools.</li> </ul>				
<b>External Supports:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA identifies any current external providers for critical purposes (such as data usage, talent recruitment, professional development, etc.). If the LEA does not identify any providers, the LEA describes why they believe there is no need for an external provider and how is the LEA capable of providing the service internally.</li> <li>• The LEA describes how the current providers will align to the proposed implementation plan.</li> <li>• The LEA response demonstrates a thorough understanding of the services being provided and how they can be used to support effective implementation of the selected model.</li> </ul>				
<b>Stakeholder Involvement:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA describes a detailed description of the process it used to consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEAs application, school performance and implementation of the selected model at each school.</li> <li>• The LEA demonstrates that it includes multiple relevant stakeholders. (i.e., staff, parents, community, etc.).</li> <li>• The LEA response demonstrates that stakeholder representatives are clearly involved in the decision-making and planning process.</li> </ul>				
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Total Points for LEA Readiness:</b>				

<b>B. LEA Commitment and Capacity</b>				
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Partially Meets</b>	<b>Does Not Meet</b>
	<b>8-10</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>2-4</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>Stakeholder Buy-In:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA provides strong evidence through agendas, meeting notes, letters of support and feedback that the relevant stakeholders are committed to the implementation of the required model components.</li> <li>The LEA describes an effective system or processes for ongoing collaboration and communication with staff, community, and the school board regarding implementation of selected model and progress towards performance targets.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Operational Flexibility:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA provides compelling evidence that they are committed to creating, modifying or eliminating processes and procedures as necessary to fully and effectively implement the selected model.</li> <li>The LEA describes a detailed description of the specific changes in practice and procedures that will allow operational flexibility at the school level to take place.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Competency-Based Selection:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA provides compelling evidence that it has the capacity and commitment to remove principals who have a history of low achievement (i.e., students have not on the whole, experienced growth in test scores during the administrator’s tenure at the school).</li> <li>The LEA describes actions to be taken by the school board and LEA to ensure the effectiveness of the school site principal in overseeing turnaround efforts.</li> <li>The LEA provides clear and specific information regarding the process for recruitment and selection of a new principal for the school or evidence that the current principal was hired within the last two years as part of school turnaround efforts and will not be replaced.</li> <li>The LEA clearly describes how the recruitment and selection process will be based the School Turnaround Leaders: Competencies for Success from Public Impact.</li> <li>The LEA provides strong evidence that it is implementing a performance based principal evaluation system.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Teacher Effectiveness:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA has established a clear, executable plan to recruit, prioritize hiring, evaluate and support new highly qualified staff in the school.</li> <li>The LEA provides compelling evidence that it is committed to reviewing and if necessary revising recruitment, hiring, placement and retaining practices designed to identify staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the targeted school.</li> <li>The LEA provides strong evidence that it is implementing a performance based teacher evaluation system.</li> </ul>				

LEA Commitment and Capacity Cont.	Exceeds	Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Meet
<p><b>Teacher Effectiveness:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA provides compelling evidence that it is committed to supporting teachers based on teacher evaluation data through staff training and/or coaching in order to meet performance targets.</li> <li>The LEA has well-established policies and procedures in place to evaluate the degree to which skills taught through staff training and/or coaching lead to improved student performance.</li> <li>The LEA describes the system of support for teachers when data reveal they have demonstrated insufficient mastery of content (i.e., low student performance as assessed through multiple measures).</li> <li>The LEA describes effective strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the necessary skills and/or rewards for staff that have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Instructional Infrastructure:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA clearly describes the actions to be taken to ensure the school is using a comprehensive data system that allows for the collection of student data down to the individual student level and timely meaningful feedback for decision-making at all levels of the system throughout the school year.</li> <li>The LEA provides evidence that a formal system is in place or will be in place to train and support teachers in using data (from balanced assessment system) to drive instruction which includes formal and informal professional development and is differentiated for new to district teachers.</li> <li>The LEA provides evidence that an effective system is in place or will be in place that is part of a formal policy providing for weekly teacher collaboration time during the work day in order for teachers to work in vertical and horizontal teams for the purpose of improving instruction, including a structure for data discussions.</li> <li>The LEA clearly describes the actions to be taken by the School Board and the LEA to ensure the school is implementing a guaranteed and viable curriculum aligned with the Arizona College and Career Readiness Standards.</li> <li>The LEA provides evidence of an intervention plan for struggling students to meet the standards.</li> <li>The LEA provides compelling evidence that it is committed to establishing bold year end performance targets that are likely to substantially raise student achievement each year and will lead to attainment of the exit criteria.</li> </ul>				

LEA Commitment and Capacity Cont.	Exceeds	Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Meet
<p><b>Model Implementation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA provides compelling evidence that it is committed to reviewing and if necessary revising its practices or policies to enable its schools to fully and effectively implement all the required model components.</li> <li>The LEA clearly describes the actions to be taken by the school board and the LEA to provide support to each school based on the specific needs of the school to be able to fully and effectively implement all the required model components.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Evaluation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA effectively demonstrates that it has a comprehensive evaluation system in place to assess and monitor the overall performance of the organization over time in implementing the selected model.</li> <li>The LEA describes the evaluation system in sufficient detail, including the multiple evaluation measures to be used, instruments and method(s) for assessing each of the outcomes, the timeline for their administration, the person(s) responsible and the specific uses of the data to be gathered.</li> <li>The LEA has described the process to ensure fidelity to the evaluation timeline and the review of data to monitor progress.</li> <li>The LEA describes the plan to make mid-course corrections to modify strategies and/or action steps if data does not indicate targets have been met.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>External Providers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its selected model, the LEA presents strong evidence as to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality.</li> <li>Even if the provider has not yet been identified, a proposed scope of work aligned to the school needs is provided which includes a description of what specific services the external provider will be expected to offer, deliverables and timeline for deliverables.</li> <li>The LEA clearly describes the process for monitoring and evaluating the work of the external providers as well as the process for terminating services mid-course.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Alignment of Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA provides compelling evidence that it has prioritized resources to provide extensive supports for each targeted school by identifying the process for aligning resources necessary to fully and effectively implement all required model components.</li> <li>All funding sources that the school is eligible for are considered when developing the LEA plan (Title I, IDEA, etc.).</li> <li>The LEA has clearly considered resources other than fiscal to support implementation of selected model.</li> </ul>				

LEA Commitment and Capacity Cont.	Exceeds	Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Meet
<p><b>Fiscal Capacity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA has clearly described the expertise of the staff that will have oversight managing the funds in accordance with applicable Federal and State statues, regulations, program plans, and General Statement of Assurance in order ensure compliance.</li> <li>The LEA has a well-documented process for wise and informed use of funds that focuses on student achievement, demonstrates expenditure of sufficient resources, including time, personnel, funding, and technology using many funding sources.</li> <li>The LEA has procedures for clearly communicating the budget to all appropriate stakeholders.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Sustainability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA describes the sustainability plan that clearly details the LEA's commitment and capacity to continue school improvement efforts once the grant funding is no longer available.</li> <li>The LEA clearly delineates what specific capacity is being built through this grant; outlining what this capacity looks like; and summarizing how it will sustain continuous improvement.</li> <li>The LEA provides a strong rationale to support the reduction or elimination of personnel, programs, and/or professional development and still sustain improvement efforts.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>				
<p><b>Total Points for LEA Commitment and Capacity:</b></p>				

<b>C. Needs Assessment</b>				
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Partially Meets</b>	<b>Does Not Meet</b>
	<b>8-10</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>2-4</b>	<b>0</b>
The needs assessment process is clearly described and evident that it was completed by a team of stakeholders.				
The analysis of current conditions incorporates multiple data points including, but not limited to, school achievement data, classroom observations, surveys, principal/ teacher evaluations, family and community engagement data, professional development data and program data.				
Student data on behavior, graduation rate, attendance, participation in extended learning and interventions is described in the current conditions.				
The description of current conditions of the school addresses all 7 Turnaround Principles.				
Multiple data sources are utilized to indicate and analyze student performance, individual subgroups, and content areas. Multiple data sources include, but are not limited to AIMS results, benchmark tests, formative and summative assessments.				
Gaps between subgroups are addressed. The bottom quartile student data are addressed.				
The needs identified in each school are prioritized to determine the top primary concerns and root causes to be addressed in year one. Conclusions are based on analyzed data, observations and findings.				
The need is evident, compelling, and clearly linked to the chosen intervention model and performance targets.				
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Total Points for Needs Assessment:</b>				

## D. Program Plan, Monitoring and Budget Alignment

Criteria	Exceeds	Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Meet
	8-10	5-7	2-4	0
The <b>selected intervention model(s)</b> best meets the needs for each school. There is a direct alignment between the needs assessment findings and the selected model.				
The <b>performance targets</b> for each school are identified for math, reading and/or graduation rate for each of the three years and are aligned to the exit criteria and needs assessment findings and are likely to substantially raise student achievement each year.				
Based on the selected model, the <b>model implementation plan</b> for each school addresses the following:				
<b>Restart Model:</b> Describes in detail the proposed strategies and action steps to reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO) or charter management organization (CMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. The details of the review process are clearly delineated in the model implementation plan.				
<b>School Closure:</b> Describes in detail the proposed strategies and action steps of how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.				
<b>Transformation Model:</b> Describes in detail the evidence-based and proven effective strategies and action steps for <b>all</b> of the required transformation model components to be used to progress towards the performance targets.				
<b>Turnaround Model:</b> Describes in detail the evidence-based and proven effective strategies and action steps for <b>all</b> of the required turnaround model components to be used to progress towards the performance targets.				
The <b>model implementation plan</b> for each school is clearly aligned to the needs assessment findings, addresses the top primary concerns and root causes and will lead to attainment of exit criteria.				
The <b>model implementation plan</b> for each school includes a tentative <b>timeline</b> for implementation of the action steps during the grant period for each of the required model components. The timeline is realistic and is likely to result in full and effective implementation of the required model components.				
The <b>monitoring/evaluation plan</b> for each school consists of multiple evaluation measures to determine effectiveness throughout implementation of the selected model for each of the required model components.				
The <b>monitoring/evaluation plan</b> includes benchmarks for evaluation measures at specific times throughout implementation of the selected model.				

<b>Program Plan, Monitoring and Budget Alignment Cont.</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Partially Meets</b>	<b>Does Not Meet</b>
The <b>monitoring/evaluation plan</b> includes a process for progress monitoring to ensure timely review of data and mid-course corrections as necessary.				
The <b>aligned budget/resource plan</b> for each school addresses the identified needs and will lead to progress towards the performance targets.				
The <b>aligned budget/resource plan</b> for each school fully addresses the allocation of resources and consists only of reasonable, necessary and allowable expenses directly related to full and effective implementation of all of the required model components.				
The <b>aligned budget/resource plan</b> for each school consists of requested funds and/or resources that support evidence-based practices, materials and programs, improvement of instructional opportunities, increased learning time, interventions for low performing students and administrative, support and instructional staff expenses.				
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Total Points for Program Plan, Program Budget and Monitoring:</b>				
<b>Pre-Implementation Plan</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Partially Meets</b>	<b>Does Not Meet</b>
<p><b>If Applicable:</b> The <b>pre-implementation plan</b> for each school is aligned to the selected model implementation plan and includes evidence-based strategies and action steps that directly relate to effective and full implementation of the selected intervention model in order to meet performance targets, a timeline for pre-implementation, a monitoring plan and clearly identifies the funds and/or resources are reasonable and needed for pre-implementation activities. The pre-implementation plan aligns to the needs assessment findings.</p> <p><b><i>An applicant MUST Meet or Exceed in order to be awarded pre-implementation funds. In addition, an applicant MUST meet the minimum points required for all sections of the application in order to receive pre-implementation funds in year 1.</i></b></p>				

<b>E. Three-Year Preliminary Budget</b>				
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Partially Meets</b>	<b>Does Not Meet</b>
	<b>8-10</b>	<b>5-7</b>	<b>2-4</b>	<b>0</b>
The <b>three-year preliminary budget</b> for each school aligns to the <b>budget/resource plan</b> for the selected model.				
The <b>three-year preliminary budget</b> for each school fully addresses the allocation of funds needed to completely implement all of the required model components.				
The <b>three-year preliminary budget</b> requests are within the limits of no less than \$50,000 or no more than \$2 million per year over the three year grant period for each participating school and include sufficient funds to fully and effectively implement the selected model.				
<b>Comments:</b>				
<b>Total Points for Three-Year Preliminary Budget:</b>				

**Attachment A**

**Eligible Schools**

LEA Name	School Name	School NCES ID #
Ed Ahead	Academy Adventures Midtown	3191
Akimel O'Otham Pee Posh Charter School Inc.	Akimel O'Otham Pee Posh (3-5)	1993
AZ Compass Schools Inc.	AZ Compass Prep School	2929
Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified District	Baboquivari Middle School	311
Tucson Unified District	Catalina Magnet HS	1261
Glendale Elementary District	Challenger Middle School	1402
Sunnyside Unified District	Chaparral Middle School	1148
Edkey, Inc. - Sequoia Ranch School	Children First Academy - Phoenix	02881
Children's Success Academy Inc.	Children's Success Academy	2078
Coolidge Unified District	Coolidge High School	158
Eloy Elementary District	Curiel School	207
Tucson Unified District	Direct Link I	1568
Tuba City Unified District	Eagles Nest Intermediate School	00813
EduPreneurship, Inc.	EduPreneurship Student Center (ESC) Phoenix	01731
E-Institute Charter Schools, Inc.	E-Institute Charter High School at Buckeye	03186
Douglas Unified District	Faras Elementary School	00191
Florence Unified School District	Florence Virtual Academy	03195
Ganado Unified School District	Ganado High School	252
Globe Unified District	Globe High School	287
Tucson Unified District	Harriett Johnson Primary School	1569
Lake Havasu Unified District	Havasonline	02538
Coolidge Unified District	HoHoKam Middle School	1534
Blueprint Education	Hope High School	03108
PAS Charter, Inc.	Intelli-School Glendale	02985
Ira H. Hayes Memorial Applied Learning Center Inc.	Ira H. Hayes High School	2216
Cedar Unified District	Jeddito School	325
Precision Academy Systems, Inc	Precision Academy System Charter School	01864
Red Mesa Unified District	Red Mesa Junior High School	00206
Riverside Elementary District	Riverside Traditional School	581
RSD Charter School, Inc.	RSD Computerized Plus High School	02869
Shonto Governing Board of Education, Inc.	Shonto Preparatory Technology High School	01770
Sahuarita Unified District	Sopori Elementary School	628
Superior Unified School District	Superior Junior High School	759
Window Rock Unified District	Tse'Hootsooi Elementary School	2764
Tucson International Academy	Tucson International Academy Midvale	02397
Sanders Unified District	Valley High School	1142
Vechij Himgdag Alternative School Inc.	Vechij Himgdag MashchamakuD	2215

LEA Name	School Name	School NCEC ID #
Vector School District Inc.	Vector Prep and Arts Academy	2970
Visions Unlimited Academy, Inc.	Visions Unlimited Academy	02099
Wildcat Secondary School	Wildcat School	2651
Pima Prevention Partnership	Arizona Collegiate High School	03226
Bowie Unified District	Bowie Elementary School	00072
Chinle Unified District	Canyon De Chelly Elementary School	00136
Tucson Unified District	Mary Meredith K-12 School	01606
Mesa Unified District	Mesa Distance Learning	01832
Tucson Unified District	TUSD - Distance Learning Program	02547

### Allowable Use of Funds

All activities funded with SIG funds must be reasonable and necessary, directly related to the full and effective implementation of the intervention model selected by the LEA, address the needs identified by the LEA, and advance the overall goal of the SIG program to increase the academic achievement in chronically low achieving schools.

SIG funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds, but only to supplement non-Federal funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, an LEA must continue to provide all non-Federal funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including pre-implementation activities.

*An LEA may request no less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year over the three year grant period for each participating school. Actual allocations will be based on the intervention model chosen, ADE guidelines and upon LEA and school needs. Grant awards will not be made to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that are out of compliance with state or federal requirements.*

### Restart Model

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

- Converting a school or closing and reopening a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
- A school implementing a restart model may implement activities described in the final requirements with respect to other models.
- A restart school must enroll, within the grades it serves, all former students who wish to attend the school.

### School Closure

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

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

### **Turnaround Model**

- On-going, high quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program.
- Training in data analysis to inform and differentiate instruction.
- Financial incentives to recruit place and retain staff with skills necessary to meet the needs of students in the turnaround school.
- Appropriate social-emotional and community oriented services and supports for students.
- Stipends that provide additional time for data meetings, review of curriculum to make sure it is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with the Arizona College and Career Readiness Standards.
- Strategies that provide increased learning time.
- Costs associated with developing local competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within a turnaround environment to meet the needs of students.
- Costs associated with implementing the new school model or any of the activities under the transformation intervention model described in the final requirements.

### **Transformation Model**

- Costs associated with the development of a rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation system for teacher and principals that take into account student growth data, multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates; and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.
- Rewards for school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates.
- On-going, high quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program.
- Financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.
- Additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a transformation school.
- Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development.
- Stipends that provide additional time for data meetings, review of curriculum to make sure it is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with the Arizona College and Career Readiness Standards.
- Training in data analysis to inform and differentiate instruction.

- Costs associated with implementing a school-wide —response-to-intervention model.
- Additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content.
- Technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.
- Enrollment in advanced coursework, early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers.
- Student transition programs for middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies.
- Costs associated with credit recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills.
- Stipends for additional time for establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or to graduate.
- Strategies that provide increased learning time.
- Providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.
- Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff.
- Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment.
- Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.
- Ongoing, intensive technical support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

### Allowable Use of Funds for Pre-Implementation

(\*Section J from the FY 2009 Guidance, —SIG, Race to the Top, and the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund, ll has been removed and replaced with this new Section J for FY 2010.)

**An LEA's proposed uses of YEAR 1 SIG funds for pre-implementation activities must be:**

- Directly related to the selected model;
- Reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model;
- 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 from prior years;
- Research-based; and
- Represent a significant reform that goes beyond the basic educational program.

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

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

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

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

**Arizona School Improvement Grant 1003(g)  
Intent to Apply**

<b>LEA Name:</b>				
<b>Mailing Address:</b>				
<b>CTDS #:</b>		<b>Entity ID #:</b>		<b>NCES ID#:</b>

<b>Superintendent:</b>			
<b>Mailing Address:</b>			
<b>Telephone #:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	

<b>Program Contact Person:</b>			
<b>Mailing Address:</b>			
<b>Telephone #:</b>		<b>Email:</b>	

**Eligible School(s) and Selected Intervention Model**  
[\(http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/legislation.html#guidance\)](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/legislation.html#guidance)

School Name	Restart	Closure	Transformation	Turnaround

**Signatures**

_____	_____
Name of Superintendent	Signature of Superintendent
_____	_____
Name of Program Contact	Signature of Program Contact

**LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plan Addendum for Restart Model**  
 (Submit an Addendum for each participating school requesting to implement the Restart Model)

Name of Participating School: \_\_\_\_\_

Briefly describe why the Restart Model was chosen for the school:

\_\_\_\_\_

**Performance Targets:** Describe the bold performance targets in math, reading/language arts and/or high school graduation rates for each participating school that will need to be met in order to meet the exit criteria. Provide estimated \*annual performance targets for each of the three years.

*\*Adjustments for performance targets may occur based on newly implemented state assessment in 2014-2015 school year.*

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>Restart Model</b>	<b>Model Implementation Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Monitoring/Evaluation Plan</b>	<b>Budget/Resource Alignment</b>
<i>Description of Restart Model Program Requirements.</i>	<i>Describe specific strategies and action steps for each of the Restart Model Program Requirements to be used to progress towards the performance targets.</i>	<i>Provide a list of tentative dates (beginning and end dates) in which the action steps will be implemented.</i>	<i>Describe the LEA plan for monitoring progress implementation of the Restart Model.</i>	<i>Clearly identify funds and/or resources that the LEA and School will use to support implementation of each of the Restart Model Program Requirements to achieve performance targets.</i>
Convert a school or close and reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO) or a charter management organization (CMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.				
Implementation activities with respect to other intervention models.				

**LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plan Addendum for School Closure**  
 (Submit an Addendum for each participating school requesting to implement the School Closure)

<b>Name of Participating School:</b>			
<b>Briefly describe why School Closure was chosen for the school:</b>			
<b>School Closure</b>	<b>Model Implementation Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Budget/Resource Alignment</b>
<i>Description of School Closure Program Requirements.</i>	<i>Describe specific strategies and action steps for each of the School Closure Program Requirement.</i>	<i>Provide a list of tentative dates (beginning and end dates) in which the action steps will be implemented.</i>	<i>Clearly identify funds and/or resources that the LEA and School will use to support implementation of each of the School Closure Program Requirements.</i>
LEA closes school and enrolls all of the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.			
LEA involves parent and community in the closure process.			

**LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plan Addendum for Turnaround Model**  
 (Submit an Addendum for each participating school requesting to implement the Turnaround Model)

Name of Participating School: \_\_\_\_\_

Briefly describe why the Turnaround Model was chosen for the school:

\_\_\_\_\_

**Performance Targets:** Describe the bold performance targets in math, reading/language arts and/or high school graduation rates for each participating school that will need to be met in order to meet the exit criteria. Provide estimated \*annual performance targets for each of the three years.

*\*Adjustments for performance targets may occur based on newly implemented state assessment in 2014-2015 school year.*

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>Turnaround Model</b>	<b>Model Implementation Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Monitoring/Evaluation Plan</b>	<b>Budget/Resource Alignment</b>
<i>Description of Turnaround Model Program Requirements.</i>	<i>Describe specific strategies and action steps for each of the Turnaround Model Program Requirements to be used to progress towards the performance targets.</i>	<i>Provide a list of tentative dates (beginning and end dates) in which the action steps will be implemented.</i>	<i>Describe the LEA plan for monitoring progress of implementation of the Turnaround Model.</i>	<i>Clearly identify funds and/or resources that the LEA and School will use to support implementation of each of the Turnaround Model Program Requirements to achieve performance targets.</i>
<b>Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.</b>				
<b>Using locally adopted</b>				

<p><b><i>competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students. Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and select new staff.</i></b></p>				
<p><b><i>Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school.</i></b></p>				
<p><b><i>Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.</i></b></p>				
<p><b><i>Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new “turnaround office” in the LEA or SEA, hire a “turnaround leader” who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.</i></b></p>				

<b><i>Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards.</i></b>				
<b><i>Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.</i></b>				
<b><i>Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.</i></b>				
<b><i>Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.</i></b>				
<b><i>Pre-Implementation-If requesting pre-implementation funds complete this section.</i></b>				

**LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plan Addendum for Transformation Model**  
 (Submit an Addendum for each participating school requesting to implement the Transformation Model)

<b>Name of Participating School:</b>	
<b>Briefly describe why the Transformation Model was chosen for the school:</b>	
<b>Performance Targets: Describe the bold performance targets in math, reading/language arts and/or high school graduation rates for each participating school that will need to be met in order to meet the exit criteria. Provide estimated *annual performance targets for each of the three years.</b>	
<i>*Adjustments for performance targets may occur based on newly implemented state assessment in 2014-2015 school year.</i>	

<b>Transformation Model</b>	<b>Model Implementation Plan</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Monitoring/Evaluation Plan</b>	<b>Budget/Resource Alignment</b>
<i>Description of Transformation Model Program Requirements.</i>	<i>Describe specific strategies and action steps for each of the Transformation Model Program Requirements to be used to progress towards the performance targets.</i>	<i>Provide a list of tentative dates (beginning and end dates) in which the action steps will be implemented.</i>	<i>Describe the LEA plan for monitoring progress of implementation of the Transformation Model.</i>	<i>Clearly identify funds and/or resources that the LEA and School will use to support implementation each of the Transformation Model Program Requirements to achieve performance targets.</i>
<b>Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and</b>				

<b><i>increase high school graduation rates.</i></b>				
<b><i>Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates, and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.</i></b>				
<b><i>Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.</i></b>				
<b><i>Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.</i></b>				
<b><i>Implement such strategies as</i></b>				

<b><i>financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.</i></b>				
<b><i>Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards.</i></b>				
<b><i>Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.</i></b>				
<b><i>Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.</i></b>				
<b><i>Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.</i></b>				
<b><i>Pre-Implementation- If requesting pre-implementation funds complete this section.</i></b>				

**LEA and School Three-Year Preliminary Planning Budget Template**  
**(Submit a proposed three-year preliminary budget for each participating school requesting SIG funds and for the LEA if requesting LEA level funds)**

If requesting LEA funds, describe the support activities and estimate the amount of funds that will be set-aside to support the school(s) in implementing the selected model.

For each school competing for SIG funds, a preliminary 3-year budget is required. For each school estimate the amount of funds that will be needed to implement and support the various requirements of the four interventions. The minimum annual amount per school is \$50,000 and the maximum annual amount per school is \$2,000,000. (A proposed 3 year budget must be submitted for each school- make additional copies as needed).

**LEA Preliminary Budget to Support Selected School Model(s)**

<b>Name of LEA:</b>				
<b>Support Activities</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Total 3 Year Grant Amount</b>
<b>Total</b>				

<b>Restart Model</b>				
<b>Name of Participating School:</b>				
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Total 3 Year Grant Amount</b>
Recruiting and selecting EMO/CMO				
Enrollment of students into existing building OR other buildings				
Conversion of school to new configuration and management				
Additional Reform Activities from other models: Specify				
<b>Total</b>				

<b>School Closure</b>				
<b>Name of Participating School:</b>				
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Total 3 Year Grant Amount</b>
Reasonable and necessary costs for closing of existing school				
Parent and Community Outreach				
Enrollment of students into other buildings or LEAs				
Additional Closure Activities: Specify				
<b>Total</b>				

<b>Turnaround Model</b>				
<b>Name of Participating School:</b>				
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Total 3 Year Grant Amount</b>
Recruiting and hiring building principal				
Teacher and principal evaluation systems				
Process for screening existing staff, rehiring 50% and hiring 50% new staff				
Incentives, career growth and flexible work conditions designed to recruit, place and retain turnaround staff				
Ongoing, high-quality, sustainable job-embedded professional development aligned with instructional program				
Implementing new governance structure				
Identify and implement an instructional program aligned to state academic standards				
Assessment data review and analysis				
Data systems				
Increased learning time for students				
Community and support services for students				
Reading Interventions (RTI)				
Math Interventions (RTI)				
Additional Reform Activities: Specify				
Pre-Implementation Activities				
<b>Total</b>				

<b>Transformation Model</b>				
<b>Name of Participating School:</b>				
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Total 3 Year Grant Amount</b>
Recruiting and hiring building principal				
Teacher and principal evaluation systems				
School leader, teacher and other staff rewards for increasing student achievement and high school graduation rates				
Process for removing school leaders, teachers and other staff that have not after ample time increased student achievement and high school graduation rates				
Ongoing, high-quality, sustainable job-embedded professional development aligned with instructional program				
Incentives, career growth and flexible work conditions designed to recruit, place and retain transformation staff				
Identify and implement an instructional program aligned to state academic standards				
Assessment data review and analysis				
Data systems				
Increased learning time for students				
Ongoing family and community engagement				
Reading Interventions (RTI)				
Math Interventions (RTI)				
Additional Reform Activities: Specify				
Pre-Implementation Activities				
<b>Total</b>				

An educational service provider may be contracted with through the LEA/school to provide support for selected school intervention model. Determine if the service provider is on the ADE approved vendor list. These providers are for the districts to use at their discretion. **Please note that this is not an all-inclusive list; it includes only those educational service providers who chose to submit materials for review upon invitation for the school improvement RFP.** Arizona is a local control state which allows all schools and districts the freedom to choose their own service providers, including those not awarded through the ADE RFP process. Any district that participates in the State Purchasing Cooperative may use these completed contracts which satisfy school procurement requirements.

**Following is the list of awarded providers and their area of award:**

External Provider	Leadership Services	Curriculum Services	Assessment Services
A2Z	X	X	X
ACA	X	X	X
Achieve 3000	X	X	X
ACT		X	X
Adaptive Technology	X	X	X
America's Choice	X	X	X
ATI		X	X
Cambium	X	X	X
Collaborative Learning	X	X	
Compass Learning	X	X	X
ENI	X	X	X
Flippen	X	X	X
Global Partnership	X	X	X
Hope Foundation	X	X	X
Houghton Mifflin	X	X	
International Center for Leadership	X	X	X
IRRE	X	X	X
Leaderation	X	X	X
Learning and Leadership	X	X	X
Learning Sciences International	X	X	
LindaMood Bell	X	X	X
McCrel	X	X	X
MI	X	X	X
Mosiaca	X	X	X
National Institute for School Leadership	X		
Pearson	X	X	X
Reliance	X	X	X
Scantron		X	X
Scholastic	X	X	X
SFA	X	X	X
Teachscape	X	X	
WestED	X	X	X
Wireless	X	X	X

LEA and School Improvement Implementation Specialists (IS) are approved Arizona Department of Education (ADE) vendors and will be contracted through the ADE to provide **on-site support** for LEA's and schools in developing, implementing and monitoring continuous improvement plans aligned to the selected intervention models and in deepening capacity to implement processes that are systematic, systemic and sustainable and will lead to increases in student achievement. **\*\*\*An ADE approved Implementation Specialist is an OPTIONAL resource and will not affect a LEA's ability to receive or be awarded funds.**

The IS will be contracted for no more than 50 days of service for each school year. The 50 days will include:

- \* **On-site visits (Minimum of 10-additional site visits based on LEA/school needs)**
- \* **Desktop support (go-to meetings, webinars, phone calls, reports)**
- \* **Attendance at ADE required training days**
- \* **Attendance with LEA and/or school at leadership trainings**

The required qualifications for an IS are:

- Master's Degree in Educational Leadership
- Implementation Specialist must have a minimum of 5 years of teaching experience.
- Implementation Specialist must have a minimum of 5 years of administrative experience, having held a position as either: principal, superintendent or similar district, county or state office position.
- Complete the ADE School Improvement required orientation for Implementation Specialists
- Sign and commit to a Code of Ethics
- Ability to travel to LEA and school sites local and/or overnight

The preferred qualifications for an IS are:

- National Institute of School Leadership Certification
- Certified School Improvement Specialist (CSIS) Certification
- Superintendent and/or principal certification
- Instructional and/or leadership coaching experience
- Instructional and/or leadership training(s)
- Experience working with a LEA and school implementing the Transformation or Turnaround Model

**LEA and School Improvement Implementation Specialists will provide the following services:**

1. Differentiated support for LEA and school leadership based on needs by providing on-site and desktop support to LEA's and schools, attending appropriate trainings with leadership and attending ADE required trainings; not to exceed 50 days per school year.
2. Differentiated support for LEA and school leadership based on needs by providing a minimum of 10 on-site full day visits (minimum of 8 hrs. /day). LEA's

and schools with greater needs (number of needed visits will be determined in collaboration with School Improvement Education Program Specialist) will require additional on-site visits.

3. Collaboration with the ADE School Improvement Education Program Specialist to coordinate technical assistance, professional development and monitoring.
4. Coordinate, assist and deliver appropriate coaching, mentoring and professional development for LEA and school leadership in the areas of Continuous Improvement; LEA Leadership; Curriculum and Instructional Systems; Supplemental Supports and Intervention Services; Data, Assessment and Evaluation; and Stakeholder Relations.
5. Provide coaching and mentoring support for LEA and school leadership in the development of LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans aligned to the intervention models including school achievement goals for priority schools targeting subgroups that lead to identification.
6. Review the alignment of LEA and school resources (human, fiscal, etc.) to assist LEA and school leadership in strategic decision making to support development and implementation of LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans.
7. Provide coaching and mentoring support for LEA and school leadership in implementing and monitoring effectiveness of strategies and action steps in the LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans.
8. Collect and use data to monitor implementation of the LEA and School Continuous Improvement Plans.
9. Provide coaching and mentoring support for LEA and school leadership in developing, implementing and monitoring continuous improvement processes that are systematic, systemic and sustainable and will lead to increases in student achievement.
10. Provide job-embedded professional development through capacity building coaching for LEA and school leadership.
11. Support LEA and school leadership by attending leadership development trainings with LEA and school and by implementing best practices from trainings.
12. Support, guide and facilitate LEA and school participation in peer network professional development opportunities.

***If you chose to have the services of an Implementation Specialist, the LEA will need to give permission in the grant application and sign a letter authorizing ADE to utilize a portion of the LEA's school improvement grant assistance funds to assign an LEA and School Improvement Implementation Specialist.***

LEA Name	School Name
Ed Ahead	Academy Adventures Midtown
Akimel O'Otham Pee Posh Charter School Inc.	Akimel O'Otham Pee Posh (3-5)
AZ Compass Schools Inc.	AZ Compass Prep School
Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified District	Baboquivari Middle School
Tucson Unified District	Catalina Magnet HS
Glendale Elementary District	Challenger Middle School
Sunnyside Unified District	Chaparral Middle School
Edkey, Inc. - Sequoia Ranch School	Children First Academy - Phoenix
Children's Success Academy Inc.	Children's Success Academy
Coolidge Unified District	Coolidge High School
Eloy Elementary District	Curiel School
Tucson Unified District	Direct Link I
Tuba City Unified District	Eagles Nest Intermediate School
EduPreneurship, Inc.	EduPreneurship Student Center (ESC) Phoenix
E-Institute Charter Schools, Inc.	E-Institute Charter High School at Buckeye
Douglas Unified District	Faras Elementary School
Florence Unified School District	Florence Virtual Academy
Ganado Unified School District	Ganado High School
Globe Unified District	Globe High School
Tucson Unified District	Harriett Johnson Primary School
Lake Havasu Unified District	Havasunonline
Coolidge Unified District	HoHoKam Middle School
Blueprint Education	Hope High School
PAS Charter, Inc.	Intelli-School Glendale
Ira H. Hayes Memorial Applied Learning Center Inc.	Ira H. Hayes High School
Cedar Unified District	Jeddito School
Precision Academy Systems, Inc	Precision Academy System Charter School
Red Mesa Unified District	Red Mesa Junior High School
Riverside Elementary District	Riverside Traditional School
RSD Charter School, Inc.	RSD Computerized Plus High School
Shonto Governing Board of Education, Inc.	Shonto Preparatory Technology High School
Sahuarita Unified District	Sopori Elementary School
Superior Unified School District	Superior Junior High School
Window Rock Unified District	Tse'Hootsooi Elementary School
Tucson International Academy	Tucson International Academy Midvale
Sanders Unified District	Valley High School
Vechij Himdag Alternative School Inc.	Vechij Himdag MashchamakuD
Vector School District Inc.	Vector Prep and Arts Academy
Visions Unlimited Academy, Inc.	Visions Unlimited Academy
Wildcat Secondary School	Wildcat School
Pima Prevention Partnership	Arizona Collegiate High School
Bowie Unified District	Bowie Elementary School
Chinle Unified District	Canyon De Chelly Elementary School
Tucson Unified District	Mary Meredith K-12 School
Mesa Unified District	Mesa Distance Learning
Tucson Unified District	TUSD - Distance Learning Program

School NCE	Reason
3191	C
1993	C
2929	C
311	C
1261	C
1402	C
1148	C
02881	C
2078	C
158	C
207	C
1568	C
00813	C
01731	C
03186	C
00191	C
03195	C
252	C
287	C
1569	C
02538	D-2
1534	C
03108	C
02985	C
2216	C
325	C
01864	C, D-1
00206	C
581	C
02869	C, D-1
01770	C
628	C
759	C
2764	C
02397	C
1142	C
2215	C
2970	C
02099	C
2651	C
03226	C
00072	C
00136	C
01606	C
01832	D-2
02547	D-2