

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: Office of the State Superintendent of Education 810 First Street, NE, 8 th Floor Washington, DC 20002
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Sharon Gaskins Position and Office: Deputy Assistant Superintendent, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education Contact's Mailing Address: Office of the State Superintendent of Education 810 First Street, NE, 8 th Floor Washington, DC 20002 Telephone: (202) 654-6112 Fax: (202)741-0227 Email address: sharon.gaskins@dc.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Jesús Aguirre	Telephone: (202) 727-3471
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X 	Date: November 22, 2013
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

School Improvement Grants

Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: District of Columbia



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

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

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is mandatory required to obtain or retain benefit and voluntary. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed FY 2013 School Improvement Grant application to this address.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

ESEA Flexibility

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

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2013 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2013 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its SIG funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

This application is for use only by SEAs that will make new awards. New awards are defined as an award of SIG funds to an LEA for a school that the LEA was not previously approved to serve with SIG funds in the school year for which funds are being awarded—in this case, the 2014–2015 school year. New three-year awards may be made with the FY 2013 funds or any unobligated SIG funds from previous competitions not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.

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

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

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

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to OESE.OST@ed.gov.

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

Paper Submission:

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

Carlas McCauley, Group Leader
Office of School Turnaround
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013.

For Further Information

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: Office of the State Superintendent of Education 810 First Street, NE, 8th Floor Washington, DC 20002</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Sharon Gaskins</p> <p>Position and Office: Deputy Assistant Superintendent, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: Office of the State Superintendent of Education 810 First Street, NE, 8th Floor Washington, DC 20002</p> <p>Telephone: (202) 654-6112</p> <p>Fax: (202) 741-0227</p> <p>Email address: sharon.gaskins@dc.gov</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Jesús Aguirre</p>	<p>Telephone: (202) 727-3471</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X</p>	<p>Date: November 22, 2013</p>
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p>	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

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

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

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

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY (if applicable)	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

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

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

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

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

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

APPLICANT RESPONSE

The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), *hereafter referred to as “the SEA”*, will create a rubric (See Appendix B) to evaluate all School Improvement Grant (SIG) applications submitted on behalf of eligible Local Education Agencies (LEA). The criteria the SEA will use to evaluate the LEAs application based upon each school’s *needs assessment, capacity and budget* are outlined below:

Needs Assessment

The SEA will ensure that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each priority school, as applicable in their LEA

application and has selected an intervention for each school by requiring LEAs to conduct a thorough **needs assessment** that requires an evaluation of their current level of implementation utilizing 53 SIG Indicators. These 53 SIG indicators are aligned to the 7 Turnaround Principles included as part of the District of Columbia's approved ESEA Waiver (*Last updated July 11, 2012 (See pages 76-82)*).

The LEA will need to provide a brief overview of any interventions currently in place within the school that address the 7 Turnaround Principles. Additionally, the LEA will provide a description of the process of the needs assessment for each school, as well as a detailed description of how SIG funds will be deployed in support of the interventions. Finally, the LEA must show how each intervention will be aligned to the needs assessment and turnaround principles.

Based on these actions, the LEA will then choose the most appropriate turnaround model for each school based on each school's current needs. (*See LEA Application Tabs A (Part 1)*).

OSSE will evaluate the comprehensiveness of this assessment against the grant rubric (*See Page 7*) which will allocate points to LEA applications based on the comprehensiveness of the needs assessment and the process used to analyze findings.

Capacity

The SEA will assess each LEA's capacity to fully implement the selected intervention in each school by requiring that LEA's respond to several questions (**See Tab A, Part 3**) that will help the SEA assess the LEA's level of capacity. The SEA will require the LEA to describe:

- The steps that will be taken to retain or replace teachers and school leaders to meet the requirements of the school's selected model. The purpose of this question is for the SEA to be able to determine the LEA's processes for retaining current teachers in future SIG schools and the process by which the LEA will replace teachers and school leaders. Additionally, the LEA will be required to indicate the number of staff, along with their credentials, who are dedicated to the implementation of the SIG turnaround model/intervention.
- Other funds that will be directly dedicated to supporting the implementation of the proposed SIG turnaround model/intervention. Knowing what additional funds the LEA plans to use to support implementation of SIG turnaround models will help the SEA decide whether these funds are sufficient to enhance SIG program implementation.
- The plan for recruiting new principals and/or teachers for the Turnaround and Transformation models. Additionally, should LEAs decide to enlist the Restart model, where applicable, the process by which LEAs decide to take this action should also be delineated.
- Their effort(s) to decrease barriers and garner evidence of support from teachers, the Board of Education, school staff, and/or parents in its plan to implement the proposed SIG turnaround model/intervention. This information will help the SEA determine the support received from the school community to determine the LEA's ability to carry out the selected SIG turnaround model fully and effectively.
- Any other additional/other elements of capacity the LEA will employ to implement their SIG proposed turnaround models in each school.
- Any areas where practices or policies have or will be modified where necessary to be able to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
- The LEA's plan to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

All of these areas will be reviewed again the SIG rubric (*See Pages 4-7*), which will allocate points based on the LEA’s demonstrated ability to use SIG and other resources to implement the proposed activities effectively. The SEA will also review the following items to further understand the LEA’s capacity to implement. These items are currently available to OSSE, and include:

- LEA Federal/State Audit Findings
- LEA Program Monitoring Reports
- LEA’s past history of grants management of multiple federal grants (i.e., burn-rate, quarterly draw-down of funds).

Budget

The SEA will ensure that the LEA’s budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each priority school, as applicable, by ensuring that the LEA adheres to the following in (**Tab C and D**) of the LEA application:

Assurance	Rationale
<p>The LEA provides a three year budget to support the implementation of the selected turnaround model</p>	<p>The LEA will provide a narrative statement for each school to be served to explain how the total amount of funds included in the budget will be sufficient to fully and effectively implement the selected interventions in each Priority school for a full three years.</p> <p>Each LEA applicant must provide a separate budget for each of the three years of the period of availability and a sustainability budget for each Priority school it proposes to serve with school improvement funds. In its descriptions of activities to be funded, the LEA will distinguish between activities to be implemented by the school and services to be provided by the LEA.</p>
<p>The items listed per each school’s budget are in compliance with Title I requirements, are in clear alignment with and support school goals and provide specific detail for additional funding sources and activities</p>	<p>The LEA will be asked to provide details on the totality of other funds expected to be dedicated to supporting the intervention, including local funds, Title I funds, or funds from other sources. For years 2 and 3, if the school has made progress toward meeting annual goals, on the leading indicators, and/or toward full implementation of the selected turnaround model, a renewal award will be made to the LEA for the school each year.</p> <p>The SEA reserves the right to annually evaluate each school’s budget before making renewal awards each year. Lastly, the SEA does not plan to cap award amounts. However, the LEA should not request an amount exceeding \$2,000,000.00 per year. (The SEA will evaluate the school based on these assurances. (See SEA Rubric, Pages 14-15).</p>

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.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Below the SEA has described the criteria it will use to assess the LEAs commitment to conduct the above actions:

Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements:

The LEA will be required to provide a list of interventions the school will deploy in support of their selected turnaround model/intervention, a detailed description of their chosen interventions, the connection between each intervention and the 7 Turnaround Principles, a rationale for choosing the selected interventions, indicators that will be used to monitor interventions and resources that will be applied to support interventions (*See Tab B in the LEA application and Pages 12-13 of the SEA rubric*).

Additionally, the LEA will be required to provide a detailed action plan for implementing the selected intervention(s) per school. The LEA must submit a timeline that covers the full period of implementation through the life of the grant and must show that the basic elements of the selected turnaround model/intervention(s) will be up and running by the start of the 2014-2015 school year (SY) (*See Tab v. Part 2*)

Using the SIG rubric, the SEA will evaluate the quality and comprehensiveness of the proposed actions the LEA will take in the design and implementation of these activities (*See pages 12-13 of the SEA rubric*).

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

The SEA will evaluate the actions the LEA has taken toward recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers, where applicable, to ensure their quality, by requiring that LEA's (*See LEA Application Tab A, Part 3*) describe the proposed plan for recruiting new principals for the Turnaround and Transformation Models or the availability of EMOs to enlist for the Restart Model.

Align other resources with the interventions:

The SEA will evaluate the actions the LEA has taken toward aligning other resources with their selected interventions by requiring that LEA's describe in the LEA Application (*See LEA Application Tab A, Part 3*) which "other" funds will be directly dedicated to supporting the implementation of each school's proposed SIG turnaround model/intervention (i.e., Title I, Part A; Title II, Title III and Race to the Top).

Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively:

The SEA will evaluate the actions the LEA has taken toward modifying its practices or policies, if necessary, thus enabling the LEA to implement the interventions fully and effectively by requiring that the LEA identify any ways in which practices or policies were modified in order to implement the interventions fully and effectively, if applicable (*See LEA Application Tab A, Part 3*).

Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends:

The SEA will evaluate the actions the LEA has taken toward sustaining the reforms after the funding period ends by requiring that the LEA within the LEA SIG application (*See LEA Application, Tab A, Part 3*) describe in detail the how other funds will be used to sustain SIG turnaround models/interventions after the life of the SIG

grant.

Above the SEA has described the criteria it will use to assess the LEAs commitment to conduct the aforementioned actions. Additionally, the SEA will also evaluate schools during monitoring which will be used to evaluate each school's fidelity to the plans detailed in their original application.

The SEA will conduct monitoring visits, to include but not limited to, on-site monitoring in schools, desktop monitoring and LEA monitoring. The purpose of SIG monitoring, whether on-site, desktop or LEA will be to ensure that each school receiving School Improvement Grant (SIG) funding has the capacity to fully support implementation of their proposed SIG turnaround model; to determine the level of progress being made toward key indicators/SIG leading indicators; to identify progress toward measurable goals; and to offer mid-course correction and guidance toward compliance with the final requirements of the grant.

The SEA will hold the LEA accountable by conducting annual monitoring visits. School-level monitoring will take place on an annual basis as well, to better understand implementation progress, identify promising practices, and identify where implementation is off track.

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

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

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

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

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

The SEA will review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period by requiring the following:

The LEA must submit a proposed budget for school and LEA expenditures using SIG budget template (**See Tab D in the LEA application**). The budgets must span from the date of the Grant Award through the first day of school. The following is a sample of budget and program categories:

PROGRAM CATEGORIES	BUDGET CATEGORIES
Instruction	Salaries and Benefits
Support Services	Supplies and Materials
Administrative Costs	Fixed Property Costs (Rents & Utilities)
Operations and Maintenance	Contracted Professional Services
Transportation	Equipment
Other	Other

Additionally, the LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA

will use each year to implement the selected turnaround model/intervention in each Priority school it commits to serve. The LEA must also provide LEA-level activities that will be designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in its Priority schools.

Three-year budgets (SY 14-15, 15-16, and 16-17) are required for all Priority schools. The LEA's budget must be of sufficient size and scope to implement the intervention model fully for three years for each Priority school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be budgeted separately but included as part of the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.

The SEA does not plan to place any caps on the amount LEAs will be able to use during the pre-implementation period.

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

The SEA will evaluate the LEAs proposed pre-implementation activities to determine whether they are allowable by ensuring the following –

- Activities must support the intervention model
- Activities must be reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model
- Activities must have a reasonable budget to support the pre-implementation activities and must be aligned to the selected turnaround model/intervention as well as Turnaround Principles
- Activities must address a need or needs identified in the LEA's needs assessment
- Activities must address improving student achievement in a priority school
- Activities must be completed in the time provided for pre-implementation (**See Section C of the SEA Application**)
- Activities must be completed using supplemental funding

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

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

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

Applicant Response

The OSSE will make three-year awards per approved school with renewal each year based upon successful adherence to SIG guidelines and perspective turnaround model.

MONTH	IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE	DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITY
January	January 21, 2014	Request for Approval (RFA) will be released
	January 28, 2014	FY 13 SIG LEA Application Technical Assistance Workshop (Mandatory)
February	February 4, 2015	FY 13 SIG LEA Application Technical Assistance (Optional – Specific Needs/Requests)
	February 6, 2015	FY 13 SIG LEA Application Technical Assistance (Optional – Specific Needs/Requests)
	February 18, 2014	LEA(s) Application Due
March	March 11, 2014	LEA Application Defense
	March 25, 2014	Award Notification
April	April 1, 2014	Public Notification of SIG Awards
May	May 1-31, 2014	SIG Pre-implementation
June	June 1-30, 2014	SIG Pre-implementation
July	July 1-31, 2014	SIG Pre-implementation
August	August 1-31, 2014	SIG Pre-implementation

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.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Annual Goals

The LEA will be required to provide annual goals in the areas of reading, math and high school graduation rates (**See Tab 2, Part A of the LEA Application**) for each school in its SIG application for a period of three years beginning with SY 14-15 and ending with SY 16-17 (**See Tab A, Part 2 of the LEA Application**). OSSE will review the proposed annual goals and monitoring plan against the SEA's rubric (**See page 10 of the SEA rubric**) to ensure that the established goals are realistic, yet reflect high expectations for student achievement,

and that the plans to monitor the goals and aligned leading indicators are rigorous.

OSSE will review schools' progress toward these goals and leading indicators in order to determine progress. We will hold annual progress conversations with each LEA to discuss progress-to-date and to identify areas that are on-track, off track, and those requiring additional support.

When analyzing annual goals the OSSE will evaluate the following, but not limited to:

- DC-CAS results (student assessment data)
- High school graduation rates
- Data on the leading indicators - LEAs that receives a School Improvement Grant will be required to submit data on the leading indicators annually as listed in the LEAs application.

Grant Renewal

Schools exhibiting little to no progress over the course of the grant period may not be renewed for SIG funding in the following year. However, OSSE is committed to meaningfully engaging with participating LEAs to strengthen implementation over the course of the grant, prior to a non-renewal decision being made. We will use the conversations mentioned above to inform future renewal requests, as it is critical for performance data and implementation progress to be taken into account when understanding whether or not the LEA has the capacity needed to implement the work with fidelity. For instance, a LEA/school that is not showing progress on its leading indicators, but is working diligently to course-correct and adjust its implementation to address the problems, could be considered for renewal funding, whereas an LEA/school that is not committed to making such adjustments would likely not be considered for renewal funding.

- (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.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

The SEA will use our Priority schools per the ESEA Waiver Revised July 11, 2012.

- (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.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

OSSE will conduct monitoring activities through both desktop and on-site monitoring.

Desktop monitoring will involve OSSE reviewing the LEA for compliance with SIG requirements and its implementation plan. The review may include, but not limited to, reviewing reimbursement requests for School

Improvement Grants, reviewing progress reports that will be required by OSSE, and other sources of information.

On-site monitoring will involve a comprehensive assessment of the LEA's programming. A monitoring team comprised of content area experts will evaluate the implementation of the school's proposed plans and compliance with SIG requirements. Visits may include a review of selected documentation, visits to classrooms, focus group meetings, and other activities. Ultimately, these visits will aim to identify bright spots in implementation and to determine if and corrective actions are needed to ensure success.

The on-site monitoring schedule will be prioritized based on the ongoing reviews of data mentioned in the section above. Those LEAs/schools that show signs of being off track in their implementation or performance will be prioritized for increased attention. All monitoring strategies and schedules will be coordinated agency-wide to identify cross-cutting areas of monitoring across programs, to realize synergies, to set clear expectations for grantees and to ease the burden on individual schools. All LEAs will receive an on-site monitoring in the first year, and a desk-top monitoring for years in which on-site monitoring does not take place.

The SEA may also conduct additional monitoring based on the following:

- A-133 Single audit results,
- Consistent non-compliance relative to unresolved findings from previous monitoring reviews,
- Public complaints from the public to the OSSE,
- Excess carryover or failure to liquidate funds,
- Late reporting (i.e., expenditures, status reports, progress reports, equipment inventory),
- Lack of alignment between expenditures and approved budget,
- Percent of disallowed to allowed expenditures,
- Excessive administrative costs,
- Failure to adhere to terms and conditions set forth in the Grant Award notice (GAN), and
- Failure to make substantial progress toward grant goals and objectives.

Since four LEAs are eligible to receive funds for serving Priority schools, OSSE believes it has the capacity to adequately monitor their implementation progress in the manner described above.

- (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.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

First, the SEA will prioritize serving all Priority schools first. As described above, the SEA will first collect applications only from LEAs with Priority schools.

Consistent with the Department's non-regulatory Guidance, the SEA will make efforts to spread 1003(g) funds among schools with the highest needs. Therefore, if there are insufficient funds to serve all Priority schools, the

SEA will award funds to schools within LEAs with multiple Priority schools beginning with the lowest-performing school and continuing until there are insufficient funds to provide for a full and effective intervention in any more schools. As state above, the LEA’s capacity to serve the targeted schools will be a key factor in determining the selected schools as well.

- (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.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

The SEA will be using its “Priority” schools list waiver.

- (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.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

The SEA does not intend to take over any “Priority” schools.

- (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.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

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

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

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

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

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit,

select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.

Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICANT RESPONSE

The SEA will use its five percent reservation to support the SIG principals through monthly Professional Development meetings. These meetings will be facilitated by OSSE staff with the inclusion of guest speakers who have experience working in or turning around low-performing schools. The purpose of the Principal Academies will be to provide support for principals leading Priority schools by way of Technical Assistance (TA) and collaborative learning experiences through peer interaction and the sharing of best practices.

The Principals Academy program is designed to strengthen the skills and talents of school leaders so that they can be more effective in driving achievement gains in their schools. Principals will participate in activities that focus on leadership skills through field trips to other schools to observe best practices and webinars around data-driven instruction, building a positive school-wide culture, school management techniques, and other key topics.

The Principals Academy will help principals increase their capacity to:

- Work with teachers to shape a school environment that is conducive to learning
- Align instruction to Common Core State Standards
- Organize resources to improve classroom instruction and student learning
- Make good decisions about hiring, professional learning, and other issues that influence the quality of teaching
- Prepare for DC CAS Administration
- Utilize data to inform instruction

- Evaluate their overall school performance and student outcomes
- Enhance parent and community engagement
- Address student's social and emotional needs to develop the whole child

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.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

On December 5, 2013 the OSSE SIG Point of Contact (POC) presented at the Title I State Committee of Practitioners meeting held from 4:00pm – 6:30pm. The SEA discussed the purpose of SIG, how SIG impacts Title I, and the SEA's goals as it relates to Priority schools. The SEA garnered feedback from the Committee of Practitioners regarding how they feel the SEA can best support Priority school leaders using SIG and how SIG funding can align with other funding streams (i.e., Title I). – **See Appendix C**

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.

The District of Columbia 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

The District of Columbia Public Schools 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. [See Appendix D](#)

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The LEA application form that the SEA uses must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs. – [See Appendix E](#)

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 \$2,000,000.00 (not to exceed \$6,000,000.00 per school over three years).

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final

requirements;

- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,
- (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 13:			

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:			

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 awards² to its LEAs.
- Use the renewal process identified in the District of Columbia'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, the 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).

² 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.

APPENDIXES

- APPENDIX A: **Eligible Priority School List**
- APPENDIX B: **SEA SIG Application Rubric**
- APPENDIX C: **Committee of Practitioners Responses**
- APPENDIX D: **Assurance of Notice and Comment Period**
- APPENDIX E: **LEA Application**

APPENDIX A		2013-2014 OSSE SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION (PERSISTENTLY LOWEST ACHIEVING/PRIORITY)								
	LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID#	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	PRIORITY	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
1	DCPS	1100030	Aiton ES	110003000122	Yes					Yes
2	"	1100030	Amidon-Bowen ES	110003000121	Yes					Yes
3	"	1100030	Anacostia Senior HS	110003000085	Yes				40%	Yes
4	"	1100030	Ballou HS	110003000084	Yes				50%	Yes
5	PCS	1100003	Booker T. Washington PCS	110000300217	Yes				76%	Yes
6	"	1100030	Browne EC	110003000152	Yes					Yes
7	"	1100030	Cardozo HS	110003000082	Yes					Yes
8	"	1100030	Coolidge HS	110003000081	Yes				59%	Yes
9	"	1100030	C.W. Harris	110003000185	Yes				42%	Yes
10	"	1100030	Drew ES	110003000097	Yes					Yes
11	"	1100030	Dunbar Senior HS	110003000079	Yes				59%	Yes
12	"	1100030	Eastern Senior HS	110003000078	Yes				82%	Yes
13	"	1100030	Hendley ES	110003000182	Yes					Yes
14	"	1100030	Houston ES	110003000181	Yes					Yes
15	"	1100030	Langdon EC	110003000044	Yes					Yes
16	"	1100030	LaSalle-Backus EC	110003000042	Yes					Yes
17	"	1100030	Luke C. Moore Academy HS	110003000198	Yes				36%	Yes
18	"	1100030	Malcolm X ES	110003000036	Yes					Yes
19	PCS	1100014	Maya Angelou PCS	110001400391	Yes				51%	Yes
20	"	1100030	Moten ES at Wilkinson	110003000002	Yes					Yes
21	PCS	1100018	Options HS PCS	110001800232	Yes				57%	Yes
22	"	1100030	Patterson ES	11003000158	Yes					Yes
23	"	1100030	Roosevelt SHS	110003000008	Yes				48%	Yes
24	"	1100030	The Washington Metropolitan High School	110003000397	Yes				34%	Yes

25	"	110030	H.D. Woodson HS	11003000055	Yes		53%	Yes
----	---	--------	-----------------	-------------	-----	--	-----	-----

APPENDIX B



School Improvement Grant (SIG) RFA Scoring Rubric

This tool is for evaluating local educational agencies (LEAs) 2013 SIG Application funded by the District of Columbia's School Improvement Grant (SIG). The rubric provides guidance to review panel members on making funding recommendations to the District of Columbia's Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE).

As a reviewer, it is valuable for the OSSE as well as the applicant to know your thoughts about the application. Therefore, please provide comments under the "strengths" and "weaknesses" area after each section. Your comments may be shared with the applicant, so be thoughtful in your comments. Please write / type the scores and comments directly into the spaces provided.

The scoring is based on a 90-point scale. Reviewers may decide to award funding that is less than the amount requested in the application. If you decide that funding less than the amount request is appropriate, please provide the rationale for this decision in the "Comments" box on the last page of the rubric (page 14).

You are to assign a score to each criterion included in the rubric as applicable. Your final funding recommendation to the OSSE should be based on all relevant information within the application. The review panel's recommendations are the primary factor in the OSSE's decision about whether or not to award a grant. The final decision, however, remains with the OSSE.

Thank you for your time and participation in the 2013 School Improvement Grant Application process. Please find below the rubric to be used to evaluate all SIG applications submitted on behalf of eligible LEAs.

FY 2013 School Improvement Grant Rubric	
Tab i.	
Applicant Information and Certification (Points: N/A)	
Tabs ii. – iv.	
Assurances (Points: N/A)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Assurances: ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Funds	
<input type="checkbox"/> Assurances: General Education Provisions Act	
<input type="checkbox"/> Assurances: Additional / Other Assurances	
Tab v.	
Consultation: (Points: 10 points)	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has described its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders, including parents, regarding the LEA’s application and solicited their input for the development and implementation of school improvement turnaround models in its participating “Priority” schools. <input type="checkbox"/> Examples may include local board meetings, parent meetings, district advisory committee, and local bargaining unit meetings which indicate discussion of the LEA’s application. <input type="checkbox"/> The LEA identifies which stakeholder recommendations have been used in the development of the LEA’s SIG Application have been used in the development of the LEA’s SIG implementation plan, and discusses stakeholder input not accepted, including a rationale for rejecting that input. 	
<p>The LEA clearly identifies its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application.</p> <p>The LEA’s description demonstrates comprehensive consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application, including local board meetings, parent meetings, district advisory committee, and local bargaining unit meetings.</p> <p>The LEA has provided minutes and agendas of meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s SIG application that recount the input obtained.</p> <p>The LEA has identified all significant stakeholder input, identifies input incorporated in the SIG implementation plan, discusses rejected input and provides a rationale for each rejected suggestion.</p>	<p>Strong (8-10 points)</p>
<p>The LEA identifies a general process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application.</p> <p>The LEA’s description demonstrates consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application, including parents and other stakeholders.</p> <p>The LEA has described meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s SIG application, including a description of key stakeholder input that was incorporated in the LEA’s SIG application.</p> <p>The LEA has identified significant stakeholder input, identifies input incorporated in the SIG plan, and provides a rationale for each rejected suggestion.</p>	<p>Adequate (5 -7 points)</p>
<p>The LEA does not clearly identify its process for consulting with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application.</p> <p>The LEA’s description does not adequately demonstrate consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application.</p>	<p>Inadequate (1-4 points)</p>

<p>The LEA has not sufficiently described meetings with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's SIG application.</p> <p>The LEA has not sufficiently identified significant stakeholder input; noted input incorporated in the SIG plan, or provided a rationale for each rejected suggestion.</p>	
<p><i>Strengths:</i></p>	
<p><i>Weaknesses:</i></p>	
<p>Total Points: _____ /10 points</p>	
<p>Tab v.</p>	
<p>Leading Indicators: (Points: 10 points)</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The LEA's provides a detailed explanation of the current or proposed plan for collecting SIG leading indicators data.</p>	
<p>The current actions and/or planned activities for collecting SIG leading indicators' data are clearly stated, reasonable, and contain a proposed plan for the collection of data not currently collected along with a detailed timeline that outlines a system for submitting timely data as requested by the SEA.</p>	<p>Strong (8-10 points)</p>
<p>The current actions and/or planned activities for collecting SIG leading indicators' data is minimally stated but lacks feasibility.</p>	<p>Adequate (5-7 points)</p>
<p>The current actions and/or planned activities for collecting SIG leading indicators' data is not clearly stated, reasonable, nor does it contain a proposed plan for the collection of data not currently collected or a detailed timeline that outlines a system for submitting timely data as requested by the SEA.</p>	<p>Inadequate (1-4 points)</p>
<p><i>Strengths:</i></p>	

Weaknesses:

Total Points: _____/10 points

Tab vi.

Lack of Capacity (**Points: N/A**) – If the LEA is not applying to serve each “Priority” school, the LEA must explain why it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. The LEA must demonstrate lack of capacity by describing elements of capacity that are lacking.

- If the LEA determines there is a lack of capacity to sufficiently serve each “Priority” school, OSSE will evaluate the sufficiency of the LEAs stance, by reviewing their responses to the following items in “Tab vi”:
 - Number and credentials of staff dedicated to implementation
 - Dedication of other funds to directly support implementation
 - Ability to recruit new principals for the Turnaround and Transformation models or the availability of EMOs to enlist for the Restart model
 - Barriers and/or evidence of support from teachers, the Board of Education, School staff, and/or Parents

Choose one of the following:

ACCEPTABLE RESPONSE

UNACCEPTABLE RESPONSE

Rationale:

Tab A

Capacity of LEA and School/Campus and Sufficiency of Funds to Implement Turnaround Model/Intervention
(10 points)

- The LEA must describe all actions it will take, or has taken regarding the following:

- Retain or replace teachers and school leaders to meet the requirements of the school’s selected model.
- Other funds that will be directly dedicated to supporting the implementation of the proposed SIG turnaround model/intervention.
- The plan for recruiting new principals and/or teachers for the Turnaround and Transformation models.
- The efforts the LEA put forth to decrease barriers and garner evidence of support from teachers, the Board of Education, School staff, and/or parents in the plan to implement the proposed SIG turnaround model/intervention.
- Additional/other elements of capacity the LEA will employ to implement their SIG proposed/turnaround model in each school.
- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality
- Align other resources with the interventions
- Modify its practices, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively
- Sustain the reform after the funding period ends

<p>The LEA provided a strong plan for retaining and/or replacing teachers and school leaders for the SIG turnaround model/intervention.</p> <p>The LEA provided a summary of multiple funding streams with a strong description indicating how funds will be directly dedicated to supporting the implementation of the proposed SIG turnaround model/intervention.</p> <p>The LEA provided a strong plan for recruiting new principals and/or teachers for the SIG turnaround model/intervention.</p> <p>The LEA provided strong evidence showing support on behalf of the staff, leaders, and other stakeholders are in support of the turnaround model selected and provided strong evidence of how the LEA decreased barriers in support of the selected turnaround model.</p> <p>The LEA sufficiently described additional/other elements of capacity that will be used to implement SIG model.</p> <p>The LEA, as applicable, clearly articulated the external providers it plans to involve in implementing its chosen turnaround model/intervention model at each school. 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. The LEA has included the following a) A detailed discussion of the recruitment process the LEA will undertake to identify potential external providers; b) A detailed description of what roles the LEA will play in the implementation of the models(s) and of what specific services the external provider will be expected to offer; c) A</p>	<p>Strong (8-10 points)</p>
--	-----------------------------

copy of the LEAs application for external providers' d) A detailed description of the process that the LEA would utilize to evaluate these applications; e) A discussion of how final selections of external providers will be made; and 7) A detailed process for the monitoring and evaluation of the work of the external provider(s) by the LEA.

The LEA demonstrated in a convincing manner how it will align other resources available to the school and District to carry out its chosen SIG turnaround model/intervention.

The LEA has included the following: a) a workable plan for aligning resources to implement the components of a given SIG turnaround model/intervention.

The LEA provided a specific and detailed discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

The LEA presented a convincing and detailed discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. For instance, the LEA specifies what areas, items, or personnel will no longer be budgeted in order to continue this endeavor and also describes how the LEA will fill this gap with the absence of SIG funding if necessary.

The LEA provided an adequate plan for retaining and/or replacing teachers and school leaders for the SIG turnaround model/intervention.

The LEA provided a summary of a limited number of funding streams with a general description indicating how funds will be directly dedicated to supporting the implementation of the proposed SIG turnaround model/intervention.

The LEA provided an adequate plan for recruiting new principals and/or teachers for the SIG turnaround model/intervention.

The LEA provided adequate evidence showing support on behalf of the staff, leaders, and other stakeholders are in support of the turnaround model selected and provided adequate evidence of how the LEA decreased barriers in support of the selected turnaround model.

The LEA briefly described additional/other elements of capacity that will be used to implement SIG model.

The LEA, as applicable, involved external providers in implementing its chosen intervention model, however, did not clearly articulate the process. The LEA presented some

Adequate (5-7 points)

<p>limited evidence as to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality.</p> <p>The LEA demonstrated, in a limited manner how it will align other resources available to the school and the District to carry out its chosen SIG turnaround/ intervention model.</p> <p>The LEA provided some discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; however, the details about these proposed modifications vague.</p> <p>The LEA presented some discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends, but the discussion lacks sufficient detail for the reviewer to be convinced that the reforms will indeed be sustained after the funding is gone.</p>	
<p>The LEA plan for retaining and/or replacing teachers and school leaders for the SIG turnaround model/intervention was limited with insufficient evidence included in the plan.</p> <p>The LEA provided a summary which contained little to no reference to additional funds that will be directly dedicated to supporting the implementation of the proposed SIG turnaround model/intervention.</p> <p>The LEA’s plan for recruiting new principals and/or teachers for the SIG turnaround model/intervention was limited with insufficient evidence included in the plan. The LEA provided minimal evidence showing support on behalf of the staff, leaders, and other stakeholders are in support of the turnaround model selected and provided minimal evidence of how the LEA decreased barriers in support of the selected turnaround model.</p> <p>The LEA’s description lacks sufficient information regarding additional/other elements of capacity that will be used to implement SIG model.</p> <p>The LEA, as applicable, presented little or no evidence to support the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality nor did the LEA outline how it intends to involve external providers in implementing its chosen SIG turnaround model/intervention.</p> <p>The LEA presented little or no evidence as to how it will align other resources available to the school and the District to carry out chosen a SIG turnaround model/intervention.</p>	<p>Inadequate (1-4 points)</p>

<p>The LEA provided little or no discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. The LEA presented little to no discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.</p> <p>The LEA presented limited discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends, additionally the discussion lacks sufficient detail for the reviewer to be convinced that the reforms will indeed be sustained after the funding is gone.</p>	
<p><i>Strengths:</i></p>	
<p><i>Weaknesses:</i></p>	
<p>Total Points: _____/10 points</p>	
<p>Tab A</p>	
<p>Overview: Proposed Plan for Funding Allocations for Individual Participating School Applying for SIG Funding (Points: N/A)</p>	
<p>Tab A</p>	
<p>School Needs Assessment (Points: 10 points)</p>	
<p>The LEA describes the process and findings of the needs assessment conducted on each school it commits to serve and the evidence used to select the intervention model to be implemented at each school. A description includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment instruments used <input type="checkbox"/> LEA and school personnel involved <input type="checkbox"/> Process for analyzing and selecting the intervention model <input type="checkbox"/> Findings on use of state-adopted standards-aligned materials and interventions <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum pacing and instruction time <input type="checkbox"/> Amount and types of PD, collaboration, and instructional support <input type="checkbox"/> Use of student data, alignment of resources, and staff effectiveness <input type="checkbox"/> Current interventions and their effectiveness 	
<p>The narrative includes a thorough and complete overview of the process used to assess schools, including specific instruments used, and multiple data elements cited.</p> <p>The narrative identifies a variety of qualified LEA, school,</p>	<p>Strong (8-10 points)</p>

<p>parents, and community stakeholders providing a range of perspectives involved in collecting and analyzing school data.</p> <p>The narrative describes a specific and effective process for analyzing assessment findings, including meetings of appropriate LEA and school personnel and school advisory groups to review findings and provide input on the needs analysis.</p> <p>The narrative includes discrete and specific findings concerning all of the areas listed in the RFA that led to the selection of the intervention.</p>	
<p>The narrative includes a general overview of the process used to assess schools, including specific instruments used, and multiple data elements cited.</p> <p>The narrative identifies LEA, school, and community stakeholders involved in collecting and analyzing school data, with a description of their level of involvement.</p> <p>The narrative describes a process for analyzing assessment findings, including a basic description of how LEA and school personnel and school advisory groups reviewed the findings and provided input.</p> <p>The narrative includes basic findings concerning all of the areas listed in the RFA that led to the selection of the intervention.</p>	<p>Adequate (5-7 points)</p>
<p>The narrative includes limited information on the process used to assess schools, including specific instruments used, and multiple sources cited.</p> <p>The narrative does not sufficiently describe a process for analyzing assessment findings.</p> <p>The narrative does not include findings concerning all of the areas listed in the RFA that led to the selection of the intervention.</p>	<p>Inadequate (1-4 points)</p>
<p><i>Strengths:</i></p>	
<p><i>Weaknesses:</i></p>	

Total Points: _____/10 points

Tab A

Annual Student Achievement Goals (Points: 10 points)

- The LEA has established annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in reading/language arts (ELA) mathematics, and high school graduation rates, where applicable, that it will use to monitor each Priority school it commits to serve.

The annual goals for student achievement are measurable, are based on the state's assessments in ELA and mathematics, and are clearly identified for each school that the LEA commits to serve.

The goals are realistic and reflect high expectations for improved student achievement, and are based on the needs of each school.

The plan for monitoring the identified goals is clearly described, includes specific timelines and procedures, and identifies the personnel responsible for its implementation.

Strong (8-10 points)

The annual goals for student achievement are measurable, are based on the state's assessments in ELA and mathematics, and are generally identified for each school that the LEA commits to serve.

The goals are realistic, project improved student achievement, and are based on the needs of each school.

The plan for monitoring the identified goals is described and includes clear implementation procedures.

Adequate (5-7 points)

The annual goals for student achievement are not sufficiently identified for each school that the LEA commits to serve.

The goals appear limited, project a minimal increase in student achievement, and/or are not based on the needs of each school.

The plan for monitoring the identified goals is inadequate or is not provided.

Inadequate (1-4 points)

<i>Strengths:</i>	
<i>Weaknesses:</i>	
Total Points: _____/10 points	

Tab A	
Demonstration of Capacity to Implement Selected Intervention Models (Points: 10 points)	
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA demonstrates its capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each “Priority” school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school turnaround model/intervention(s) it has selected.	
<p>The LEA fully describes how it will use SIG funding and all other available resources required to implement the turnaround model selected. The narrative includes extensive information on the specific use of each resource to support implementation of the planned school improvement activities.</p> <p>The description demonstrates that the LEA has fully identified the resource needs of each school and appropriately planned how resources will be used to achieve successful implementation of all activities planned for each school.</p>	Strong (8-10 points)
<p>The LEA describes how it will use SIG funding to implement the turnaround model selected. The narrative includes general information on how resources will be used to support implementation of the planned school improvement activities.</p> <p>The description demonstrates that the LEA has considered the differing resource needs of each school</p>	Adequate (5-7 points)

<p>in determining how SIG funding and other LEA resources will be used to address the specific needs of each school and lead to successful implementation.</p>	
<p>The LEA provides a limited description of how it will use SIG funding to implement the turnaround model selected. The narrative includes little or no information on how other resources will be used to support implementation of the planned school improvement activities.</p> <p>The description does not adequately demonstrate that the LEA has considered the differing resource needs at each school in determining how SIG funding and other LEA resources will be used to address the specific needs of each school and lead to successful implementation.</p>	<p>Inadequate (1-4 points)</p>
<p><i>Strengths:</i></p>	
<p><i>Weaknesses:</i></p>	
<p align="center">Total Points: _____ /10 points</p>	
<p>Tab A</p>	
<p>School's Student Profile Data (Points: N/A)</p>	
<p>Tab B</p>	
<p>Comprehensive Overview of the Seven Turnaround Principles (Points: 10 points)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The LEA will describe how SIG funds will be deployed in support of interventions and how each intervention will be aligned to the needs assessment and turnaround principle. <input type="checkbox"/> The LEA will describe the action plan for implementing the selected turnaround model/intervention over three years. <input type="checkbox"/> The LEA will describe in detail any services to be received by each school/campus, if any. <input type="checkbox"/> The LEA will describe their process for design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements (http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/2010-27313.pdf). 	

<p>Interventions are determined based upon student need and are specific to the needs of the District. The District-level action plan is unique to the district needs. Interventions are worded and research-based as effective school improvement strategies. All interventions are measurable and realistic. Interventions thoroughly support the attainment of the goal(s) and there is a clear alignment of the results of the needs assessment to the turnaround principles.</p> <p>Services are determined based upon student need and is specific to the needs of each building. Services are unique to each building's needs, not simply repeated.</p> <p>The LEA designed and implemented interventions consistent with the final requirements authorized under Section 1003(g) of Title I of the ESEA. The interventions clearly articulate the LEAs plan for implementing the school's SIG turnaround model/interventions.</p>	<p>Strong (8-10 points)</p>
<p>Interventions are based upon student need and are specific to the needs of the District. The District-level action plan is measurable and realistic. Interventions thoroughly support the attainment of the goal(s) however, there is little alignment of the results of the needs assessment to the turnaround principles.</p> <p>Services are determined based upon students' needs, however lack specificity to the needs of the students and building.</p> <p>The LEA designed and implemented interventions however the interventions show a lack of consistency with the final requirements authorized under Section 1003(g) of Title I of the ESEA. The interventions articulated are only satisfactory in articulating the LEAs plan for implementing the school's SIG turnaround model.</p>	<p>Adequate (5-7 points)</p>
<p>Generic goals and associated interventions are given. A District-level action plan does not exist. Interventions do not align to the results of the needs assessment and turnaround principles.</p> <p>Services do not appear to be unique to each building's student needs.</p> <p>The LEA provided little to no evidence of a plan that sufficiently implements interventions consistent with the final requirements authorized under Section 1003(g) of Title I of the ESEA.</p>	<p>Inadequate (1-4 points)</p>

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Total Points: _____ /10 points

Tab C

Explanation for Proposed Budget Items (Budget Narrative) (Points: 10 points)

The school and LEA budget(s) are aligned.

<p>The LEA and school budgets are clearly aligned and, taken together, fully describe appropriate expenditures of funds in all categories that are clearly sufficient to support the design, implementation and ongoing maintenance of the proposed SIG activities. The proposed expenditures reflect research-based strategies likely to increase student achievement.</p>	<p>Strong (8-10 points)</p>
---	-----------------------------

<p>The LEA and school budgets are aligned and, taken together, adequately describe expenditures of funds in all categories of the proposed SIG activities. The proposed expenditures reflect strategies likely to increase student achievement.</p>	<p>Adequate (5-7 points)</p>
---	------------------------------

<p>The LEA and school budgets are not clearly aligned, the LEA has not sufficiently described expenditures of funds in categories necessary to support proposed SIG activities, and/or proposed expenditures reflect strategies unlikely to increase student achievement</p>	<p>Inadequate (1-4 points)</p>
--	--------------------------------

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Total Points: _____/10 points

Tab D

Proposed Three Year Annual SIG Budget (Points: 10 points)

The LEA projected budget template is complete.

The LEA projected budget template is complete, expenditures are accurately classified by object code, the full term of the grant is covered, and totals by year are provided.	Strong (8-10 points)
---	----------------------

The LEA projected budget template is complete; expenditures are appropriately listed for the full term of the grant and totals by year are provided.	Adequate (5-7 points)
--	-----------------------

The LEA projected budget is incomplete, expenditures are not accurately classified by object code, and/or the full term of the grant is not covered.	Inadequate (1-4 points)
--	-------------------------

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Total Points: _____/10 points

OVERALL COMMENTS:

DRAFT

SECTION TOTALS	SCORE:
Applicant Information and Certification	N/A
Assurances: ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Funds	N/A
Assurances: General Education Provisions Act	N/A
Assurances: Additional Assurances (Office of the State Superintendent of Education)	N/A
Consultation	/10 points
Leading Indicators	/10 points
Lack of Capacity	N/A
Capacity of LEA and School/Campus and Sufficiency of Funds to Implement Turnaround Model/Intervention	/10 points
Overview: Proposed Plan for Funding Allocations for Individual	N/A

Participating School Applying for SIG Funding	
School Needs Assessment	/10 points
Annual Student Achievement Goals	/10 points
Demonstration of Capacity to Implement Selected Intervention Models	/10 points
School's Student Profile Data	N/A
Comprehensive Overview of the Seven Turnaround Principles	/10 points
Explanation for Proposed Budget Items (Budget Narrative)	/10 points
Proposed Three Year Annual SIG Budget	/10 points
FINAL SCORE:	

Fund Application?	YES/NO
If no, would you partially fund?	YES/NO
If yes, how much?	\$

DRAFT

APPENDIX C

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.

On Thursday, December 5, 2013, LeeTosha Henry, Program Analyst in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education presented at the Title I State Committee of Practitioners meeting held at the Office of the State Superintendent of Education in Washington, D.C. The meeting began promptly at 4:00pm and concluded around 6:30pm.

The SEA discussed the purpose of SIG, the impact of the SIG on Title I, and the SEAs goals as it relates to support Priority schools in the District. The SEA garnered feedback (see below) from the Committee of Practitioners regarding how the SEA can best support Priority school leaders in the implementation of the SIG as well as alignment between Title I funding and the SIG.

Participant Questions/Comments

Participant #1 Question – “In slide #4, why are there no scores for Eastern High School?”

Participant #2 Question – “Have you convened a school-based meeting regarding the ESEA Waiver?”

Participant #3 Comment – “I would like to talk off-line regarding specifics as to OSSE’s specific role in supporting Priority schools.”

Participant # 4 Question – “There appears to be overlap between OSSE, the Office of School Turnaround and the requirements in Indistar. How are the agencies working together to ensure that schools are not overburdened because the right hand doesn’t know what the left hand is doing?”

Participant # 5 Question (Email) – See Email Attached

Henry, LeeTosha (OSSE)

From: McKenzie-Thompson, Kenann (DCPS)
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 3:23 PM
To: Henry, LeeTosha (OSSE)
Cc: Cadet, Fabiola (DCPS)
Subject: RE: meeting follow up

Greetings,

Thanks for your reply. I wanted to make sure that the SIG process would be clear to us as well. Is it offered or do we need to initiate accessing those resources? I have copied my director of finance who may have a beat on this as well. Thanks, Kenann

From: Henry, LeeTosha (OSSE)
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 3:21 PM
To: McKenzie-Thompson, Kenann (DCPS)
Subject: RE: meeting follow up

Dr. McKenzie-Thompson,

My apologies for this oversight. Yes, Ballou HS is a Priority school as of SY 12-13. I will update the PowerPoint disseminated to reflect this. I will follow-up this email with a phone call to provide any clarity needed. Thanks so much.

LeeTosha Henry, Ph.D.
Program Analyst
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Office of the State Superintendent of Education
Government of the District of Columbia
810 First Street, NE
202-481-3797 (O)
202-257-2996 (M)
leetosha.henry@dc.gov
www.osse.dc.gov

From: McKenzie-Thompson, Kenann (DCPS)
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 11:23 AM
To: Henry, LeeTosha (OSSE)
Subject: meeting follow up

Greetings Dr. Henry,

Thank you for your presentation at the last DCCOP meeting. I had a follow up question. I work at Ballou HS and noticed we were not on your priority school list. I was curious to know if that is an updated list and if that impact our ability to access SIG funds. Thanks!

Kenann McKenzie-Thompson, Ph.D.

Director of Operations
F.W. Ballou High School
3401 4th Street, S.E.

Washington, D.C. 20032

Direct: (202) 645-7131 | Fax: (202) 645-3397

Web: www.balloudc.org | Twitter: @Balloudc

Sent with Knight P.R.I.D.E.

**** Please consider the environment and paper use before printing this e-mail ****

Look out for those in need this winter. When the temperature or wind chill is 32°F or below, the District issues a Hypothermia Alert. For assistance during an Alert, call the [Shelter Hotline](#) at **1-800-535-7252** or **311**.

311 Online District Residents Businesses Visitors Media Online Services



Office of the State Superintendent of Education

Search Search

dc.gov osse.dc.gov

- OSSE Home
- Services
- Programs
- Resources
- News Room
- Events
- State Board of Ed
- About OSSE



ADD THIS Text Resize

School Improvement Grant (SIG) FY 12 Waiver Request

Friday, November 15, 2013

OSSE is Requesting a Waiver from the United States Department of Education of FY 12 School Improvement Grant Funds.

School Improvement Grant SIG FY 12 Waiver Request

Comments

Leave a comment in the box below:

Submit

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

Powered by



This form was created inside of The District of Columbia.

[Report Abuse](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Additional Terms](#)

Attachment(s):



School Improvement Grant (SIG) FY 12 Waiver Request

198.98 KB

[PDF] This document is presented in Portable Document Format (PDF). A PDF reader is required for viewing. [Download a PDF Reader](#) or [learn more about PDFs](#).



School Improvement Grant (SIG) FY 12 Waiver Request

OSSE is requesting a waiver from the United States Department of Education to waive School Improvement Grant (SIG) FY 12 funding used for the purpose of implementing one of four SIG Turnaround models (Turnaround, Transformation, Restart and Closure) in the lowest-achieving schools (“Priority” schools). This request to extend the waiver, submitted pursuant to section 9401(d)(2) of the ESEA, would permit OSSE, in accordance with criteria developed by OSSE, to be thoughtful and strategic regarding the implementation of SIG models in Priority schools approved for SIG funding during SY 14-15.

OSSE seeks this extended waiver because if granted the opportunity to carryover one hundred percent of FY 12 funds in combination with FY 13 funding to run one competition (beginning SY 14-15), LEAs will have the necessary time to conduct adequate planning for true fidelity to the SIG models. OSSE believes that the additional time is in the public interest and will enable qualifying LEAs to ensure that Priority schools that are eligible to receive SIG funding are able to support effective implementation of selected SIG intervention models for a period of three years.



School 1: Proposed Three Year Annual SIG Fund Budgets

Below, provide a full proposed budget to be funded from a 1003(g) School Improvement Grant for each of the next three school years. For performance years 2 and 3, if the school has made progress toward meeting annual goals, on the leading indicators, and/or toward full implementation of the selected intervention, a renewal award may be made to the LEA for the school.

