

APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Indiana Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: 115 West Washington Street Suite 600  Indianapolis, IN 46204</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Cindy Hurst</p> <p>Position and Office: Title I Coordinator</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: 115 West Washington Street Suite 600 Indianapolis, IN 46204</p> <p>Telephone: 317*234*2145</p> <p>Fax:</p> <p>Email address: churst@doe.in.gov</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Mrs. Glenda Ritz</p>	<p>Telephone: 317*232*6665</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X </p>	<p>Date:  12/4/13</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>	

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:** Indiana



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

OMB Number: 1810-0682

Expiration Date: September 30, 2016

### Paperwork Burden Statement

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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

### **Purpose of the Program**

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

### **ESEA Flexibility**

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

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

### **Availability of Funds**

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

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

### **State and LEA Allocations**

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

### **Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners**

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

# FY 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

## SUBMISSION INFORMATION

### **Electronic Submission:**

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

The SEA should submit its FY 2013 application to [OESE.OST@ed.gov](mailto:OESE.OST@ed.gov).

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

### **Paper Submission:**

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

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

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

### **Application Deadline**

Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013.

### **For Further Information**

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: <b>Indiana Department of Education</b>	Applicant's Mailing Address: 115 West Washington Street Suite 600  Indianapolis, IN 46204
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant  Name: <b>Cindy Hurst</b>  Position and Office: <b>Title I Coordinator</b>  Contact's Mailing Address: 115 West Washington Street Suite 600 Indianapolis, IN 46204  Telephone: 317*234*2145  Fax:  Email address: churst@doe.in.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): <b>Mrs. Glenda Ritz</b>	Telephone: <b>317*232*6665</b>
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

## PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

### A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

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

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

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

#### SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

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

**EXAMPLE:**

#### 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

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

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			
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:</b>			<b>None</b>

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

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

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

**Indiana’s FY 13 SIG application for LEAs (Title I – 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2014-2015 School Year Grant Application) will prompt the LEA to complete a needs assessment that will ultimately lead the LEA to an informed decision as to the appropriate intervention model for its SIG schools.**

**In the LEA and School Data Section, Part 4 of Indiana’s LEA application, LEAs will be required to identify needs of overall students who did not pass ISTEP+ or ECA, as well as student subgroups which did not pass ISTEP+ or ECA. This data will be provided for both ELA and math. Included in the data provided will be: percentage and number of students in the group that did not pass, how severe the failure of the group is, how the needs of the group are unique, and goals for each SIG grant year. This piece is intended for LEAs to immediately identify needs of students within the school and develop long-term goals for improvement.**

**The second section of Part 4 asks LEAs to demonstrate how data was analyzed for instructional programs, school leadership, and school infrastructure. LEAs will also demonstrate justification for the selected interventions.**

**Part 4 of the LEA’s application review rubric will evaluate the LEAs analysis of the school needs. See attached scoring rubric.**

- (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.

**IDOE will require the LEA to complete the second section of Part 4 which asks LEAs to demonstrate how data was analyzed for instructional programs, school leadership, and school infrastructure, and demonstrate justification for the selected interventions. Additionally, Part 7 of the LEA application requires evidence regarding the LEAs capacity to implement the improvement model. LEAs must submit a budget for each school identified in its application to demonstrate its capacity to use the funding to provide adequate resources and supports to each school. The LEA is required to sign off on this piece as an assurance in the Indiana application. Additionally, as part of the budget section, the LEA will also provide budgetary documentation regarding other funding alignment in regards to SIG.**

- (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)

**Indiana will review each school’s annual budget for alignment of funding outside of the SIG and alignment with the interventions and action steps that are explained in the grant. LEAs will be identifying goals, specific action steps, and budgeted items within the model principals. Additionally, Indiana has added a “Year 4 Sustainability Goal” for which LEAs will have to consider what activities/personnel/support will be needed. Funding sources for those items, if necessary, will be identified in the application.**

**IDOE will determine if sufficient funds have been budgeted to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model and other grant requirements and determine if the funding is likely to lead to improved teacher instruction, principal leadership and student achievement.**

**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.

**Each part of the LEA application has a corresponding evaluation part in the scoring rubric (Title I – 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2014-2015 School Year Grant Application – RUBRIC). (See attached LEA application and scoring rubric.) The principles align as follows:**

- Part 5-Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
- Part 6-and Part 9: Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends;
- Part 7-Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively;

- Part 8-Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and;
- Part 9-Align other resources with the interventions.

Indiana’s FY 13 LEA SIG application was revised in response to issues with the identified points. Interventions did not align with final requirements nor did they appear to be part of a whole school reform effort (aligning with other resources). Additionally, selection (and subsequent monitoring) of external providers was not effective, and sustainability planning was a very small part of the focus. Indiana’s new application is designed to ensure that schools are more thoughtful about the plan for their school and how to best utilize funds.

The principles in each school improvement model have been organized around “culture” and “academic achievement”. Indiana’s revised application will ask schools to identify SMART goals for each area of the grant. LEAs must also identify action steps, persons responsible, timelines, and partnerships directly related to the smart goals. Indiana has also added a goal for sustainability as a way to ensure that LEAs are thinking long term about how to best utilize funds and continue improvement strategies and implementation after the funds are gone.

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

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA’s proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period<sup>2</sup> to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

Indiana’s application for 2013-2014 SIG funds includes a pre-implementation section, which asks schools to share what steps are being taken during the pre-implementation year to prepare for Year 1 of SIG. The application is designed to provide information pertaining to budgeted activities in Part 6, Part 7, and Part 9. These three areas will be reviewed with the rubric to ensure capacity prior to implementation. (See attached budget appendix and scoring rubric.)

(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?

Indiana will evaluate the pre-implementation for allowable, reasonable, and necessary expenditures and activities, per Indiana’s Title I Fiscal Guidance Handbook and Federal Regulations. Indiana’s scoring rubric evaluates pre-implementation to be sure any expenditure is not considered supplanting and are allowable, reasonable, and necessary. (See attached Scoring Rubric.)

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

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

Date	Activity
December 6, 2013	IDOE submits SEA application to USDOE for approval
March 1, 2014	IDOE releases LEA application

March 1, 2014	IDOE releases guidance for LEA application (i.e., webinar, guidance document, FAQ)
March 20, 2014	Provide a technical assistance training for interested schools
April 1, 2014	LEA applications due to IDOE
April 30, 2014	IDOE will make 3-Year Award Designations to Schools
May – July 2014	IDOE provides technical assistance and support for Cohort 5 LEAs and Schools
July 2014	Full implementation begins

**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.

**Indiana will ensure, as part of the application process, that SMART goals and activities are aligned to the needs of the school. The criteria for the goals will be (a) inclusion of one English/Language Arts and one mathematics goal for all students (b) aggressive yet attainable; and (c) measureable through ISTEP+ and/or end of course assessments. IDOE will conduct pre-training with its reviewers to achieve inter-rater reliability on the scoring rubric to ensure similar recognition of high quality and appropriate SMART goals.**

**Indiana has developed renewal applications for both Transformation and Turnaround schools (attached to this application). Part of the decision to continue an LEA’s award will be based on completion of the renewal application and measureable growth against their goals and leading indicators.**

(2) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals. If an SEA is requesting the priority schools list waiver, it need not provide this information, as it will have no Tier III schools.

**Not applicable. Indiana will use its list of priority schools for this application.**

(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.

**Indiana commits to monitor each school implementing a SIG grant three times during the school year**

**(using the process and report format attached to this application). Telephone calls will be made as needed regarding implementation of the model. The Office of Early Learning and Intervention (Title I) in collaboration with the Outreach Division of School Improvement will conduct onsite monitoring visits and complete monitoring reports.**

**To evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the school improvement models, IDOE will enlist a qualified independent partner to evaluate both the state's overall turnaround strategy and the interventions in individual schools. The external evaluator will utilize relevant school, LEA, and state data, including data resulting from SIG monitoring, in order to determine the fidelity of the intervention's implementation and its effectiveness. Finally, to ensure financial responsibility, each district will receive a 1003(g) fiscal review per year. Additional fiscal monitoring will be ongoing through the renewal and amendment processes.**

(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.

**Indiana will review and score each application received on a common rubric; each school will receive two initial reviews. Of the top rated, at minimum, a third review will be done to determine a final score. Schools with the highest scores will receive funding until funds are no longer available.**

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

**Not applicable. Indiana will use its list of priority schools for this grant.**

(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.

**Public Law 221 (PL 221) is Indiana's comprehensive accountability system for K-12 education. It was passed by the General Assembly in 2000, prior to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The law aimed to establish major education reform and accountability statewide. To measure progress, PL 221 places Indiana schools into one of five categories (i.e., A to F). Schools that remain in the lowest category, F, may receive one of the state interventions after their sixth consecutive year. If an intervention is necessary, any takeover school receiving a 1003(g) school improvement grant will be required to meet the final requirements as outlined in the 1003(g) school improvement grant.**

**Currently, three schools are in year five of F and are current SIG awardees: McGary Middle School in Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation and Lew Wallace STEM Academy and Watson Boys Academy in Gary Community School Corporation. If these schools were to enter into the sixth year of F status, then the Indiana State Board of Education would assign an intervention, such as assigning a Lead Partner or a management company (Turnaround School Operator, TSO) to lead interventions at the school. For example, five schools were assigned a TSO for the 2012-2013 school year. Each school was**

**removed from the authority of its LEA and operated like a charter school. Three other schools, all 1003(g) recipients in 2012-2013, were assigned Lead Partners. Their grants continued, but the external provider was replaced with a state assigned Lead Partner.**

**Regardless of the assigned intervention, the SIG principles would continue to be fulfilled.**

(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.

**Indiana has not identified any schools to which services will be directly provided at this time. This section will be amended, if necessary.**

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

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

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

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, as applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, as applicable, implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school or priority school, as applicable.

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

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

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

**Indiana has typically used administration funds to assign Lead Partners to schools during a state takeover event. Indiana may opt to do that for the 2014-2015 school year (this is not yet known at the time of submission). Administrative funds will also be used for the services of an external provider for the program. Any additional costs related to administration, personnel, or technical assistance would not exceed the 5% administrative reservation.**

**G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS**

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

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

**Indiana 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**

**Indiana 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.



# Indiana Department of Education

Glenda Ritz, NBCT  
Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

## Title I – 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2014-2015 School Year Grant Application

**LEAs must submit an application for EACH school applying for 1003(g).**

### Part I: Grantee Information

#### Applicant Information

School Corporation/ Eligible Entity		Corp #	
School		School #	
Superintendent Name		Email	
Title I Administrator Name		Email	
Principal		Email	
Mailing Address		City	Zip Cod
Telephone		Fax	
Total Funding Authorization			

#### Application Type

**Select one of the following options:**

- Turnaround
- Transformation
- Restart
- Closure

#### Important Dates

<b>Application Release</b>	Release application and guidance to LEAs	March 1, 2014
<b>Technical Assistance Training</b>	Offer technical assistance training to eligible Priority schools	March 20, 2014
<b>Application Due</b>	LEA application must be submitted to IDOE	April 1, 2014
<b>Notification</b>	SEA awards will be published and LEAs notified of 3-Year Awards	April 30, 2014
<b>Funds Available</b>	Funds will be available to grantees	July 1, 2014

## Part 2: LEA and School Assurances and Waivers

The LEA/Eligible Entity must provide the following assurances in its application. The LEA/Eligible Entity must be able to provide, upon request, evidence of compliance with each assurance.

- Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Priority school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements
- 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 and key school categories. Monitor each Priority school that an LEA serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable Priority schools that receive school improvement funds
- If an LEA implements a restart model in a Priority school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements
- 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
- Ensure that each Priority school that an LEA 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
- 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
- Collaboration with the Teacher's Union, include letters from the teachers' union with each school application indicating its agreement to fully participate in all components of the school improvement model selected
- Report to the SEA the school-level data required under leading indicators for the final requirements
- The LEA and School have consulted with all stakeholders regarding the LEA's intent to implement a new school improvement model.
- This application has been completed by a team consisting of a minimum of: one LEA central office staff, the building principal, at least two building staff members

**The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement.**

- "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Priority Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- Implementing a school-wide program in a Priority Title I participating school that does meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

**Superintendent Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title I Administrator Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Principal Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Staff Members Consulted and Part of the Application Process:**

**Workgroup Members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
<i>Example: Mrs. Joan Smith</i>	<i>Example: Title I Resource Teacher</i>







Complete the table below regarding key areas of student learning indicators. Include your 2012-2013 data, your goals for 2014-2015, as well as key findings related to this data.

Student Leading Indicators	2013-2014	2014-2015	Key Findings
1. Number of minutes within the school year that students are required to attend school			
2. Dropout rate*			
3. Student attendance rate (must be a percentage between 0.00 and 100.00)			
4. Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework* (e.g., AP/IB), or advanced math coursework			
5. Number of students completing dual enrollment classes			
6. Types of increased learning time offered LSY- Longer School Year LSD- Longer School Day BAS-Before/After School SS- Summer School WES-Weekend School OTH-Other			
7. Discipline incidents*			
8. Truants (# of unduplicated students, enter as a whole number)			
9. Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system			
10. Teacher attendance rate			

For the following categories, please demonstrate (1) how the LEA has analyzed specific needs for instructional programs, school leadership, and school infrastructure and (2) justification for the selected interventions for these areas.

Instructional Programs	
LEA analysis	

<b>Justification for Selected Interventions</b>	
---	--

<b>School Leadership</b>	
<b>LEA analysis</b>	
<b>Justification for Selected Interventions</b>	

<b>School Infrastructure</b>	
<b>LEA analysis</b>	
<b>Justification for Selected Interventions</b>	

## Part 5: Selection of Improvement Model

Based on our findings of the data sources, the LEA is selecting this model for this school:

- Turnaround       Transformation       Restart       Closure

**Instructions:** Reflect on the data, findings, root cause analysis, self-assessment and the elements of the four improvement models. As a team, reach consensus, as to the model that is the best fit for the school and that has the greatest likelihood, when implemented, to affect principal leadership, teacher instruction, and student learning.

**Describe how the model corresponds to the data, findings, analysis and self-assessment and led to the selected model.**

**Describe how the model will create teacher, principal, and student change.**

## Part 6: Improvement Model

Complete the appropriate intervention model of choice and **attach** with LEA and School Data.

## Part 7: LEA Capacity to Implement the Improvement Model

Capacity Task	Yes	No	District Evidence
<p>1. Projected budgets are sufficient and appropriate to support the full and effective implementation of the intervention for three years, while meeting all fiscal requirements and being reasonable, allocable, and necessary.</p>			
<p>2. The LEA and administrative staff has the credentials, demonstrated track record, and has made a three-year commitment to the implementation of the selected model.</p> <p><i>Turnaround and Transformation models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Ability to recruit new principals through partnerships with outside educational organizations and/or universities</i></li> <li>• <i>Statewide and national postings for administrative openings</i></li> <li>• <i>External networking</i></li> <li>• <i>Resumes provided</i></li> <li>• <i>Data examined to demonstrate track record</i></li> <li>• <i>Principal hiring process</i></li> <li>• <i>Principal transfer procedures/policies</i></li> </ul>			
<p>3. The School Board is fully committed to eliminating barriers, such as allowing for staffing, curriculum, calendar, and operational flexibility, to allow for the full implementation of the selected model.</p> <p><i>All models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>School Board Assurances</i></li> <li>• <i>School Board Meeting Minutes from proposal and or discussion</i></li> <li>• <i>Supports the creation of a new turnaround office (or reorganization if additional schools are being added within a district) with an appointed turnaround leader having significant and successful experience in changing schools</i></li> </ul>			
<p>4. The superintendent is fully committed to eliminating barriers, such as allowing for staffing, curriculum, calendar, and</p>			

<p>operational flexibility, to allow for the full implementation of the selected model.</p> <p><i>All models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Superintendent Assurance</i></li> <li>• <i>School Board Meeting Minutes from proposal and or discussion</i></li> <li>• <i>Superintendent SIG Presentation</i></li> <li>• <i>Creation of a new turnaround office (or reorganization if additional schools are being added within a district) with an appointed turnaround leader having significant and successful experience in changing schools</i></li> </ul>			
<p>5. The teacher’s union is fully committed to eliminating barriers to allow for the full implementation of the model, including but not limited to teacher evaluations, hiring and dismissal procedures and length of the school day.</p> <p><i>Turnaround, Transformation Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Teacher Union Assurance</i></li> <li>• <i>An outline of amendments to SIG Teacher contracts that will allow for full implementation of the identified model</i></li> </ul>			
<p>6. The district has a robust process in place to select the staff for each 1003(g) building.</p> <p><i>Turnaround, Transformation Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Teacher Union Assurance</i></li> <li>• <i>An outline of amendments to SIG Teacher contracts that will allow for full implementation of the identified model</i></li> <li>• <i>Principal ownership in staff hiring process</i></li> <li>• <i>Detailed and descriptive staff hiring process</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Staff transfer policies and procedures</i></li> <li>○ <i>Staff recruitment, placement, and retention procedures</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
<p>7. District staff has a process for monitoring and supporting the implementation of the selected improvement model.</p> <p><i>All Models</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Professional Development Calendar</i></li> <li>• <i>Curriculum and Assessment Calendar</i></li> <li>• <i>Parent Requirements</i></li> <li>• <i>Monitoring and Evaluation System</i></li> </ul>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Process</li> <li>• Data Review</li> <li>• Special Population Review</li> <li>• Fiscal Monitoring</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--

**Part 8: Selection of External Providers**

Capacity Task	Yes	No	District Evidence
<p>The LEA has or will recruit, screen, selects and support appropriate external providers.  <i>The IDOE will assess the LEA's commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers by requiring the LEA to document a process for assessing external provider quality which may include, but will not be limited to:</i></p>			
(a) Interviewing and analyzing external providers to determine evidence-based effectiveness, experience, expertise, and documentation to assure quality and efficiency of each external provider based on each schools identified SIG needs;			
(b) Selecting an external provider based upon the provider's commitment of timely and effective implementation and the ability to meet school needs;			
(c) Aligning the selection with existing efficiency and capacity of LEA and school resources, specifically time and personnel;			
(d) Assessing the services, including, but not limited to: communication, sources of data used to evaluate effectiveness, monitoring of records, in-school presence, recording and reporting of progress with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs.			

**Part 9: Budget**

Complete the budget worksheets (1) including other funding areas and alignment to SIG, and (2) for **each** of the three years of the SIG. Attach with LEA and School Data.



SAMPLE

Indiana  
Department of Education

Glenda Ritz, NBCT

Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

School Improvement Grant (1003g)

Part 9 -- BUDGET

Alignment of Other Funding

Sources to SIG Elements

<i>Element of the Intervention</i>	<i>Intervention</i>	<i>Resources</i>
<b>FEDERAL RESOURCES</b>		

Use of research-based instructional practices that are vertically aligned across grade levels and the state standards	Turnaround Transformation Restart	Title I, Part A - regular and stimulus funds (schoolwide or targeted assistance programs)
Assistance with design and implementation of improvement plan including high-quality job-embedded professional development designed to assist schools in implementing the intervention model	Turnaround Transformation Restart	1003(a) School Improvement Grant - AYP funds
Recruitment of teaching staff with skills and experience to effectively implement the selected intervention model	Turnaround Transformation	Title II, Part A
Job-embedded staff development aligned to grant goals to assist English language learners	Turnaround Transformation Restart	Title III, Part A - LEP

<i>Element of the Intervention</i>	<i>Intervention</i>	<i>Resources</i>
<b>STATE RESOURCES</b>		

Focuses on early grade level intervention to improve the reading readiness and reading skills of students who are at risk of not learning to read	Turnaround Transformation Restart	Early Intervention Grant
High ability grants to provide resources that support high ability students	Turnaround Transformation Restart	High Ability Grant

Required Funding Alignment Section of Budget



School Improvement Grant (1003g)

Part 9 -- BUDGET

Alignment of Other Funding

Sources to SIG Elements

<i>Element of the Intervention</i>	<i>Intervention</i>	<i>Resources</i>
<b>FEDERAL RESOURCES</b>		

<i>Element of the Intervention</i>	<i>Intervention</i>	<i>Resources</i>
<b>STATE RESOURCES</b>		







School Improvement Grant (1003g)  
Part 9 -- BUDGET  
School Year 2015-2016  
Year 2

Note: The total amount of funding per year must total **no less than \$50,000** and **no greater than \$2,000,000** per year.  
The original approved allocation amount cannot be increased through an amendment.  
All administrative costs - personnel, travel, supplies, etc. - **MUST** be noted in blue.

Corporation Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Corporation Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
School Name: \_\_\_\_\_

ACCOUNT NO.	FTE	Cert.	Noncert.	EXPENDITURE DESCRIPTION	SUBTOTAL	LINE ITEM TOTAL
<b>1. PERSONNEL (include positions and names)</b>						
	0.00	<b>TOTAL SALARIES</b>			\$ -	\$ -
<b>2. Benefits: Benefits should be based on actual known costs or an established formula. Fixed charges/benefits below are for the personnel listed under PERSONNEL above and only for the percentage of time devoted to this project.</b>						
				<b>TOTAL FIXED CHARGES / FRINGE BENEFITS</b>		
<b>3. TRAVEL: (differentiate in-state and out-of-state)</b>						
				out-of-state		
				out-of-state		
				in-state		
				in-state		
				<b>TOTAL TRAVEL</b>		\$ -
<b>4. CONTRACTED SERVICES: (List the type of contracted services to be provided, including the vendor's name, if applicable.)</b>						
				<b>TOTAL CONTRACTED SERVICES</b>		\$ -
<b>5. SUPPLIES: Enter the total amount of materials and supplies. Provide a list of supplies on a separate sheet. (Include the total amount to be used to purchase testing, programmatic and/or office supplies.)</b>						
				<b>TOTAL SUPPLIES</b>		\$ -
<b>6. EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY: Enter the total amount of equipment and technology purchases. Provide a list of equipment and technology on a separate sheet. Equipment is defined as "tangible, non-expendable/non-consumable personal property having a useful lifespan of more than one year".</b>						
				<b>TOTAL EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY</b>		\$ -
<b>7. OTHER SERVICES: (Include a specific description of services.)</b>						
				<b>INDIRECT COST (2.07%)</b>		\$ -
<b>TOTAL ANTICIPATED EXPENDITURES (SUM OF SECTIONS 1-7 OF THIS FORM).</b>						\$ -





School Improvement Grant (1003g)  
Section 9 - BUDGET  
School Year 2016-2017  
Year 3

Note: The total amount of funding per year must total no less than \$50,000 and no greater than \$2,000,000 per year.  
The original approved allocation amount cannot be increased through an amendment.  
All administrative costs - personnel, travel, supplies, etc. - MUST be noted in blue.

Corporation Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Corporation Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
School Name: \_\_\_\_\_

ACCOUNT NO.	FTE	Cert.	Noncert.	EXPENDITURE DESCRIPTION	SUBTOTAL	LINE ITEM TOTAL
<b>1. PERSONNEL (include positions and names)</b>						
	0.00	<b>TOTAL SALARIES</b>			\$ -	\$ -
<b>2. Benefits: Benefits should be based on actual known costs or an established formula. Fixed charges/benefits below are for the personnel listed under PERSONNEL above and only for the percentage of time devoted to this project.</b>						
				<b>TOTAL FIXED CHARGES / FRINGE BENEFITS</b>		
<b>3. TRAVEL: (differentiate in-state and out-of-state)</b>						
				out-of-state		
				out-of-state		
				in-state		
				in-state		
				<b>TOTAL TRAVEL</b>		\$ -
<b>4. CONTRACTED SERVICES: (List the type of contracted services to be provided, including the vendor's name, if applicable.)</b>						
				<b>TOTAL CONTRACTED SERVICES</b>		\$ -
<b>5. SUPPLIES: Enter the total amount of materials and supplies. Provide a list of supplies on a separate sheet. (Include the total amount to be used to purchase testing, programmatic and/or office supplies.)</b>						
				<b>TOTAL SUPPLIES</b>		\$ -
<b>6. EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY: Enter the total amount of equipment and technology purchases. Provide a list of equipment and technology on a separate sheet. Equipment is defined as "tangible, non-expendable/non-consumable personal property having a useful lifespan of more than one year".</b>						
				<b>TOTAL EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY</b>		\$ -
<b>7. OTHER SERVICES: (Include a specific description of services.)</b>						
				<b>INDIRECT COST (2.07%)</b>		\$ -
<b>TOTAL ANTICIPATED EXPENDITURES (SUM OF SECTIONS 1-7 OF THIS FORM).</b>						\$ -















**cover costs.**

**OTHER FUNDING SOURCE**


--



to add a line for additional items, insert line in MIDDLE of chart section for line item total to automatically compute


--

--



--





# Indiana Department of Education

**Glenda Ritz, NBCT**  
Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

## Title I – 1003(g) School Improvement Grant 2014-2015 School Year Grant Application–RUBRIC

### Part 1: Grantee Information

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points
Missing two or more areas of information	Missing one area of information	All areas of information complete

### Part 2: LEA and School Assurances and Waivers

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points
Missing two or more assurances	Missing one assurance	All areas of assurances complete

### Part 3: Schools to be Served by LEA

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points
Missing multiple eligible schools, or missing multiple explanations/capacity to serve.	Missing eligible school, or missing explanation/capacity to serve.	All eligible schools are accounted for and models selected, or explanation given for why LEA does not have capacity to serve.

### Part 4: Needs Assessment and Goals

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points
<p>Little or nocompletion of testing: data with goals; student leading indicators; key findings; analysis of instructional program, school leadership, and school infrastructure needs with selected interventions.</p> <p>Little to none of the required data sources have been provided and/or the analysis (findings) is lacking or minimal</p> <p>Little or no use of analysis and/or causes are illogical and not based on data</p> <p>The alignment of the school, its needs, and the improvement model chosen is lacking or minimal.</p>	<p>Some completion of testing: data with goals; student leading indicators; key findings; analysis of instructional program, school leadership, and school infrastructure needs with selected interventions.</p> <p>Some of the required data sources have been provided</p> <p>Some of the analysis (findings) from the data and goals and interventions seem accurate</p> <p>A general alignment between the needs of the school and the model chosen has been demonstrated.</p>	<p>Full completion of testing: data with goals; student leading indicators; key findings; analysis of instructional program, school leadership, and school infrastructure needs with selected interventions.</p> <p>All of the required data sources have been provided</p> <p>All of the analysis (findings) from the data and the goals and interventions are logical</p> <p>The alignment between the needs of the school and the model chosen is specifically and conclusively demonstrated as appropriate.</p>

## Part 5: Selection of Intervention Model

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points
<p>Model chosen</p> <p>Description minimally covers how the model corresponds to the data, findings, analysis, and self-assessment.</p> <p>Description does not include ways in which the model will cover areas of teacher, principal, and student change in the building.</p>	<p>Model chosen</p> <p>Description is clear, concise, and covers some areas of how the model corresponds to the data, findings, analysis, and self-assessment.</p> <p>Description includes some ways in which the model will cover teacher, principal, and student change in the building.</p>	<p>Model chosen</p> <p>Description is clear, concise, and covers all areas of how the model corresponds to the data, findings, analysis, and self-assessment.</p> <p>Description includes clear and complete ways in which the model will cover all areas of teacher, principal, and student change in the building.</p>

## Part 6: Improvement Model

<i>Transformation Model</i>			
	Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points
<b>Pre-Implementation</b>	<p>Less than four areas of pre-implementation are being addressed.</p> <p>Expenditures taking place in pre-implementation year could be considered supplanting (expenditures discussed in pre-implementation year are also included in grant proposal budget), and/or are not considered reasonable, allocable, and necessary.</p> <p>Capital Expenses taking place in pre-implementation, being paid for with Title I funds, are not in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c)</p>	<p>At least five areas of pre-implementation are being addressed.</p> <p>Some expenditures taking place in pre-implementation year may be considered supplanting (some expenditures discussed in pre-implementation year are also included in grant proposal budget), or are not considered reasonable, allocable, and necessary.</p> <p>Capital Expenses taking place in pre-implementation, being paid for with Title I funds, may not be in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533</p>	<p>All areas of pre-implementation are addressed.</p> <p>Any expenditures taking place in pre-implementation year would not be considered supplanting (expenditures discussed in pre-implementation year are not included in grant proposal budget), and are considered reasonable, allocable, and necessary.</p> <p>Capital Expenses taking place in pre-implementation, being paid for with Title I funds, are in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building</p>

	(minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).	(construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).	alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).
<b>Culture</b>	Five or less of the Culture-related Transformation Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.	Six of the Culture-related Transformation Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.	All Culture-related Transformation Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.
SMART Goal	SMART goal is missing multiple areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely – and/or are not aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goal is missing one area – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and is aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goal covers all areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and is aligned to the needs of school.
Sustainability Goal	There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  Multiple principles are not adequately planned for.	There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  At least one principle is not adequately planned for.	There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  All principles are exceptionally planned for.
<i>Replace the principal who led the school prior to implementing the model</i>	Principal is replaced with one having an ineffective track record.	Principal is replaced with one without evidence of a proven track record.	Principal is replaced with one that has evidence of a proven track record; or the LEA can demonstrate that a principal was replaced within the last two years: the prior principal in the school was replaced as part of a broader reform effort; <b>and</b> the new principal has the experience and skills needed to implement successfully a turnaround, restart, or transformation model.
<i>Use evaluation systems for teachers and principals that consider student growth and assessments; develop with teacher/principal involvement</i>	Evaluation systems for principal and teachers do not include an assessment aligned to student academic growth.  Evaluation system development does not include involvement of principal or teachers.	Evaluation systems for principal and teachers includes a single assessment aligned to student academic growth.  Evaluation systems are developed with teachers' or principals involvement.	Evaluation systems for principal and teachers includes multiple assessments aligned to student academic growth.  Evaluation systems are developed with teachers' and principal involvement.
<i>Reward school leaders, teachers, staff who, in implementing this model, increased student achievement or high school graduation rates; remove those who, after professional development, have not</i>	Rewards for school leaders, teachers and staff implementing this model have not been determined using tools and rubrics that are data driven and reflect an increase in student achievement or high school	Rewards for school leaders, teachers and staff implementing this model have been determined using tools and rubrics that are data driven and reflect an increase in student achievement or high school	Rewards for school leaders, teachers and staff implementing this model have been determined using tools and rubrics that are data driven and reflect an increase in student achievement or high school

	<p>graduation rates.</p> <p>Awards not described or do not correspond to effective practices of retaining teachers and thus are unlikely motivators.</p> <p>Description for assisting teachers who are not improving student learning or graduation rates is not given, not detailed, or not likely to change teachers' practices.</p>	<p>graduation rates.</p> <p>The awards correspond to effective practices of retaining teachers such as improving working conditions, increasing financial compensation, and/or providing job promotions.</p> <p>Provides description of effective and logical process for assisting teachers (e.g., providing additional professional, mentoring) who are not improving student learning or graduation rates.</p>	<p>graduation rates.</p> <p>The awards correspond to effective practices of retaining teachers such as improving working conditions, increasing financial compensation, and/or providing job promotions as identified by staff through a survey or needs assessment.</p> <p>Provides a comprehensive, effective, and logical process for assisting teachers (e.g., providing additional professional, mentoring) who are not improving student learning or graduation rates; plan must provide an implementation timeline and pathways for improvement or release.</p>
<p><i>Provide high quality, job-embedded professional development</i></p>	<p>Topics of professional development are disparate; do not align to SIG goals, needs assessments or other data points; established by the LEA; not differentiated by teacher need.</p> <p>Professional development is rarely provided at the school; usually occurs as a whole district.</p> <p>Focus of professional development is not related to teacher collaboration, coaching and mentoring, data analysis or curriculum and instruction.</p>	<p>Topics of professional development are connected to the SIG goals, needs assessments, and other data points; but, not differentiated by teacher need.</p> <p>Professional development is conducted monthly through job-embedded opportunities at the school.</p> <p>Professional development often includes vertical collaboration; may include coaching and mentoring, data analysis, or determining appropriate curriculum and instruction.</p>	<p>Topics of professional development are determined by SIG goals, needs assessments, and other data points; professional development is differentiated by teacher need.</p> <p>Professional development is conducted weekly through job-embedded opportunities at the school.</p> <p>Professional development includes vertical and horizontal collaboration, coaching and mentoring, data analysis, and determining appropriate curriculum and instruction.</p>
<p><i>Implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff (financial incentives, promotion, careergrowth, flexible work time)</i></p>	<p>Strategies for recruitment and retention do not correspond with strategies known to be effective.</p> <p>No Mentors or coaches are included.</p>	<p>Recruitment and retention of staff includes at least two strategies known to be effective, such as improving working conditions, providing higher salaries, and/or offering job promotions.</p> <p>Mentors and/or coaches are provided</p>	<p>Recruitment and retention of staff includes at least three strategies known to be effective, such as improving working conditions, providing higher salaries, and offering job promotions.</p> <p>Mentors and/or coaches are provided</p>

		for identified groups of teachers, such as newer teachers or those changing grade levels.	for all staff.
<i>Provide increased learning time for students and staff</i>	Does not provide increased learning time for all students and staff.  Time is not of sufficient length (90 hours or less) to create change.	Provides increased learning time for all students and staff.  Time is of sufficient length (at least 180 hours) to potentially increase learning.	Provides increased, intentional learning time driven by student data indicated for all students and staff.  Time is of extensive length (at least 300 hours) to potentially increase learning.
<i>Provide mechanisms for family and community engagement</i>	LEA did not conduct a community-wide assessment to identify the major factors that significantly affect the academic achievement of students in the school, including an inventory of the resources in the community that could be aligned, integrated, and coordinated to address these challenges.	LEA conducts a basic, community-wide assessment to identify the major factors that significantly affect the academic achievement of students in the school, including an inventory of the resources in the community that could be aligned, integrated, and coordinated to address these challenges.	LEA conducts a comprehensive, community-wide assessment to identify the major factors that significantly affect the academic achievement of students in the school, including an inventory of the resources in the community that could be aligned, integrated, and coordinated to address these challenges.
<i>Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (staffing, calendars/time, budgeting)</i>	LEA does not provide a document or plan that indicates authority will be granted to the school to make operational decisions; or the decisions allowed are not of significance.	LEA provides a document or plan that indicates areas that will grant minor operational decisions to the school	LEA provides a comprehensive documents or plan that indicates areas that will grant significant operational decisions to the school
<i>LEA and, SEA supports school with ongoing, intensive technical assistance and support</i>	No supports are described; support appears sporadic.  Support for both teachers and principals are not in place or transparent.  Provided by district staff or others without proven track records in school change or the model.	Some supports detailed; support occurs throughout the year.  Some supports for both teachers and principals are in place.  Provided by external leaders in change with knowledge of the identified school model.	Multiple supports detailed; support occurs throughout the year.  Multiple supports for both teachers and principals are in place.  Provided by external, experienced leaders in change and in the school model.
<b>Academics</b>	Only one of the Academic-related Transformation Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.	Two of the Academic-related Transformation Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.	All Academic-related Transformation Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.
SMART Goal	SMART goals are not provided for ELA and Math, are missing multiple areas – specific, measurable,	SMART goals are provided for both ELA and Math, but are missing one area – specific, measurable, attainable,	SMART goals are provided for both ELA and Math, cover all areas – specific, measurable, attainable,

	attainable, realistic, and timely – and/or are not aligned to the needs of school.	realistic, and timely. SMART goals are aligned to the needs of school.	realistic, and timely - and are aligned to the needs of school.
Sustainability Goal	There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  Multiple principles are not adequately planned for.	There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  At least one principle is not adequately planned for.	There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  All principles are exceptionally planned for.
<i>Use data to implement an aligned instructional program</i>	LEA provides minimal assessments with no data; technology is not used.  LEA rarely provides professional development for teachers to increase skills in conducting assessments and using results to inform instruction.	LEA provides some assessments and data with minimal technology for the school to align its instructional program.  LEA provides professional development in conducting and using assessment results to inform instruction throughout the year.	LEA provides multiple assessments and data points through technology-based resources for the school to align its instructional program.  LEA provides intensive and ongoing professional development in conducting and using assessment results to inform instructional decision making throughout the year.
<i>Promote the use of data to inform and differentiated instruction</i>	Rarely provides time for teachers to collaborate and analyze student data and make instructional decisions.  Provides professional development that occurs outside of the classroom and does not focus on live student data or on improving differentiated instruction.	Provide regular time (e.g., monthly) for teachers to collaborate and analyze student data and make instructional decisions.  Provides job-embedded professional development to increase knowledge of differentiated instruction.	Provides frequent structured time (e.g., weekly) for teachers to collaborate and analyze student data and make instructional decisions.  Provides extended, job-embedded professional development that includes observation and coaching to increase knowledge of differentiated instruction.
<i>LEA and, SEA supports school with ongoing, intensive technical assistance and support.</i>	No academic supports are described; support appears sporadic.  Academic support for both teachers and principals are not in place or transparent.  Provided by district staff or others without proven track records in school change or the model.	Some academic supports detailed; support occurs throughout the year.  Some academic supports for both teachers and principals are in place.  Provided by external leaders in change with knowledge of the identified school model.	Multiple academic supports detailed; support occurs throughout the year.  Multiple academic supports for both teachers and principals are in place.  Provided by external, experienced leaders in change and in the school model.

<b>Turnaround Model</b>			
	<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>
<b>Pre-Implementation</b>	<p>Less than four areas of pre-implementation are being addressed.</p> <p>Expenditures taking place in pre-implementation year could be considered supplanting (expenditures discussed in pre-implementation year are also included in grant proposal budget), and/or are not considered reasonable, allocable, and necessary.</p> <p>Capital Expenses taking place in pre-implementation, being paid for with Title I funds, are not in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).</p>	<p>At least five areas of pre-implementation are being addressed.</p> <p>Some expenditures taking place in pre-implementation year may be considered supplanting (some expenditures discussed in pre-implementation year are also included in grant proposal budget), or are not considered reasonable, allocable, and necessary.</p> <p>Capital Expenses taking place in pre-implementation, being paid for with Title I funds, may not be in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).</p>	<p>All areas of pre-implementation are addressed.</p> <p>Any expenditures taking place in pre-implementation year would not be considered supplanting (expenditures discussed in pre-implementation year are not included in grant proposal budget), and are considered reasonable, allocable, and necessary.</p> <p>Capital Expenses taking place in pre-implementation, being paid for with Title I funds, are in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).</p>
<b>Culture</b>	Less than four of the Culture-related Turnaround Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.	Five of the Culture-related Turnaround Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.	All Culture-related Turnaround Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.
<b>SMART Goal</b>	SMART goal is missing multiple areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely – and/or are not aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goal is missing one area – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and is aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goal covers all areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and is aligned to the needs of school.
<b>Sustainability Goal</b>	<p>There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.</p> <p>Multiple principles are not adequately planned for.</p>	<p>There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.</p> <p>At least one principle is not adequately planned for.</p>	<p>There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.</p> <p>All principles are exceptionally planned for.</p>
<i>Replace the principal and grant principal operational flexibility</i>	<p>Principal is replaced with one having an ineffective track record.</p> <p>LEA does not provide a document or plan that indicates authority will be</p>	<p>Principal is replaced with one without evidence of a proven track record.</p> <p>LEA provides a document or plan that indicates areas that will grant minor</p>	<p>Principal is replaced with one that has evidence of a proven track record; or the LEA can demonstrate that a principal was replaced within the last two years: the prior principal in the</p>

	<p>granted to the principal to make operational decisions; or the decisions allowed are not of significance.</p>	<p>operational decisions to the principal.</p>	<p>school was replaced as part of a broader reform effort; <b>and</b> the new principal has the experience and skills needed to implement successfully a turnaround, restart, or transformation model.</p> <p>LEA provides a comprehensive documents or plan that indicates areas that will grant significant operational decisions to the principal.</p>
<p><i>Measure the effectiveness of current staff; screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; select new staff</i></p>	<p>LEA calibrates and tracks the effectiveness of staff using classroom observations or another single source to determine effectiveness.</p> <p>Screening of current staff is conducted by the school or district; interview questions are of insufficient nature to determine staff's willingness to implement the model.</p> <p>Less than 50 percent of the staff is rehired.</p>	<p>LEA calibrates and tracks the effectiveness of staff using classroom observation records and one additional source to determine effectiveness.</p> <p>Screening of current staff is conducted by a team of school and district personnel; interview questions are general in nature and offer some insight in the staff's willingness to implement the model.</p> <p>50 percent of the staff is rehired.</p>	<p>LEA calibrates and tracks the effectiveness of staff using classroom observation records and at least two additional sources to determine effectiveness.</p> <p>Screening of current staff is conducted by a team of school and district personnel and an external partner; interview questions are rigorous and relevant to determine the staff's willingness to fully implement the model.</p> <p>More than 50 percent of the staff is rehired.</p>
<p><i>Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff (financial incentives, promotion, career growth, and flexible work conditions)</i></p>	<p>Strategies for recruitment and retention do not correspond with strategies known to be effective.</p> <p>No Mentors or coaches are included.</p>	<p>Recruitment and retention of staff includes at least two strategies known to be effective, such as improving working conditions, providing higher salaries, and/or offering job promotions.</p> <p>Mentors and/or coaches are provided for identified groups of teachers, such as newer teachers or those changing grade levels.</p>	<p>Recruitment and retention of staff includes at least three strategies known to be effective, such as improving working conditions, providing higher salaries, and offering job promotions.</p> <p>Mentors and/or coaches are provided for all staff.</p>
<p><i>Provide high quality, job-embedded professional development</i></p>	<p>Topics of professional development are disparate; do not align to SIG goals, needs assessments or other data points; established by the LEA;</p>	<p>Topics of professional development are connected to the SIG goals, needs assessments, and other data points; but, not differentiated by teacher</p>	<p>Topics of professional development are determined by SIG goals, needs assessments, and other data points; professional development is</p>

	<p>not differentiated by teacher need.</p> <p>Professional development is rarely provided at the school; usually occurs as a whole district.</p> <p>Focus of professional development is not related to teacher collaboration, coaching and mentoring, data analysis or curriculum and instruction.</p>	<p>need.</p> <p>Professional development is conducted monthly through job-embedded opportunities at the school.</p> <p>Professional development often includes vertical collaboration; may include coaching and mentoring, data analysis, or determining appropriate curriculum and instruction.</p>	<p>differentiated by teacher need.</p> <p>Professional development is conducted weekly through job-embedded opportunities at the school.</p> <p>Professional development includes vertical and horizontal collaboration, coaching and mentoring, data analysis, and determining appropriate curriculum and instruction.</p>
<p><i>Adopt a new governance structure (i.e., turnaround office, turnaround leader)</i></p>	<p>Reshuffles or redesigns its current structure rather than creating a turnaround office and appointing a turnaround leader.</p> <p>Turnaround leader and staff provides minimal and/or inconsistent support and time in the school.</p>	<p>Creates a new turnaround office and/or appoints a turnaround leader with successful experience in school turnaround.</p> <p>Turnaround leader and staff will spend some time in the school allowing for a supportive relationship with the school.</p>	<p>Creates a new turnaround office with an appointed turnaround leader who has significant and successful experience in school turnaround.</p> <p>Turnaround leader and staff will spend extensive time in the school allowing for a highly visible, supportive, and transparent relationship with the school.</p>
<p><i>Provide social-emotional and community-oriented services/supports</i></p>	<p>Does not collaborate with external organizations; support to families is limited.</p> <p>No partnerships in the community to provide family and community engagement activities.</p>	<p>Collaborates with minimal external organizations or community partners to provide space and services for student needs, (e.g., dental, medical, behavioral, etc) as needed.</p> <p>Works with community to provide limited family and community engagement activities.</p>	<p>Collaborates with several external organizations and community partners to provide sustainable space and services for student needs, (e.g., dental, medical, behavioral, etc).</p> <p>Works with community to provide on-going and consistent family and community engagement activities.</p>
<p><b>Academics</b></p>	<p>Only one of the Academic-related Turnaround Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.</p>	<p>Two of the Academic-related Turnaround Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.</p>	<p>All Academic-related Turnaround Principles have action steps, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items clearly described.</p>
<p>SMART Goal</p>	<p>SMART goals are not provided for ELA and Math, are missing multiple areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely – and/or are not aligned to the needs of school.</p>	<p>SMART goals are provided for both ELA and Math, but is missing one area – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely. SMART goals are aligned to the needs of school.</p>	<p>SMART goals are provided for both ELA and Math, cover all areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and are aligned to the needs of school.</p>
<p>Sustainability Goal</p>	<p>There is inadequate evidence of a</p>	<p>There is adequate evidence of a</p>	<p>There is exceptional evidence of a</p>

	<p>process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.</p> <p>Multiple principles are not adequately planned for.</p>	<p>process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.</p> <p>At least one principle is not adequately planned for.</p>	<p>process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.</p> <p>All principles are exceptionally planned for.</p>
<i>Use data to implement an aligned instructional program</i>	<p>LEA provides minimal assessments with no data; technology is not used.</p> <p>LEA rarely provides professional development for teachers to increase skills in conducting assessments and using results to inform instruction.</p>	<p>LEA provides some assessments and data with minimal technology for the school to align its instructional program.</p> <p>LEA provides professional development in conducting and using assessment results to inform instruction throughout the year.</p>	<p>LEA provides multiple assessments and data points through technology-based resources for the school to align its instructional program.</p> <p>LEA provides intensive and ongoing professional development in conducting and using assessment results to inform instructional decision making throughout the year.</p>
<i>Promote the use of data to inform and differentiated instruction</i>	<p>Rarely provides time for teachers to collaborate and analyze student data and make instructional decisions.</p> <p>Provides professional development that occurs outside of the classroom and does not focus on live student data or on improving differentiated instruction.</p>	<p>Provide regular time (e.g., monthly) for teachers to collaborate and analyze student data and make instructional decisions.</p> <p>Provides job-embedded professional development to increase knowledge of differentiated instruction.</p>	<p>Provides frequent structured time (e.g., weekly) for teachers to collaborate and analyze student data and make instructional decisions.</p> <p>Provides extended, job-embedded professional development that includes observation and coaching to increase knowledge of differentiated instruction.</p>
<i>Provide increased learning time for students and staff</i>	<p>Does not provide increased learning time for all students and staff.</p> <p>Time is not of sufficient length (90 hours or less) to create change.</p>	<p>Provides increased learning time for all students and staff.</p> <p>Time is of sufficient length (at least 180 hours) to potentially increase learning</p>	<p>Provides increased, intentional learning time driven by student data indicated for all students and staff.</p> <p>Time is of extensive length (at least 300 hours) to potentially increase learning.</p>

<b>Restart</b>			
	<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>
<b>Pre-Implementation</b>	<p>Less than four areas of pre-implementation are being addressed.</p> <p>Expenditures taking place in pre-</p>	<p>At least five areas of pre-implementation are being addressed.</p> <p>Some expenditures taking place in</p>	<p>All areas of pre-implementation are addressed.</p> <p>Any expenditures taking place in pre-</p>

	implementation year could be considered supplanting (expenditures discussed in pre-implementation year are also included in grant proposal budget), and/or are not considered reasonable, allocable, and necessary.	pre-implementation year may be considered supplanting (some expenditures discussed in pre-implementation year are also included in grant proposal budget), or are not considered reasonable, allocable, and necessary.	implementation year would not be considered supplanting (expenditures discussed in pre-implementation year are not included in grant proposal budget), and are considered reasonable, allocable, and necessary.
<b>Culture</b>	Culture Element does not adequately and clearly describe action steps taken, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items.	Culture Element adequately and clearly describes at least three of the following: action steps taken, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items.	Culture Element adequately and clearly describes action steps taken, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items.
SMART Goal	SMART goal is missing multiple areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely – and/or is not aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goal is missing one area – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and is aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goal covers all areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and is aligned to the needs of school.
<b>Academic</b>	Academic Element does not adequately and clearly describe action steps taken, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items.	Academic Element adequately and clearly describes at least three of the following: action steps taken, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items.	Academic Element adequately and clearly describes action steps taken, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items.
SMART Goal	SMART goals are not provided for ELA and Math, are missing multiple areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely – and/or are not aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goals are provided for both ELA and Math, but is missing one area – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely. SMART goals are aligned to the needs of school.	SMART goals are provided for both ELA and Math, cover all areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and are aligned to the needs of school.
Sustainability Goal	There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  Multiple principles are not adequately planned for.	There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  At least one principle is not adequately planned for.	There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  All principles are exceptionally planned for.

<b>Closure</b>			
	<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>
<b>Pre-Implementation</b>	Pre-implementation consultation with other schools not- adequately described.	Pre-implementation consultation with other schools adequately described.	Pre-implementation consultation with other schools clearly and exceptionally described.

<b>Culture</b>	Culture Elements do not adequately and clearly describe action steps taken, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items.	Culture Elements adequately and clearly describes at least three of the following: action steps taken, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items.	Culture Elements adequately and clearly describe action steps taken, person(s) responsible, timeline, and budgeted items.
SMART Goal	SMART goal is missing multiple areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely – and/or is not aligned to needs of school.	SMART goal is missing one area – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and is aligned to needs of school.	SMART goal covers all areas – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely - and is aligned to needs of school.
Sustainability Goal	There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  Multiple principles are not adequately planned for.	There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  At least one principle is not adequately planned for.	There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.  All principles are exceptionally planned for.

**Part 7: LEA Capacity to Implement the Improvement Model**

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points
<p>There is inadequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.</p> <p>Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and inadequately explained.</p> <p>The School Board, Superintendent, and teacher’s union are not fully committed to eliminating barriers to allow for full implementation of the model chosen.</p> <p>The process for selecting staff is not clear and does not</p>	<p>There is adequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.</p> <p>Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained.</p> <p>The School Board, Superintendent, and teacher’s union are only partially committed to eliminating</p>	<p>There is exceptional evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.</p> <p>All of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained.</p> <p>The School Board, Superintendent, and teacher’s union are fully committed to eliminating barriers to allow for full implementation of the model</p>

<p>involve multiple parties within the district.</p> <p>District staff does not have an outlined process for monitoring and supporting the implementation of the selected improvement model.</p>	<p>barriers to allow for full implementation of the model chosen.</p> <p>The process for selecting staff is lacking rigor, clarity, and/or multiple parties within the district.</p> <p>District staff has vaguely outlined a process for monitoring and supporting the implementation of the selected improvement model.</p>	<p>chosen.</p> <p>The process for selecting staff is rigorous, clear, and involves multiple parties within the district.</p> <p>District staff has clearly outlined a process for monitoring and supporting the implementation of the selected improvement model.</p>
--	---	---

### Part 8: Selection of External Providers

Inadequate – 1 point	Adequate – 2 points	Excellent – 3 points
<p>There is inadequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider.</p> <p>Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and inadequately explained.</p> <p>The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider does not meet the identified needs.</p> <p>The LEA includes inadequate expectations for the external provider in reference to: assessing the services, including, but not limited to: communication, sources of data used to evaluate effectiveness, monitoring of records, in-school presence, recording</p>	<p>There is adequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider.</p> <p>Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and adequately explained.</p> <p>Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified.</p> <p>The LEA includes adequate expectations for the external provider in reference to: assessing the services, including, but not limited to: communication, sources of data used to evaluate effectiveness, monitoring of records, in-school</p>	<p>There is exceptional evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider.</p> <p>All of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider are addressed and thoroughly explained.</p> <p>The LEA includes a comprehensive process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified.</p> <p>The LEA includes exceptional expectations for the external provider in reference to: assessing the services, including, but not limited to: communication, sources of data used to evaluate effectiveness, monitoring of records, in-school presence, recording and reporting of progress</p>

and reporting of progress with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs.	presence, recording and reporting of progress with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs.	with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs.
---	---	---

**Part 9: Budget**

<b>Align other resources with the interventions.</b>		
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>
<p>There is inadequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.</p> <p>Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and inadequately explained.</p> <p>The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities does not meet the identified needs.</p>	<p>There is adequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.</p> <p>Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained.</p> <p>Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.</p>	<p>There is exceptional evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.</p> <p>All of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained.</p> <p>The LEA includes a comprehensive process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.</p>

<b>Expenditures in budget are aligned with grant goals and federal requirements.</b>		
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>

<p>Little or no expenditures are reasonable, allowable, or necessary.</p> <p>Few, if any, expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant.</p> <p>Budget demonstrates no reduction in funding, internal capacity building or sustainability over time.</p> <p>Expenditures could be considered supplanting (expenditures are also included in Basic Title I Budget, or are responsibility of district).</p> <p>Capital Expenses in budget are not in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).</p>	<p>Some expenditures are reasonable, allowable, and necessary.</p> <p>Some expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant.</p> <p>Budget demonstrates some reduction in funding as internal capacity is built and sustained over time.</p> <p>Some expenditures may be considered supplanting (some expenditures are also included in Basic Title I Budget, or are responsibility of district).</p> <p>Capital Expenses in budget may not be in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).</p>	<p>Expenditures are reasonable, allowable, and necessary.</p> <p>Expenditures are aligned with the activities and goals of the grant.</p> <p>Budget demonstrates gradual reduction as internal capacity is built and sustained over time.</p> <p>Expenditures are not considered supplanting (expenditures are not included in Basic Title I Budget, or are not responsibility of district).</p> <p>Capital Expenses in budget are in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 76.533 (construction), 34 C.F.R. § 77.1(c) (minor building alterations), Title I, Part A (see B-7) (rewiring).</p>
---	---	--

<b>Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.</b>		
<b>Inadequate – 1 point</b>	<b>Adequate – 2 points</b>	<b>Excellent – 3 points</b>
<p>There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.</p> <p>Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and/or inadequately explained.</p> <p>The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends does not meet the identified needs.</p>	<p>There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.</p> <p>Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and adequately explained.</p> <p>Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the identified needs.</p>	<p>There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.</p> <p>All of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and thoroughly explained.</p> <p>The LEA includes a comprehensive process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the identified needs.</p>

## Monitoring Checklist and Rubric

### Pre-visit [all]

- Confirm date/time of visit with principal
- Notify superintendent of visit
- Review documentation from school
  - ▶ School improvement plan, root cause analysis, and data sheet (first visit)
  - ▶ Prior visit report (if applicable)
- Prepare Leadership Meeting & Group Interview Questions

### Visit #1 [Focus, 1003(a), 1003(g), Priority]

- Leadership Team Collaborative Meeting
  - ▶ Review Leading and Achievement indicators and 1003(g) plan and budget.
- Classroom Observations
- Debrief with Principal and/or School Leadership Team
  - ▶ Provide progress report (complete and share within 48 hours of visit)
  - ▶ Discuss next steps

### Post-visit [all]

- E-mail progress report to principal and appropriate district personnel within 48 hours (if necessary)
- File all Monitoring Documents
- E-mail requests for resources to appropriate IDOE Staff

**Turnaround 1003(g)**

<b>Required Elements</b>		<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Scale</b>				<b>Visit Notes</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>
		1 - no evidence 2 - little evidence 3 - some evidence 4 - extensive evidence						
<b>1 - Provide Strong Leadership and operational flexibility</b>	a. replace principal	Permanent principal in place						
	b. provide principal with operational flexibility - scheduling, staff, curriculum, budget	Adjusted school calendar						
		Authority to hire staff						
	Choice in curriculum							
<b>2 - Teacher Effectiveness</b>	a. measure effectiveness of current staff	Evaluation system in place						

	b. screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent	No more than 50% of staff rehired						
	c. select new staff	Selection process for new staff in place						
		Mentor teachers						
	d. provide job - embedded, ongoing PD informed by teacher eval and support systems; tied to teacher and student needs	Coaching/modeling						
		Focused PD						
		PLCs						
<b>3 - Rewards</b>	for staff who have increased student achievement	Reward system in place						
<b>4 - Incentives</b>	implement strategies to recruit, replace, and retain staff (incentives, promotion, career growth, flexible work	Incentive system in place						

	conditions)	Recruitment system in place						
<b>5 - School Schedule</b>	redesign the school day, week, or year	Saturday School						
		Before School						
		After School						
		Other						
<b>6 - Strengthen school's instructional program</b>	a. based on student needs	Reading Program						
		Math Program						
		Focused Strategies						

	b. ensuring instructional program is research based and rigorous	Research Based Program Implemented						
	c. ensuring instructional program is aligned with state standards	Use and alignment of state standards						
<b>7 - Increased Learning Time</b>	provide increased learning time for students and staff	Success time - additional learning time within school day						
		PLCs and collaboration time						
<b>8- Data</b>	a. to inform instruction	Data Meetings						
		8-Steps or other Data Initiative						
	b. for continuous improvement	Regrouping during additional instructional time						
		Differentiation in classroom based on data						

	c. collaboration time	Data discussions between staff						
<b>9 - School Environment</b>	a. school safety and discipline	PBIS or other behavior system in place						
	b. students' social, emotional, and health needs	Student recognition program						
		student groups - geared toward student interest - present in building						
<b>10 - Community and Family Involvement</b>	provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement	Parent or Community Liaison in place						
		Partnerships with at least two community agencies						
		Parent events in place						

**Transformation 1003(g)**

<b>Required Elements</b>		<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Scale</b>				<b>Visit Notes</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>
		<i>1 - no evidence</i> <i>2 - little evidence</i> <i>3 - some evidence</i> <i>4 - extensive evidence</i>						
<b>1 - Develop Teacher and Leader Effectiveness</b>	a. replace the principal	Permanent principal in place						
	b. develop an evaluation system for teachers and principals using student growth data and multiple assessments	Evaluation system in place						
	c. reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement	Reward system in place						
	d. remove staff who, after opportunities to improve, have not	System for staff removal in place						
	e. provide job - embedded, ongoing PD informed by teacher eval and support systems; tied to teacher and student needs	Coaching/Modeling						
		Focused PD						

		PLCs							
	f. implement strategies to recruit, replace, and retain staff (incentives, promotion, career growth, flexible work conditions)	Recruitment system in place							
<b>2 - Increasing Learning Time and Creating Community - Oriented Schools</b>	a. provide increased learning time for students and staff	Success time - additional learning time within school day							
		PLCs and collaboration time							
	b. provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement	Parent or Community Liaison in place							
		Partnerships with at least two community agencies							
		Parent events in place							
<b>3 - Comprehensive Instructional Reform Strategies</b>	a. use data to identify and implement instructional program	Reading Program							

		Math Program						
	b. instructional program is research-based and vertically aligned	School - wide instructional plan						
		Focused Strategies						
	c. promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction	Data Meetings						
		Regrouping during additional instructional time						
		Differentiation in classroom based on data						
	<b>4 - Provide Operational Flexibility and Sustained Support</b>	a. staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting flexibility	Adjusted school calendar					
			Authority to hire staff					

		Choice in curriculum						
		Leadership team in place						
		Saturday, Before, or After School						
	b. ongoing, intensive technical assistance and support from LEA, SEA, or Lead Partner	Data discussions between staff						
		PBIS or other behavior system in place						
		PLCs and collaboration time						
		Coaching/modeling/mentor teachers						
		Lead Partner in place						

**Characteristic**

**Rating**

**Evidence**

LOW

HIGH

**Classroom Environment**

1

2

3

4

Additional Comments:

• Safety, order, visible and invisible structures, academic atmosphere, student-centeredness, peer support, purposeful/practical space arrangement, student-work displays

**Classroom Culture**

1

2

3

4

Additional Comments:

• High expectations, achievement, rigor, relationships, respect, tolerance, collaboration, urgency

**Behavior Management**

1

2

3

4

Additional Comments:

• Efficiency, effectiveness, respect, rules and routines, consistency, compliance

**Instructional Execution**

1

2

3

4

Additional Comments:

• Objective-driven, knowledge or skill development, levels of connections being made, rigor, differentiation, student practice, scaffolding concepts, pacing, progress charting, higher order thinking, students interests and backgrounds

**Engagement**

1

2

3

4

Additional Comments:

• Compliance level, "on-task", students' personal interest level, making relevant connections



**Indiana  
Department of Education**

**Glenda Ritz, NBCT**  
Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

# **1003(g) School Improvement Grant Renewal Application**

## ***Transformation Model***

**Indiana Department of Education  
Office of Early Learning and Intervention  
South tower, Suite 600  
115 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46204**

**1003g School Improvement Grant  
Grant Renewal Criteria - Elementary/Middle School Model  
(ISTEP+, iREAD)**

**Leading and Achievement (Lagging) Indicators:** The first component of the SIG renewal process is determined by the school's performance on a predetermined set of leading indicators and achievement indicators. Leading indicators will be tracked throughout the year to monitor progress and predict the overall outcomes on the achievement indicators. Schools will be responsible for tracking performance on the designated leading indicators and reporting them to the Indiana Department of Education ("IDOE") before each on-site monitoring visit. State level student assessment data on the ISTEP+ Math and English/Language Arts assessments and third grade performance on iREAD will be used to determine a school's performance on achievement indicators. Data may not be available from the state for some achievement indicators until August 2013; in this case, a school may receive a preliminary renewal based on performance on the indicators for which data is available and preliminary estimates of the remaining achievement indicators. Once data is available, changes to a school's renewal decision may be necessary; however, a school that receives a preliminary renewal will only risk dropping to a probationary renewal.

Leading Indicators (Must meet 4 of 7)

- Number of minutes in Math and Reading in the instructional day;
- Student participation rate on ISTEP+ and iREAD combined;
- Student attendance rate;
- Teacher attendance rate;
- Combined suspension/expulsion rate;
- Minutes of job-embedded PD/week; and
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system.

Achievement Indicators (Year 1 - Schools must meet 70% of goals set; Year 2 - Schools must meet 80% of goals set)

**Note: This data will be entered in the fall, after the release of information to schools.**

For Both Math and English/Language Arts ISTEP+ Assessments:

- Percent of students passing ISTEP, by grade level;
- Percent of Bottom 25% demonstrating high growth (4-8);
- Percent of all students showing low growth; and
- Average scale score, by grade level.
- Percent of students at or above proficient on ISTEP on both Math and E/LA; and
- Percent of students achieving proficiency on IREAD (spring test only).

**Implementation:** The next component of the renewal process will be based on the school's ability to implement the required components of the Transformation Model, which are illustrated in the approved 1003(g) SIG Application. **This is a self-assessment to be completed by the school and will be used by IDOE as visits are continued in the fall of 2013.**

**Finance:** The final component of the renewal process will be based on the timely expenditure of grant funds in accordance with the approved SIG application, federal guidance, and purchasing. **This will be completed by IDOE after the application has been submitted by the school.**

### **1003g School Improvement Grant Grant Renewal Criteria - High School Model (ECA, Graduation Rate, College and Career Readiness)**

**Leading and Achievement (Lagging) Indicators:** The first component of the SIG renewal process is determined by the school's performance on a predetermined set of leading indicators and achievement indicators. Leading indicators will be tracked throughout the year to monitor progress and predict the overall outcomes on the achievement indicators. Schools will be responsible for tracking performance on the designated leading indicators and reporting them to the IDOE before each on-site monitoring visit. State level student assessment data on the English 10 and Algebra I ECA, along with other performance indicators identified below will be used to determine a school's performance on all achievement indicators. Data may not be available from the state for some achievement indicators until August, 2013; in this case, a school may receive a preliminary renewal based on performance on the indicators for which data is available, and preliminary estimates of the remaining achievement indicators. Once data is available, changes to a school's renewal decision may be necessary; however, every school that receives a preliminary renewal will only be at risk of dropping to a probationary renewal.

#### Leading Indicators (Must meet 6 of 9)

- Minutes in the instructional day;
- 10<sup>th</sup> grade participation rate on English 10 and Algebra I ECA;
- Student attendance rate;
- Teacher attendance rate;
- Dropout Rate;
- AP/IB Courses offered;
- Combined suspension/expulsion rate;
- Minutes of job-embedded PD/week; and
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system.

#### Achievement Indicators (Year 1 Schools must meet 70%; Year 2 Schools must meet 80%)

**Note: This data will be entered in the fall, after the release of information to schools.**

- For Both English 10 and Algebra I ECA:
  - 10<sup>th</sup> grade cohort pass rate;
  - 8<sup>th</sup> grade (ISTEP) to 10<sup>th</sup> grade (ECA) improvement;
  - Percent of re-testers which pass by 12<sup>th</sup> grade; and
  - Average scale score, by grade level.
- Non-waiver graduation rate; and
- Percent of graduating cohort to receive college and career readiness standard.

**Implementation:** The next component of the renewal process will be based on the school's ability to implement the required components of the Transformation Model, which are illustrated in the approved 1003(g) SIG Application. **This is a self-assessment to be completed by the school and will be used by IDOE as visits are continued in the fall of 2013.**

**Finance:** The final component of the renewal process will be based on the timely expenditure of grant funds in accordance with the approved SIG application, federal guidance, and purchasing. **This will be completed by IDOE after the application has been submitted by the school.**

# LEA ASSURANCES

Certain terms and conditions are required for receiving funds under the School Improvement 1003g Grant and through the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE); therefore, by signing the following assurances, the grantee agrees to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, rules and regulations, provisions and public policies required and all assurances in the performance of this grant as stated below.

## School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)

The grantee LEA's designees must sign and return a copy of the following assurances as in order to participate in the 1003(g) SIG program.

The grantee will use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively one of the following interventions in each of its Tier I and Tier II schools identified on the LEA grant application: (A) Turnaround Model; (B) Closure Model; (C) Transformation Model; (D) Restart Model. LEA implementation of intervention models should adhere to all regulations in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/2010-27313.pdf>).

The grantee will establish annual goals approved by the IDOE 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 and hold accountable each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the IDOE) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

The grantee will report to the IDOE all applicable school-level data that is required under Section III of the final requirements.

- Number of minutes in Math and Reading in the instructional day or school day;
- Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics;
- Student attendance rate;
- Teacher attendance rate;
- Combined suspension/expulsion rate;
- Minutes of job-embedded PD/week;
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system;
- For Both Math and English/Language Arts Each:
  - Percent of students passing ISTEP, by grade level;

- Percent of Bottom 25% demonstrating high growth (4-8);
- Percent of all students showing low growth; and
- Average scale score, by grade level;
- Percent of students at or above proficient on ISTEP on both Math and E/LA; and
- Percent of students achieving proficiency on IREAD (spring test only).
- For Both English 10 and Algebra I ECA:
  - 10<sup>th</sup> grade cohort pass rate;
  - 8<sup>th</sup> grade (ISTEP) to 10<sup>th</sup> grade (ECA) improvement;
  - Percent of re-testers which pass by 12<sup>th</sup> grade; and
  - Average scale score, by grade level.
- Non-waiver graduation rate; and
- Percent of graduating cohort to receive college and career readiness standard.

IDOE will make grant renewal decisions based on whether the school has satisfied the following requirements in regards to its annual performance targets for leading and achievement indicators:

- *Leading Indicators*— Elementary and middle schools must meet 4 of 7 applicable leading indicator goals; schools containing a high school must meet 6 of 9 leading indicator goals.
- *Achievement Indicators*— Schools in year one of the grant must also meet 70% of the achievement indicators, including yearly achievement goals in the 1003g SIG application. Schools in year two of the grant must also meet 80% of the achievement indicators including yearly achievement goals in the 1003g SIG application. Schools which administer both the ISTEP+ and ECA assessments will be measured by student performance on all applicable achievement indicators combined.

Failure to submit required data to the IDOE by set deadlines may result in a delay of funds.

### State Assurances

LEAs will establish an LEA-based School Improvement Officer or School Improvement Office that will be responsible for taking an active role in the day-to-day management of turnaround efforts at the school level in each identified Tier I, Tier II and Tier III School to be served by the approved application and for coordinating with the SEA.

LEAs that commit to serve one or more Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools that do not receive Title I, Part A funds are to ensure that each of those schools receive all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of the School Improvement Grant funds. Further, LEAs cannot use School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to support district-level activities for schools that are not receiving SIG funds.

Grantee agrees future funding opportunities may be hindered if per this or any grant opportunity/contract with IDOE have not been met and/or reports are not submitted in a timely fashion.

#### Changes

This agreement will not be modified, altered, or changed except by mutual agreement by an authorized representative(s) of each party to this agreement and must be confirmed in writing through the IDOE grant modification procedures.

#### Independent Grantee

The grantee shall perform all services as an independent grantee and shall discharge all of its liabilities as such. No act performed or representation made, whether oral or written, by grantee with respect to third parties shall be binding on the IDOE.

#### Termination

The IDOE, by written notice, may terminate this grant, in whole or in part, if funds supporting this grant are reduced or withdrawn. To the extent that this grant is for services, and if so terminated, the IDOE shall be liable only for payment in accordance with payment provision of this grant for services rendered prior to the effective date of termination.

The IDOE, in whole or in part, may terminate this grant for cause by written notification. Furthermore, the IDOE and the grantee may terminate this grant, in whole or in part, upon mutual agreement.

The IDOE may cancel an award immediately if the State finds that there has been a failure to comply with the provisions of an award, that reasonable progress has not been made, or that the purposes for which the funds were awarded/granted have not been or will not be fulfilled.

Either the IDOE or the grantee may terminate this agreement at any time by giving 30 days written notice to the other party of such termination and specifying the effective date thereof. The grantee shall be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total compensation as the services actually performed bear to the total services of the grantee covered by the agreement, less payments of compensation previously made.

#### Access to Records

The grantee agrees that the IDOE, or any of its duly authorized representatives, at any time during the term of this agreement, shall have access to, and the right to audit and examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the grantee related to the grantee's charges and performance under this agreement. Such records shall be kept by grantee for a period of five (5) years after final payment under this agreement, unless the IDOE authorizes their earlier disposition. Grantee agrees to refund to the IDOE any overpayments disclosed by any such audit. However, if any litigation, claim, negotiation, audit or other action involving the records has been started before the expiration of the 5-year period, the records shall be retained until completion of the actions and resolution of all issues, which arise from it.

This agreement, and all matters or issues collateral to it, shall be governed by, and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Indiana.

#### Legal Authority

The grantee assures that it possesses legal authority to apply for and receive funds under this agreement.

#### Equal Opportunity Employer

The grantee shall be an equal opportunity employer and shall perform to applicable requirements; accordingly, grantee shall neither discriminate nor permit discrimination in its operations or employment practices against any person or group of persons on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, handicap, or sex in any manner prohibited by law.

#### Copyrights

The grantee (i) agrees that the IDOE shall determine the disposition of the title and the rights under any copyright by grantee or employees on copyrightable material first produced or composed under this agreement; and, (ii) hereby grants to the IDOE a royalty free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license to reproduce, translate, publish, use and dispose of, to authorize others to do so, all copyrighted or copyrightable work not first produced or composed by grantee in the performance of this agreement, but which is incorporated in the material furnished under the agreement, provided that such license shall be only to the extent grantee now has, or prior to the completion or full final settlements of agreement may acquire, the right to grant such license without becoming liable to pay compensation to others solely because of such grant.

Grantee further agrees that all material produced and/or delivered under this grant will not, to the best of the grantee's knowledge, infringe upon the copyright or any other proprietary rights of any third party. Should any aspect of the materials become, or in the grantee's opinion be likely to become, the subject of any infringement claim or suite, the grantee shall procure the rights to such material or replace or modify the material to make it non-infringing.

#### Personnel

Grantee agrees that, at all times, employees of the grantee furnishing or performing any of the services specified in this agreement shall do so in a proper, workmanlike, and dignified manner.

#### Assignment

Grantee shall not assign or grant in whole or in part its rights or obligations under this agreement without prior written consent of the IDOE. Any attempted assignment without said consent shall be void and of no effect.

#### Availability of Funds

It is expressly understood and agreed that the obligation of the IDOE to proceed under this agreement is conditioned upon the appropriation of funds by the Indiana State Legislature and the receipt of state and/or federal funds. If the funds anticipated for the continuing fulfillment of the agreement are, at anytime, not forthcoming or insufficient, either through the failure of

the federal government to provide funds or of the State of Indiana to appropriate funds or the discontinuance or material alteration of the program under which funds were provided or if funds are not otherwise available to IDOE, the IDOE shall have the right upon ten (10) working days written notice to the grantee, to reduce the amount of funds payable to the grantee or to terminate this agreement without damage, penalty, cost, or expenses to IDOE of any kind whatsoever. The effective date of reduction or termination shall be as specified in the notice of reduction or termination.

Superintendent

Turnaround Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Principal

IDOE Coordinator of Title I

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# **Appendix A:**

## **Performance Framework for Renewal Process**

- 1. Leading and Achievement Indicators – Elementary/Middle School Model**
- 2. Leading and Achievement Indicators – High School Model**
- 3. Implementation Indicators**
- 4. Finance Indicators**

**1. School Improvement Grant (1003g)  
 Leading and Achievement Indicators  
 Elementary/Middle School Model  
 (Schools complete only the Leading Indicators portion)**

Leading Indicators (Must meet at least 4 of 7 to be renewed)	Indicator		Beginning	End	Goal
	Minutes in Math and Reading per day		Math: E/LA:	Math: E/LA:	Math: E/LA:
	Student participation rate				
	Student attendance rate				
	Teacher attendance rate				
	Suspension/Expulsion Rate				
	Minutes of Job Embedded PD/Week				
	Distribution of teachers by performance level				
Achievement Indicators (Year 1: Must meet 70% of Achievement Indicators) (Year 2: Must meet 80% of Achievement Indicators)	Indicator		Beginning	End	Goal
	Math ISTEP+	Percent of Students Passing ISTEP+ (3-8)	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> .
			4 <sup>th</sup> .	4 <sup>th</sup> .	4 <sup>th</sup> .
			5 <sup>th</sup> .	5 <sup>th</sup> .	5 <sup>th</sup> .
			6 <sup>th</sup> .	6 <sup>th</sup> .	6 <sup>th</sup> .
		% of Bottom 25% demonstrating High Growth (4-8)	7 <sup>th</sup> .	7 <sup>th</sup> .	7 <sup>th</sup> .
			8 <sup>th</sup> .	8 <sup>th</sup> .	8 <sup>th</sup> .
		% of Students demonstrating Low Growth			
	Average scale score	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	
		4 <sup>th</sup> .	4 <sup>th</sup> .	4 <sup>th</sup> .	
		5 <sup>th</sup> .	5 <sup>th</sup> .	5 <sup>th</sup> .	
		6 <sup>th</sup> .	6 <sup>th</sup> .	6 <sup>th</sup> .	
		7 <sup>th</sup> .	7 <sup>th</sup> .	7 <sup>th</sup> .	
		8 <sup>th</sup> .	8 <sup>th</sup> .	8 <sup>th</sup> .	
E/LA ISTEP+	Percent of Students Passing ISTEP+ (3-8)	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	
		4 <sup>th</sup> .	4 <sup>th</sup> .	4 <sup>th</sup> .	
		5 <sup>th</sup> .	5 <sup>th</sup> .	5 <sup>th</sup> .	
		6 <sup>th</sup> .	6 <sup>th</sup> .	6 <sup>th</sup> .	
	% of Bottom 25% demonstrating High Growth (4-8)	7 <sup>th</sup> .	7 <sup>th</sup> .	7 <sup>th</sup> .	
		8 <sup>th</sup> .	8 <sup>th</sup> .	8 <sup>th</sup> .	
	% of Students Demonstrating Low Growth				
	Average scale score	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	
		4 <sup>th</sup> .	4 <sup>th</sup> .	4 <sup>th</sup> .	
		5 <sup>th</sup> .	5 <sup>th</sup> .	5 <sup>th</sup> .	
		6 <sup>th</sup> .	6 <sup>th</sup> .	6 <sup>th</sup> .	
		7 <sup>th</sup> .	7 <sup>th</sup> .	7 <sup>th</sup> .	
		8 <sup>th</sup> .	8 <sup>th</sup> .	8 <sup>th</sup> .	
Percent of students proficient on					

	ISTEP (Both ELA and Math) (3-8)			
	Percent of students proficient on IREAD (Spring Test Only) (3)			

**2. School Improvement Grant (1003g)  
Leading and Achievement Indicators  
High School Model  
(Schools complete only the Leading Indicators portion)**

Leading Indicators (Must meet at least 6 of 9 to be renewed)	Indicator		Beginning	End	Goal
	Minutes in school day				
	Student Participation rate				
	Student attendance rate				
	Teacher attendance rate				
	Dropout rate				
	# of AP/IB Courses Offered				
	Suspension/Expulsion Rate				
	Minutes of Job Embedded PD/Week				
	Distribution of teachers by performance level				
Achievement Indicators (Year 1: Must meet 70% of Achievement Indicators) (Year 2: Must meet 80% of Achievement Indicators)	Indicator		Beginning	End	Goal
	English 10 ECA	10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Pass Rate			
		8 <sup>th</sup> (ISTEP) to 10 <sup>th</sup> (ECA) Improvement			
		% of non-passers who pass by 12 <sup>th</sup> grade.			
		Average scale score			
	Algebra 1 ECA	10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Pass Rate			
		8 <sup>th</sup> (ISTEP) to 10 <sup>th</sup> (ECA) Improvement			
		% of non-passers who pass by 12 <sup>th</sup> grade.			
		Average scale score			

	Non-Waiver Graduation Rate			
	College enrollment rates			

**3. School Improvement Grant (1003g)  
Implementation Indicators  
(Self-Assessment by School)**

Implementation	Indicator	Not Implemented	Partially Implemented	Fully Implemented	Data Not Yet Available
	1. Replace of the principal who led the school prior to implementing the model.				
	2. Use evaluation systems for teachers and principals that consider student growth and assessments; develop with teacher/principal involvement				
	3. Reward school leaders, teachers, staff who, in implementing this model, increased student achievement or high school graduation rates; remove those who after professional development, have not.				
	4. Provide high quality, job-embedded professional development.				
	5. Implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff (financial incentives, promotion, career growth, flexible work time).				
	6. Provide increased learning time for students and staff.				
	7. Use data to implement an aligned instructional program.				
	8. Promote the use of data to inform and differentiate instruction.				
	9. Provide mechanisms for family and community engagement.				
10. Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting).					

**4. School Improvement Grant (1003g)  
Finance Indicators  
(To be completed by IDOE)**

Finance	Indicator	Below Expectations	Achieved Expectations	Above Expectations	Data Not Yet Available
	Internal Controls				
Cash Management					

	Payroll/Time Distribution				
	Property Management				
	Amount of Grant Award Expended				

Comments:	
-----------	--

Continuation Funding Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Renew Grant <input type="checkbox"/> Probationary Renewal (Contingent upon successful completion of Implementation Milestones and Corrective Actions) <input type="checkbox"/> Non- Renewal
-----------------------------	--

Deputy Superintendent \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Bureau Manager, OSR \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Bureau Director, OSR Finance \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_



# **1003(g) School Improvement Grant Renewal Application**

## ***Turnaround Model***

**Indiana Department of Education  
Office of Early Learning and Intervention  
South Tower, Suite 600  
115 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46204**

**1003g School Improvement Grant  
Grant Renewal Criteria - Elementary/Middle School Model  
(ISTEP+, iREAD)**

**Leading and Achievement (Lagging) Indicators:** The first component of the SIG renewal process is determined by the school’s performance on a predetermined set of leading indicators and achievement indicators. Leading indicators will be tracked throughout the year to monitor progress and predict the overall outcomes on the achievement indicators. Schools will be responsible for tracking performance on the designated leading indicators and reporting them to the Indiana Department of Education (“IDOE”) before each on-site monitoring visit. State level student assessment data on the ISTEP+ Math and English/Language Arts assessments and third grade performance on iREAD will be used to determine a schools performance on achievement indicators. Data may not be available from the state for some achievement indicators until August 2013; in this case, a school may receive a preliminary renewal based on performance on the indicators for which data is available and preliminary estimates of the remaining achievement indicators. Once data is available, changes to a school’s renewal decision may be necessary; however, a school that receives a preliminary renewal will only risk dropping to a probationary renewal.

**Leading Indicators (Must meet 4 of 7)**

- Number of minutes in Math and Reading in the instructional day;
- Student participation rate on ISTEP+ and iREAD combined;
- Student attendance rate;
- Teacher attendance rate;
- Combined suspension/expulsion rate;
- Minutes of job-embedded PD/week; and
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA’s teacher evaluation system.

Achievement Indicators (Year 1 - Schools must meet 70% of goals set; Year 2 - Schools must meet 80% of goals set)

**Note: This data will be entered in the fall, after the release of information to schools.**

- For Both Math and English/Language Arts ISTEP+ Assessments:
  - Percent of students passing ISTEP, by grade level;
  - Percent of Bottom 25% demonstrating high growth (4-8);
  - Percent of all students showing low growth; and
  - Average scale score, by grade level.
- Percent of students at or above proficient on ISTEP on both Math and E/LA; and
- Percent of students achieving proficiency on IREAD (spring test only).

**Implementation:** The next component of the renewal process will be based on the school’s ability to implement the required components of the Turnaround Model, which are illustrated in the approved 1003(g) SIG Application. **This is a self-assessment to be completed by the school and will be used by IDOE as visits are continued in the fall of 2013.**

**Finance:** The final component of the renewal process will be based on the timely expenditure of grant funds in accordance with the approved SIG application, federal guidance, and purchasing. **This will be completed by IDOE after the application has been submitted by the school.**

### **1003g School Improvement Grant Grant Renewal Criteria - High School Model (ECA, Graduation Rate, College and Career Readiness)**

**Leading and Achievement (Lagging) Indicators:** The first component of the SIG renewal process is determined by the school's performance on a predetermined set of leading indicators and achievement indicators. Leading indicators will be tracked throughout the year to monitor progress and predict the overall outcomes on the achievement indicators. Schools will be responsible for tracking performance on the designated leading indicators and reporting them to the IDOE before each on-site monitoring visit. State level student assessment data on the English 10 and Algebra I ECA, along with other performance indicators identified below will be used to determine a schools performance on all achievement indicators. Data may not be available from the state for some achievement indicators until August, 2013; in this case, a school may receive a preliminary renewal based on performance on the indicators for which data is available, and preliminary estimates of the remaining achievement indicators. Once data is available, changes to a school's renewal decision may be necessary; however, every school that receives a preliminary renewal will only be at risk of dropping to a probationary renewal.

#### Leading Indicators (Must meet 6 of 9)

- Minutes in the instructional day;
- 10<sup>th</sup> grade participation rate on English 10 and Algebra I ECA;
- Student attendance rate;
- Teacher attendance rate;
- Dropout Rate;
- AP/IB Courses offered;
- Combined suspension/expulsion rate;
- Minutes of job-embedded PD/week; and
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system.

#### Achievement Indicators (Year 1 Schools must meet 70%; Year 2 Schools must meet 80%)

**Note: This data will be entered in the fall, after the release of information to schools.**

- For Both English 10 and Algebra I ECA:
  - 10<sup>th</sup> grade cohort pass rate;
  - 8<sup>th</sup> grade (ISTEP) to 10<sup>th</sup> grade (ECA) improvement;
  - Percent of re-testers which pass by 12<sup>th</sup> grade; and
  - Average scale score, by grade level.
- Non-waiver graduation rate; and
- Percent of graduating cohort to receive college and career readiness standard.

**Implementation:** The next component of the renewal process will be based on the school's ability to implement the required components of the Turnaround Model, which are illustrated in the approved 1003(g) SIG Application **This is a self-assessment to be completed by the school and will be used by IDOE as visits are continued in the fall of 2013.**

**Finance:** The final component of the renewal process will be based on the timely expenditure of grant funds in accordance with the approved SIG application, federal guidance, and purchasing. **This will be completed by IDOE after the application has been submitted by the school.**

# LEA ASSURANCES

Certain terms and conditions are required for receiving funds under the School Improvement 1003g Grant and through the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE); therefore, by signing the following assurances, the grantee agrees to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, rules and regulations, provisions and public policies required and all assurances in the performance of this grant as stated below.

## School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)

The grantee LEA's designees must sign and return a copy of the following assurances as in order to participate in the 1003(g) SIG program.

The grantee will use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively one of the following interventions in each of its Tier I and Tier II schools identified on the LEA grant application: (A) Turnaround Model; (B) Closure Model; (C) Transformation Model; (D) Restart Model. LEA implementation of intervention models should adhere to all regulations in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/2010-27313.pdf>).

The grantee will establish annual goals approved by the IDOE 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 and hold accountable each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the IDOE) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

The grantee will report to the IDOE all applicable school-level data that is required under Section III of the final requirements.

- Number of minutes in Math and Reading in the instructional day or school day;
- Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics;
- Student attendance rate;
- Teacher attendance rate;
- Combined suspension/expulsion rate;
- Minutes of job-embedded PD/week;
- Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system;
- For Both Math and English/Language Arts Each:
  - Percent of students passing ISTEP, by grade level;

- Percent of Bottom 25% demonstrating high growth (4-8);
- Percent of all students showing low growth; and
- Average scale score, by grade level;
- Percent of students at or above proficient on ISTEP on both Math and E/LA; and
- Percent of students achieving proficiency on IREAD (spring test only).
- For Both English 10 and Algebra I ECA:
  - 10<sup>th</sup> grade cohort pass rate;
  - 8<sup>th</sup> grade (ISTEP) to 10<sup>th</sup> grade (ECA) improvement;
  - Percent of re-testers which pass by 12<sup>th</sup> grade; and
  - Average scale score, by grade level.
- Non-waiver graduation rate; and
- Percent of graduating cohort to receive college and career readiness standard.

IDOE will make grant renewal decisions based on whether the school has satisfied the following requirements in regards to its annual performance targets for leading and achievement indicators:

- *Leading Indicators*— Elementary and middle schools must meet 4 of 7 applicable leading indicator goals; schools containing a high school must meet 6 of 9 leading indicator goals.
- *Achievement Indicators*— Schools in year one of the grant must also meet 70% of the achievement indicators, including yearly achievement goals in the 1003g SIG application. Schools in year two of the grant must also meet 80% of the achievement indicators including yearly achievement goals in the 1003g SIG application. Schools which administer both the ISTEP+ and ECA assessments will be measured by student performance on all applicable achievement indicators combined.

Failure to submit required data to the IDOE by set deadlines may result in a delay of funds.

### State Assurances

LEAs will establish an LEA-based School Improvement Officer or School Improvement Office that will be responsible for taking an active role in the day-to-day management of turnaround efforts at the school level in each identified Tier I, Tier II and Tier III School to be served by the approved application and for coordinating with the SEA.

LEAs that commit to serve one or more Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools that do not receive Title I, Part A funds are to ensure that each of those schools receive all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of the School Improvement Grant funds. Further, LEAs cannot use School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to support district-level activities for schools that are not receiving SIG funds.

Grantee agrees future funding opportunities may be hindered if per this or any grant opportunity/contract with IDOE have not been met and/or reports are not submitted in a timely fashion.

#### Changes

This agreement will not be modified, altered, or changed except by mutual agreement by an authorized representative(s) of each party to this agreement and must be confirmed in writing through the IDOE grant modification procedures.

#### Independent Grantee

The grantee shall perform all services as an independent grantee and shall discharge all of its liabilities as such. No act performed or representation made, whether oral or written, by grantee with respect to third parties shall be binding on the IDOE.

#### Termination

The IDOE, by written notice, may terminate this grant, in whole or in part, if funds supporting this grant are reduced or withdrawn. To the extent that this grant is for services, and if so terminated, the IDOE shall be liable only for payment in accordance with payment provision of this grant for services rendered prior to the effective date of termination.

The IDOE, in whole or in part, may terminate this grant for cause by written notification. Furthermore, the IDOE and the grantee may terminate this grant, in whole or in part, upon mutual agreement.

The IDOE may cancel an award immediately if the State finds that there has been a failure to comply with the provisions of an award, that reasonable progress has not been made, or that the purposes for which the funds were awarded/granted have not been or will not be fulfilled.

Either the IDOE or the grantee may terminate this agreement at any time by giving 30 days written notice to the other party of such termination and specifying the effective date thereof. The grantee shall be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total compensation as the services actually performed bear to the total services of the grantee covered by the agreement, less payments of compensation previously made.

#### Access to Records

The grantee agrees that the IDOE, or any of its duly authorized representatives, at any time during the term of this agreement, shall have access to, and the right to audit and examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the grantee related to the grantee's charges and performance under this agreement. Such records shall be kept by grantee for a period of five (5) years after final payment under this agreement, unless the IDOE authorizes their earlier disposition. Grantee agrees to refund to the IDOE any overpayments disclosed by any such audit. However, if any litigation, claim, negotiation, audit or other action involving the records has been started before the expiration of the 5-year period, the records shall be retained until completion of the actions and resolution of all issues, which arise from it.

This agreement, and all matters or issues collateral to it, shall be governed by, and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Indiana.

#### Legal Authority

The grantee assures that it possesses legal authority to apply for and receive funds under this agreement.

#### Equal Opportunity Employer

The grantee shall be an equal opportunity employer and shall perform to applicable requirements; accordingly, grantee shall neither discriminate nor permit discrimination in its operations or employment practices against any person or group of persons on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, handicap, or sex in any manner prohibited by law.

#### Copyrights

The grantee (i) agrees that the IDOE shall determine the disposition of the title and the rights under any copyright by grantee or employees on copyrightable material first produced or composed under this agreement; and, (ii) hereby grants to the IDOE a royalty free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license to reproduce, translate, publish, use and dispose of, to authorize others to do so, all copyrighted or copyrightable work not first produced or composed by grantee in the performance of this agreement, but which is incorporated in the material furnished under the agreement, provided that such license shall be only to the extent grantee now has, or prior to the completion or full final settlements of agreement may acquire, the right to grant such license without becoming liable to pay compensation to others solely because of such grant.

Grantee further agrees that all material produced and/or delivered under this grant will not, to the best of the grantee's knowledge, infringe upon the copyright or any other proprietary rights of any third party. Should any aspect of the materials become, or in the grantee's opinion be likely to become, the subject of any infringement claim or suite, the grantee shall procure the rights to such material or replace or modify the material to make it non-infringing.

#### Personnel

Grantee agrees that, at all times, employees of the grantee furnishing or performing any of the services specified in this agreement shall do so in a proper, workmanlike, and dignified manner.

#### Assignment

Grantee shall not assign or grant in whole or in part its rights or obligations under this agreement without prior written consent of the IDOE. Any attempted assignment without said consent shall be void and of no effect.

#### Availability of Funds

It is expressly understood and agreed that the obligation of the IDOE to proceed under this agreement is conditioned upon the appropriation of funds by the Indiana State Legislature and the receipt of state and/or federal funds. If the funds anticipated for the continuing fulfillment of the agreement are, at anytime, not forthcoming or insufficient, either through the failure of

the federal government to provide funds or of the State of Indiana to appropriate funds or the discontinuance or material alteration of the program under which funds were provided or if funds are not otherwise available to IDOE, the IDOE shall have the right upon ten (10) working days written notice to the grantee, to reduce the amount of funds payable to the grantee or to terminate this agreement without damage, penalty, cost, or expenses to IDOE of any kind whatsoever. The effective date of reduction or termination shall be as specified in the notice of reduction or termination.

Superintendent

Turnaround Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Principal

IDOE Coordinator of Title I

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# **Appendix A:**

## **Performance Framework for Renewal Process**

- 1. Leading Indicators – Elementary/Middle School Model (Template)**
- 2. Leading Indicators – High School Model (Template)**
- 3. Implementation Indicators**
- 4. Finance Indicators**

**1. School Improvement Grant (1003g)  
Leading and Achievement Indicators  
Elementary/Middle School Model  
(Schools complete only the Leading Indicators portion)**

Leading Indicators		Indicator	Beginning	End	Goal		
(Must meet at least 4 of 7 to be renewed)		Minutes in Math and Reading per day	Math: E/LA:	Math: E/LA:	Math: E/LA:		
		Student participation rate					
		Student attendance rate					
		Teacher attendance rate					
		Suspension/Expulsion Rate					
		Minutes of Job Embedded PD/Week					
		Distribution of teachers by performance level					
Achievement Indicators		Indicator	Beginning	End	Goal		
(Year 1: Must meet 70% of Achievement Indicators) (Year 2: Must meet 80% of Achievement Indicators)		Math ISTEP+	Percent of Students Passing ISTEP+ (3-8)	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	
			% of Bottom 25% demonstrating High Growth (4-8)				
			% of Students demonstrating Low Growth				
			Average scale score	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	
		E/LA ISTEP+	Percent of Students Passing ISTEP+ (3-8)	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	
			% of Bottom 25% demonstrating High Growth (4-8)				
			% of Students Demonstrating Low Growth				
			Average scale score	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> . 4 <sup>th</sup> . 5 <sup>th</sup> . 6 <sup>th</sup> . 7 <sup>th</sup> . 8 <sup>th</sup> .	
				Percent of students proficient on ISTEP (Both ELA and Math) (3-8)			

	Percent of students proficient on IREAD (Spring Test Only) (3)			
--	--	--	--	--

**2. School Improvement Grant (1003g)  
Leading and Achievement Indicators  
High School Model  
(Schools complete only the Leading Indicators portion)**

Leading Indicators (Must meet at least 6 of 9 to be renewed)	Indicator		Beginning	End	Goal
	Minutes in school day				
	Student Participation rate				
	Student attendance rate				
	Teacher attendance rate				
	Dropout rate				
	# of AP/IB Courses Offered				
	Suspension/Expulsion Rate				
	Minutes of Job Embedded PD/Week				
	Distribution of teachers by performance level				
Achievement Indicators (Year 1: Must meet 70% of Achievement Indicators) (Year 2: Must meet 80% of Achievement Indicators)	Indicator		Beginning	End	Goal
	English 10 ECA	10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Pass Rate			
		8 <sup>th</sup> (ISTEP) to 10 <sup>th</sup> (ECA) Improvement			
		% of non-passers who pass by 12 <sup>th</sup> grade.			
		Average scale score			
	Algebra 1 ECA	10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Pass Rate			
		8 <sup>th</sup> (ISTEP) to 10 <sup>th</sup> (ECA) Improvement			
		% of non-passers who pass by 12 <sup>th</sup> grade.			
		Average scale score			

	Non-Waiver Graduation Rate			
	College enrollment rates			

**3. School Improvement Grant (1003g)  
Implementation Indicators  
(Self-Assessment by School)**

Implementation	Indicator	Not Implemented	Partially Implemented	Fully Implemented	Data Not Yet Available
	1. Replace the principal and grant principal operational flexibility.				
	2. Measure the effectiveness of current staff; screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; select new staff.				
	3. Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff (Financial incentives, promotion, career growth, and flexible work conditions).				
	4. Provide high quality, job-embedded professional development.				
	5. Adopt a new governance structure (i.e., turnaround office, turnaround leader).				
	6. Use data to implement an aligned instructional model				
	7. Promote the use of data to inform and differentiate instruction.				
	8. Provide increased learning time for students and staff.				
	9. Provide social-emotional and community-oriented services/supports .Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement				

**4. School Improvement Grant (1003g)  
Finance Indicators  
(To be completed by IDOE)**

Finance	Indicator	Below Expectations	Achieved Expectations	Above Expectations	Data Not Yet Available
	Internal Controls				
	Cash Management				

	Payroll/Time Distribution				
	Property Management				
	Amount of Grant Award Expended				

Comments:	
-----------	--

Continuation Funding Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Renew Grant <input type="checkbox"/> Probationary Renewal (Contingent upon successful completion of Implementation Milestones and Corrective Actions) <input type="checkbox"/> Non- Renewal
-----------------------------	--