

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: North Dakota



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

OMB Number: 1810-0682

Expiration Date: September 30, 2016

Paperwork Burden Statement

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive 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.

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013.

For Further Information

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: North Dakota Department of Public Instruction	Applicant's Mailing Address: 600 E Boulevard Avenue Dept. 201 Bismarck, ND 58505-0440
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Laurie Matzke Position and Office: Director, Federal Title Programs Office Contact's Mailing Address: 600 E Boulevard Avenue Dept. 201 Bismarck, ND 58505-0440 Telephone: 701-328-2284 Fax: 701-328-0203 Email address: lmatzke@nd.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Kirsten Baesler, State Superintendent	Telephone: 701-328-4570
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X 	Date: 11-21-13
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 ¹

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS

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

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

LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##		X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##		X				
LEA 2	##	TAYLOR MS	##				X		X

Part 3 (Terminated Awards): All SEAs are required to list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed for the 2014-2015 school year. For each such school, note the amount of unused remaining funds and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds.

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

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

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

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

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction (ND DPI), in reviewing LEA applications for SIG funding, will require each applicant to overview their needs assessment data and document that the needs of each Tier I or Tier II school have been thoroughly reviewed. The LEA will need to identify the intervention model that has been selected for each school on the application. The ND DPI will review each application to ensure that the LEA has the capacity to implement the selected intervention model at each school.

In the training provided to Tier I and Tier II schools, they are specifically informed that their application must provide a detailed overview of the needs of the school, students, and community it will serve. The description of the school attendance area must be detailed, providing sufficient information for setting up the needs assessment. The description must also include charts and/or graphs displaying the results of the data analysis.

The LEA must ensure the application includes information from all four measures of data – student achievement data, school programs/process data, student/teacher/parent perceptions data, and demographic data – and has the data disaggregated by subgroups when possible.

The LEAS are provided with a scoring rubric addressing the needs assessment and informing them that their application will be scored against these criteria.

- (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.

The ND DPI will review each LEA SIG application to ensure that it has requested adequate resources to support each Tier I and Tier II school and their identified intervention model. The budget and detailed budget narrative, in conjunction with the application, will be analyzed to ensure that the LEA has the resources and capacity to fully implement the selected intervention in each selected school according to the timelines outlined in the SIG. By utilizing the nine ND DPI Federal Title Programs program staff to help review and critique the LEA SIG applications, the state has adequate staff to conduct thorough reviews of each application and provide technical assistance when needed.

In the LEA SIG application, the LEA must specifically describe its capacity to use these funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each of the schools identified in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

North Dakota's LEA SIG application is enclosed as Appendix C. Table A: Review Criteria for Capacity (from the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) guidance) has been inserted into the LEA SIG application. Districts must go through each capacity factor and address how they have the capacity in each area identified, including: high quality staff, LEA ability, stakeholder commitment, school board commitment, timeline, strategic planning of the intervention model, recruitment of school leaders, and alignment of resources.

The ND DPI staff will communicate with LEA staff to resolve all issues, offer assistance, and ensure that approval of an LEA application is only granted to LEAs that have demonstrated the resources, capacity, and support necessary to implement their selected intervention model.

- (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).

Tier I and Tier II schools will be invited to apply for the SIG funds in early spring, thus ensuring that these schools are given first priority. The ND DPI Federal Title Programs staff will review each LEA's application, budget, and detailed budget narrative to ensure that the LEA has sufficient funds to implement their selected intervention model. After all quality applications from Tier I and Tier II schools that applied for a SIG receive funding, any remaining SIG funds will be made available to Tier III schools. The Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools all complete the same application to apply for SIG funding.

North Dakota's LEA SIG application is enclosed as Appendix C. Part G of the LEA SIG application requires the LEA to identify if they are requesting a waiver from the state to extend the period of availability of the school improvement funds.

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;

In North Dakota's LEA SIG application, each LEA must describe either the action steps they have completed or will complete to implement the intervention model they have selected. The ND DPI will review each LEA's narrative based on the scoring rubric to ensure they have provided sufficient detail describing how they will design and implement their intervention model at each school. The ND DPI will provide LEAs with specific criteria from the SIG guidance for the intervention model they have selected. The LEA will need to address how they will be able to meet all of the required components as part of the application process.

The SEA will review the applications to ensure that the interventions were described in detail and are focused on helping the school's students meet the state's standards.

At the required training, the SEA will outline how the LEA must describe the design implementation plans for the interventions identified at each school and, if in Tier I or Tier II, how the interventions meet SIG final requirements.

Specific programs, professional development, or activities must be fully defined in detail. The school must ensure it is asking for high quality interventions. The professional development opportunities listed need to be expanded to ensure that they are sustained, high quality (as defined by NCLB) initiatives. The required components must be clearly labeled with headings and then under each heading, the LEA's response must indicate how each school will meet the requirements.

Based on historical SIG grant implementation, the LEA will be encouraged to build intervention model support into their SIG application through a SIG coordinator position. This position will work closely with the district to ensure the school stays on track and act as a liaison between the school, district, and state.

The ND DPI has a rigorous review process; only LEAs who outline in detail and can clearly show that they have a strong design model to meet all SIG requirements will be funded.

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

LEAs will have the option of utilizing external providers to help them implement their selected intervention. The ND DPI has established a list of consultants who can assist districts and schools with planning and implementing school improvement activities. These consultants are known as the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Consultant Team. Team members have expertise in a variety of school improvement areas to provide individualized assistance to schools. Although this is optional, the LEAs will be highly encouraged to seek the assistance from an external provider for assistance. North Dakota's only SIG school is currently finding strong success due in large part to the contracted services of a highly qualified consultant selected from the SSOS Consultant Team.

LEAs also have the option to select an external provider of their choice. The ND DPI will require each LEA to describe, in detail, the process they used to recruit, screen, and select providers to ensure quality. The LEA must identify in detail the experience level and qualifications of all external providers to

ensure quality. The external provider's qualifications must be a key consideration in the recruitment, screening, and selection process. The LEA must describe the review process it used to screen the providers prior to utilizing their services.

ND DPI staff will review LEA applications with the scoring rubric to ensure this component is addressed and that the LEA has identified the experience level and qualifications for external providers that they will utilize.

- Align other resources with the interventions;

The ND DPI will require each LEA to describe the process utilized to align other resources with their selected intervention. LEAs must have multiple funding sources available to them to support their selected intervention model. In addition to the SIG funds requested, LEAs have Title I funds and Title II A funds, as well as state and local funds, to help support school improvement initiatives. In addition, several of North Dakota's Tier I and Tier II schools are tribal schools and have additional BIE funding. North Dakota is also fortunate to have regional structures of support referred to as Regional Education Associations (REAs). Several of the state's REAs have received access to a generous grant through the Hess Corporation. The initiatives of this grant strive to increase ACT scores, reduce remedial education, and increase the number of students who complete high school and college programs on time. ND DPI staff will review LEA responses and require them to address the various funding sources available to them to support their selected intervention model.

The LEA will be required to reference each of the reform initiatives they plan to implement and how various funding sources support these initiatives. SIG funds should not be the only revenue source supporting these initiatives in the school. Multiple funds should come together as a braided approach to support the SIG reform.

SEA staff will review applications to ensure that the interventions and other resources were outlined with specific detail and that they were aligned in order to fully and effectively implement interventions. The LEA's SIG application must outline multiple specific federal and state resources that can be aligned with the SIG initiatives (e.g., Title I, Title II, Special Education, BIE, general funds, state funds, outside grants, etc.) in order to be funded.

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

The ND DPI will require each LEA to identify any practices or policies that need to be modified in order to implement the interventions fully and effectively. The ND DPI will require LEAs to provide a detailed timeline and the process they will use to modify any specific policies or practices identified. In North Dakota, district/school teacher evaluation methods do not currently take into consideration student achievement. So this issue, in particular, will need to be specifically addressed in every LEA application that serves its Tier I or Tier II schools. ND DPI staff will review each LEA application to make sure that this issue, as well as other potential policies or practices that need to be modified, are addressed with enough specificity to demonstrate the ability to make the required changes to meet the requirements of a particular intervention.

SEA staff will review the LEA application to ensure that applicants thoroughly addressed the current barriers faced by the Tier I and Tier II schools and that any modification to practices/policies were described, in detail, in order to receive SIG funding.

- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The LEA's application requires a description of how they intend to sustain the reforms listed in their application after the funding period ends. LEAs will need to specifically demonstrate that they have researched their options regarding this issue and have a plan describing how they will sustain the reforms in the future.

SEA staff will review LEA applications to determine if the LEA's application directed resources to short-term, one-time expenditures that will have a long-term payoff for students and educators. In addition, if the LEA included activities that depend on recurring funding, the LEA must have included a plan for improving systemic efficacy and sustaining systems and programs after funding ends.

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

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

The ND DPI, Federal Title Programs office, is planning to provide training in early spring 2014 to Tier I and Tier II schools that are eligible for the 2013 SIG funds. At this training, we will provide eligible schools with the application, guidance, and other resources to help them apply for SIG 2013 funding, if they so choose. We will provide detailed training to LEA staff on the process and allowable activities pertaining to the pre-implementation process.

ND DPI SEA staff who will be reading, critiquing, and scoring the 2013 SIG applications will also receive training on the requirements and components unique to the 2013 process.

There is a narrative question on the 2013 SIG application that LEAs will complete where they need to detail their proposed activities during the pre-implementation phase. In addition, our LEA guidance has been revised to require LEAs to specify in their budget and budget narrative which activities will be conducted during the pre-implementation phase. Readers will be able to review and cross-reference the narrative question, the detailed timeline, the budget, and the budget narrative to ensure alignment of all activities, to ensure that the activities take place during the pre-implementation phase, and to ensure that they are reasonable and necessary to enable the LEA to begin full implementation of their SIG application for the subsequent school year.

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

LEA staff will be provided with a list of allowable activities from the USDE guidance. The state's LEA SIG application has a specific section where the district is required to describe, in detail, the activities to be conducted during the pre-implementation phase that will better enable them to begin implementing their SIG reform initiatives at the start of the new year, beginning on July 1, 2014.

The SEA's SIG scoring rubric directly aligns with the application and has a section that evaluates the LEA's response regarding the activities to be conducted during their pre-implementation phase. By having a specific question pertaining to the pre-implementation phase activities, those SEA staff evaluating the 2013 SIG applications will be able to easily identify the proposed activities, verify whether they are allowable, and determine whether the activities will better enable the district to begin full implementation for the subsequent school year. The reviewers will also cross-reference the proposed pre-implementation activities with the district's detailed timeline to ensure that the LEA does not begin utilizing 2013 SIG funds for the pre-

implementation activities until the SEA has awarded the LEA a SIG grant. The reviewers will also cross-reference the narrative response and the timeline with the proposed budget to ensure alignment of all proposed activities. This step also assists in the determination of whether the activities are reasonable and necessary to implement the proposed SIG reform initiatives.

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

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

Currently, North Dakota students take the state assessment in the fall of each year. It is anticipated that North Dakota school districts will receive their test results in February 2014. Once the AYP data is final and made public, the state Federal Title Programs office will proceed with school and district identifications for improvement for the 2014-2015 school year. In the spring of each school year (typically in April) the ND DPI conducts a workshop for all schools identified for improvement. At this workshop, schools will be provided with a timeline of required activities and information on implementing all required AYP provisions and improvement sanctions. Schools are informed of their responsibilities and provided with resources regarding parent notification, professional development, school choice, supplemental educational services, and other corrective action sanctions and are given guidance on writing a school improvement plan. Additional funding opportunities are also addressed at this workshop.

The ND DPI will hold specific training for schools identified for Tier I and Tier II for the 2013 SIG funding in February 2014. The purpose of the training will be to inform schools of their Tier I and Tier II identification and provide an overview of the SIG process and requirements. At this training, these schools will be provided with the LEA application for SIG funds. In addition, detailed information will be provided on the four SIG intervention models, the SIG application scoring rubric, and required reports and systems utilized by the ND DPI to hold LEAs accountable for implementing the school level intervention model of their choice. The ND DPI will review and approve LEA applications for Tier I and Tier II schools in April 2014 so that these schools are clearly given first priority for the SIG funding.

If funds remain, Tier III schools will be provided with the 2013 LEA SIG application, guidance, scoring rubric, and reporting requirements at our April 2014 Program Improvement Workshop. These applications will be reviewed and approved in June 2014.

Table B: North Dakota Timeline

Process	Date
ND DPI submits 2013 SIG application to USDE	November 2013
ND DPI conducts training for Tier I and Tier II schools on 2013 LEA SIG application	February 2014
ND DPI provides technical assistance for completing applications and ensuring capacity as needed	March/April 2014
LEA SIG applications (Tier I and Tier II) due to ND DPI	April 2014
Tier I and Tier II ND DPI reviews applications	April 2014
ND DPI Annual Program Improvement Workshop	April 2014
ND DPI awards Tier I and Tier II grants	April 30, 2014
Tier I and Tier II schools begin pre-implementation period	May 2014
ND DPI notifies LEAs about availability of Tier III applications	April/May 2014
ND DPI provides training on completing 2013 LEA SIG application for Tier III schools	April/May 2014
Tier III LEA SIG applications due to ND DPI	June 2014
ND DPI reviews and scores Tier III applications	June 2014
ND DPI awards Tier III grants	June/July 2014
Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools implement approved applications	July 1, 2014

The ND DPI will first review and score LEA applications for Tier I and Tier II schools, as these schools have priority for funding. Tier III applications will be collected and reviewed only if funds are available. The reviewers for all three applications (Tiers I, II, and III) will be ND DPI program staff who are well experienced as educators and are highly knowledgeable in the school and district improvement process, as well as with federal Title I and SIG regulations.

Initial Review of Application by ND DPI Staff

Upon receipt of an LEA's Tier I or Tier II application, Federal Title Programs staff will review the application to determine if all of the required elements are included and identify any areas that are not fully explained. If this occurs, the Federal Title Programs staff will contact the LEA to request the needed element and/or provide technical assistance. If all required materials are included, the application will receive a full review.

Full Review by ND DPI Staff

A reviewer training session will be conducted prior to the full application review to discuss each element on the rubric, consider the examples given in the scoring ranges, and practice scoring with several applications in order to achieve a level of reliability among reviewers.

Each application submitted for SIG funding will be read and scored by three ND DPI program staff. Upon completion, the three scores will be averaged to determine a final score.

Once all applications have been read and scored, they will be ranked in priority order according to total points received. A determination will then be made as to how many applications can be approved based on the funding available.

Initiate Grant Award

The ND DPI will notify LEAs as to the approved amount, obtain necessary signatures on the grant award, and provide information on reporting requirements. In the event that the LEA SIG application scores too low, the LEA will be notified regarding this determination. The compiled reviewer rubric scores and comments will be provided for the LEA's records.

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.

Each spring, all approved Tier I and Tier II SIG grantees will be required to submit the following three documents to the ND DPI:

- *Annual Program Improvement Report* (SFN 52820)
<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/forms/sfn52820.pdf>
- *Follow-up Report for Additional Program Improvement Funding* (SFN 52822)
<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/forms/sfn52822.pdf>
- *Title I Continuation Application for Additional Program Improvement Funding for Tier I/Tier II Schools* (Appendix E).

The *Annual Program Improvement Report* will outline the progress that SIG grantees have made toward their

goals and performance indicators, as well as provide information needed for the Consolidated Performance Report. The *Follow-up Report for Additional Program Improvement Funding* will monitor the fiscal expenditures of each SIG grant through a detailed paper review. The *Title I Continuation Application for Additional Program Improvement Funding for Tier I/Tier II Schools* will specifically review the progress that each Tier I and Tier II school has made toward the requirements outlined in the model that they selected to implement and outline any budget adjustments for the subsequent school year. These reports are collectively reviewed to ensure that, annually, improvements are being made and the school is progressing forward in a productive manner.

In addition, Tier I and Tier II SIG grantees document their progress throughout the year within the ND DPI's SIG Online Tool through NDMILE (North Dakota Moving to Improve Learning for Everyone). This includes:

- Transformation Implementation Indicators – Throughout the school year, information is entered into NDMILE to track the school's progress on the Transformation Implementation Indicators aligned to the Transformation Model. The progress on these indicators is submitted to the ND DPI to review three times per year (November 15, February 15, and May 15).
- Leading/Lagging Metrics Annual Report – Once per year, the Tier I and Tier II schools enter data regarding the SIG established metrics.
- Intervention Annual Form – Each spring, Tier I and Tier II schools submit their personalized progress regarding the implementation of their intervention model in addition to outlining their progress for the upcoming school year. The data in this form directly correlates with the above mentioned *Title I Continuation Application for Additional Program Improvement Funding for Tier I/Tier II Schools*.

The ND DPI Federal Title Programs office consists of 16 staff members. There are nine program staff, two support staff, four fiscal officers, and one director. All schools in Tiers I, II, and III will be assigned one of the nine Federal Title Programs program staff as a contact person. Each of the nine state Federal Title Programs program staff, in coordination with the state Federal Title Programs director, will be responsible for reviewing all reports for the schools under their purview. This ongoing, multi-tiered, detailed review process ensures the SIG grantee is on the right track during the school and when closing out at the end of the program year.

The results of this review will determine the continuation of funds for the second year of the three-year cycle. In addition, if an LEA cannot demonstrate compliance with the required model components, progress toward goals, timeliness, or if the ND DPI determines that the LEA has proven lack of capacity to implement the plan, the SIG funding will be terminated and the funds will be redistributed to other eligible Tier I, II, and III schools.

The same process will be used to determine if Tier I and Tier II SIG grantees will receive continued funding for the third year of the three-year funding cycle.

(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.

In accordance with the SIG guidance, LEAs with schools in Tier I and Tier II will have first priority for SIG funding. If there are funds remaining, LEAs with schools in Tier III will be eligible to apply for funding. The same application and scoring rubric will be utilized to fund LEAs with Tier III schools. After one year of funding, LEAs with Tier III schools who received SIG funding will need to submit an annual report for each Tier III school outlining the progress made to their improvement goals as defined in both their 2013 LEA SIG application and improvement plan. Funding for Tier III schools is determined on an annual basis. If funds

remain for the subsequent year, after all Tier I and Tier II applications have been processed, then Tier III schools will be invited to submit an application for SIG funding. Tier III schools who elect to apply for SIG funding will have the option of applying for a one-year SIG or a three-year SIG.

Each spring, Tier III schools approved for a one-year SIG grant will need to submit three reports to the ND DPI:

- *Annual Program Improvement Report* (SFN 52820)
<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/forms/sfn52820.pdf>
- *Follow-up Report for Additional Program Improvement Funding* (SFN 52822)
<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/forms/sfn52822.pdf>
- *Updated Program Improvement Plan*

The review of these three documents will determine whether Tier III schools are eligible to submit a one-year SIG application for the subsequent school year.

The Federal Title Programs contact person will be responsible for providing technical assistance, answering questions, reviewing the SIG applications, reviewing reports, scoring rubrics, and all other responsibilities associated with the SIG for the schools under their purview.

(3) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools, or the priority schools, as applicable, the LEA is approved to serve.

The ND DPI will utilize various methods to monitor each LEA with a Tier I and/or Tier II school that receives SIG funds to ensure that it is implementing each school intervention model fully and effectively.

The ND DPI requires all Tier I and Tier II schools awarded SIG funding to use NDMILE to write and implement a continuous improvement plan. The NDMILE is a web-based system for school improvement planning that is made up of indicators of effective practice and is at no cost to the schools. Each indicator is tied to researched best practices on how to effectively improve student achievement for all students, including English language learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students. The NDMILE tool has been aligned to the federal SIG requirements and, therefore, is the tool that must be used for Tier I and Tier II schools.

Through the plan approval process, the ND DPI will make sure the schools participating in NDMILE have selected indicators and are implementing interventions that are proven to help the student populations affected by the school's achievement gap(s). If the plan is found to be ineffective during the improvement process, the Tier I or Tier II school must work with the state to make changes accordingly. Each Tier I or Tier II school is assigned a Federal Title Programs contact person. In addition, the Tier I or Tier II school will be provided with a list of qualified external providers that the LEA can contract with for additional support. The ND DPI, in partnership with the Academic Development Institute (ADI), developed a web-based system with state-identified key indicators. The ND DPI works closely with ADI on training, resources, tools, and areas of need. In order to keep up with the latest research, ADI is continually updating the research provided for the indicators. The ADI has also provided research to specific indicators that are aligned to RTI, ELL, and Special Education.

The benefits of schools using the NDMILE tool to write and implement a continuous improvement plan include the following elements:

- web based online tool
- no cost

- research-based indicators of effective practice
- state level support through technical assistance providers, coaching comments, and training
- meet multiple plan requirements using one planning process (Education Improvement Plan, Title I Schoolwide Plan, and Title I Program Improvement Plan)
- resources, tools, and reports built into the tool
- tracks progress
- continuous ongoing improvement plan that encourages and supports collaboration among school staff
- aligned to federal SIG requirements

NDMILE provides school improvement teams opportunities to inform, coach, sustain, track, and report improvement activities. NDMILE assists schools in determining where they are and helps them get to where they want to be—every child learning and every school improving. NDMILE offers multiple performance indicators of evidence-based practices at the school and classroom levels to improve student learning. The system accommodates rubrics for assessment of the indicators, assists in developing plans and tasks around the indicators, tracks dates, and lists those responsible for monitoring progress of the indicators. The NDMILE planning and coaching tool allows for flexibility to accommodate the reporting requirements for education improvement (such as accreditation, schoolwide, and program improvement) through one report. NDMILE will guide improvement teams through a continuous cycle of assessment, planning, implementation, and progress tracking. The school focus will be clear, responsibilities assigned, and efforts synchronized.

NDMILE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDERS

Each Tier I and Tier II NDMILE school has an assigned ND DPI contact person who offers technical assistance through the NDMILE process. To ensure success for schools, the ND DPI is committed to providing technical assistance and support for schools as they work through the steps of the process.

INDICATORS IN ACTION

Indicators in Action is a professional learning resource produced by ADI. This resource provides an explanation of indicators of effective practices. Video clips of principals, teachers, and teams show what the indicators of effective practices look like in a classroom setting when they are actually “in action”. This resource uses the NDMILE indicators in the video clips; however, the “Indicators in Action” would be an appropriate professional learning opportunity for faculty and team meetings or other workshops dealing with school improvement initiatives.

NDMILE WEBEX TRAINING SERIES

A WebEx training series is available for schools using the NDMILE. These sessions are designed as a review for schools on how to accomplish each of the various steps in the NDMILE.

Topics include:

- Registering the school, overview of the NDMILE and timelines
- Assessing indicators and using the Wise Ways®
- Resources, reports and documenting meeting agendas and minutes
- Developing plans and tasks that move schools forward
- Coaching comments and giving effective feedback
- Monitoring and reviewing school plans

Tier I and Tier II program effectiveness will be monitored through the NDMILE indicators that the school has planned for and the tasks developed around that plan. Each school’s progress is monitored by setting goals for each individual task to be completed and accountability is expressed by assigning responsibility to a staff member, target date, and completion date for each task. During the monitoring of the plan, the school must

provide the experience, sustainability, and evidence as to how each indicator was fully implemented.

To monitor Tier I and Tier II school progress throughout the SIG process, the ND DPI utilizes the SIG Online Tool through NDMILE. The ND DPI, in partnership with the ADI, developed a web-based system with state-identified key indicators directly relating to the SIG intervention models. The ND DPI works closely with ADI on training, resources, tools, and areas of need. In order to keep up with the latest research, ADI is continually updating the research provided for the indicators. ADI has also provided research to specific indicators that are aligned to RTI, ELL, and Special Education.

In addition, North Dakota, ADI, and the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) collaborated to create a joint site (Native Star/NDMILE) so North Dakota schools that jointly operate under the BIE can utilize one system for school improvement, federal planning requirements, and SIG requirements if awarded a Tier I or Tier II SIG from either the state of North Dakota or the BIE.

The benefits of schools using the Native Star/NDMILE tool to write and implement a continuous improvement plan includes the following elements:

- web based online tool
- no cost to schools or districts
- research based indicators of effective practice
- state level support through technical assistance providers, coaching comments, and training
- meet multiple plan requirements using one planning process (Education Improvement Plan, Title I Schoolwide Plan, and Title I Program Improvement Plan)
- resources, tools, and reports built into the tool
- tracks progress
- continuous ongoing improvement plan that encourages and supports collaboration among school staff
- aligned to federal SIG requirements

North Dakota's current success in utilizing NDMILE and Native Star for local improvement plans makes it an obvious choice to continue the use of the tool by integrating the SIG Online Tool. One of the most notable outcomes of using the NDMILE system is the collaboration it naturally fosters as outlined below.

The SEA . . .

- Sets reporting dates and benchmarks for periodic monitoring
- Reviews the school transformation team's
 - Meeting agendas and minutes
 - Progress with implementation indicators
 - Progress with school-specific interventions
 - Progress with leading and lagging indicators
- Enters reviewer comments on progress reports
- Data mines across all transformation schools in the state
- Generates reports
- Captures information for project evaluation

The LEA . . .

- Designates internal partner (LEA staff) and/or external partner (partner organization staff) to coach school transformation teams
- Reviews the school transformation team's
 - Meeting agendas and minutes

- Progress with implementation indicators
- Progress with school-specific interventions
- Progress with leading and lagging indicators
- Data mines across transformation schools in the district
- Reviews progress reports before they are submitted
- Reviews SEA reviewer comments

The School Team. . .

- Documents and tracks progress (over three-year grant period) toward
 - Transformation Implementation Indicators
 - Leading Indicators
 - Lagging Indicators
- Plans transformation team meetings with agendas and minutes
- Assesses, plans, and tracks progress with implementation indicators
- Links to resources relative to each implementation indicator
- Generates a variety of reports
- Dialogues with coaches
- Electronically submits reports to the SEA

As an obligation of receiving Tier I or Tier II SIG funding, the indicators and reports listed below will be required. This information will be available on the Native Star/NDMILE dashboards for Tier I and Tier II schools.

- Transformation Implementation Indicators
- Interventions Annual Form by Federal Requirement
- Leading/Lagging Metrics Annual Report

The SIG Online Tool allows for display of each Tier I and Tier II schools process of assessing, evaluating, planning, progress monitoring, and reporting of the Transformation Implementation Indicators within federal requirement categories as listed below:

- Replace the Principal
- Turnaround Leadership
- Competencies
- Implement Strategies
- Implement Evaluation Systems
- Provide Incentives
- Reward or Remove Staff
- Instructional Programs
- Continuous Use of Data
- Professional Development
- Increased Learning Time
- Family and Community Engagement
- Operational Flexibility
- Technical Support

The SIG Online Tool can generate key reports needed to document work completed in the tool.

- **Summary Report:** Provides a summary of transformation team activity, including the number of meeting minutes and progress toward implementation indicators. This report is automatically generated and requires no new entry.

- **Comprehensive Plan Report:** Provides detailed tracking of progress with implementation indicators. This report is automatically generated and requires no new entry.
- **Leading/Lagging Indicator Report:** Provides updates to progress with leading and lagging indicators.
- **Interventions Report:** Includes a brief statement of progress for each implementation strand and reviewer comments which are then provided from the SEA to the school/LEA.

The SIG Online Tool also has the capacity to provide reviewer comments back to the school/LEA on each of the various reports. The SEA has established reporting dates for each submission, and the reports are submitted electronically for review by the LEA and SEA. While the SIG Online Tool captures a great deal of documentation for determining progress with implementation indicators, leading indicators, and lagging indicators, our monitoring and evaluation methods will also include additional oversight through onsite visits and conference calls.

In the spring of 2012, the ND DPI began using the NDMILE SIG Online Tool for North Dakota's current Tier I school. The needs assessment, planning, monitoring, and evaluation design utilized in the SIG Online Tool addresses three categories of indicators: (1) implementation indicators; (2) leading indicators; and (3) lagging indicators. The Transformation Implementation Indicators parallel the federal requirements for the Transformation Model, which historically has been the model utilized by North Dakota Tier I schools. The leading indicators demonstrate the school's signs of growth or change in a given direction which provides an early read on progress towards longer-term outcomes and measure conditions that are prerequisite to the desired outcomes. The lagging indicators measure progress relative to student outcomes that are the desired ends for the interventions and for the SIG project.

The SIG Online Tool:

- Enables the SEA to set reporting dates and benchmarks for implementation indicators.
- Documents school transformation team meeting agendas and minutes.
- Provides for detailed planning and tracking of implementation indicators.
- Provides links to resources relative to each implementation indicator.
- Generates a variety of reports on implementation and leading indicators.
- Allows for coaching from a partner and/or LEA liaison.
- Provides Monitoring Review forms with SEA review comments returned to the school and LEA.
- Includes data mining features that allow the SEA to scan data across its schools.

To assist SEAs in using this tool for formative and summative evaluation, ADI has created several documents to guide verification of implementation levels. States can use this information for reporting each SIG school's fidelity regarding implementation and as one source of data for SIG program evaluation.

Monitoring and oversight will be a crucial issue for the ND DPI. The SIG Online Tool will greatly assist us in meeting the federal requirements while at the same time documenting each Tier I and Tier II school's progress toward facilitating improvement activities.

In addition, each school in Tier I and Tier II has been assigned a Federal Title Programs contact person. This person is responsible for continued communication, technical assistance, and program oversight throughout the year for all schools under their purview. Best efforts are made to keep the assigned Federal Title Programs contact the same from year-to-year to encourage consistency and integrity. The Federal Title Programs contact person will monitor the LEA and school progress, answer questions, ensure reports are submitted in a timely manner, and oversee the LEA's implementation of the SIG indicators and intervention model for each selected school.

The ND DPI will also monitor each LEA that receives a SIG through the required submission and review of

reports and school level achievement data. The ND DPI will annually monitor the fiscal expenditures of each SIG application through a detailed paper report. This report is called the *Follow-up Report for Additional Program Improvement Funding* (SFN 52822). All SIG grantees are also required to complete an *Annual Program Improvement Report* (SFN 52820) in which the district/school outlines progress made toward their goals and performance indicators. The two reports as well as the achievement data will clearly demonstrate whether or not the SIG grantees are meeting their goals and will be used to determine if continuous funding is approved.

Finally, in North Dakota, we believe that the amount of oversight that each LEA will need will vary significantly across the state. Many districts, in particular larger school districts, have a stronger internal support system and greater access to resources to help them implement the SIG requirements in their Tier I and Tier II schools. However, smaller districts such as those with limited resources, substantial barriers, or districts considered “at risk”, may need significant oversight to ensure that the SIG requirements are implemented with fidelity.

The ND DPI will develop tiered levels of intervention to target our technical assistance, monitoring, and oversight to meet the needs of all participating LEAs while ensuring SIG final requirements are met.

(4) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

The ND DPI has created a rigorous scoring rubric which is directly aligned to the LEA SIG application. This scoring rubric is included in the state application for SIG funding (see Appendix D). The scoring rubric is based on a points system and will be used to prioritize which LEAs will receive funding to support their Tier I and/or Tier II schools. Any remaining SIG funds will then be made available for schools in Tier III.

We anticipate the demand for funding will intensify in Tier III as the majority of our improvement schools fall in this category. Again, the scoring rubric which is directly aligned to the LEA SIG application will be used to prioritize which LEAs will receive funding to support their Tier III schools.

As required in previous SEA SIG proposals, any scoring rubric section that receives a score of zero (0) will automatically be ineligible for SIG funding.

(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.

The ND DPI has created a rigorous scoring rubric directly aligned to the LEA SIG application (see Appendix D). Schools in Tiers I, II, and III will use the same application to apply for funding. Schools in Tiers I and II will receive priority for SIG funding. If funds are available, schools in Tier III will be invited to submit an application for SIG funds. The scoring rubric will be used within the ND DPI to review the applications. Each school will receive a score based on the rubric. The scoring rubric will determine which schools receive funding. Using this method is fair and equitable and rewards those schools that are implementing strategies aligned with the SIG priorities. It is very realistic that not all Tier III schools will receive SIG funding. For these schools, the ND DPI will continue to offer technical assistance, monitoring, and oversight to ensure improvement regulations are met and schools continue initiatives to strive for increased student achievement.

(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.

In the state of North Dakota, the ND DPI does not have legal authority to take over a school. The North Dakota Century Code (NDCC) does not grant authority for a school takeover by the ND DPI. Therefore, the State of North Dakota will not provide services directly to any schools.

(7) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, or for priority schools, as applicable, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

In the state of North Dakota, the ND DPI does not have legal authority to take over a school. The NDCC does not grant authority for a school takeover by the ND DPI. Furthermore, NDCC does not grant authority for the establishment of charter schools. Neither the SEA nor an LEA may grant a charter. Therefore, the SEA does not intend to provide direct services to any school in the absence of a takeover.

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

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

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

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

Tier I and Tier II school or priority school, as applicable.

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

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

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

The ND DPI will reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of our School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses. The activities to be supported with these funds fall into the categories outlined below. The ND DPI does have both sufficient funds and sufficient staff to carry out the many activities that are listed in this section. As a rural state, we must offer a variety of mechanisms to connect with the field. We collaborate and work as a team to ensure we meet schools' needs as best as possible. The ND DPI Federal Title Programs office has established a comprehensive statewide system of support that is in place to provide assistance to SIG schools as indicated in this section.

■ Peer Review Team Expenditures

The ND DPI has established cadres of distinguished educators to assist the state department in reviewing Title I school and district improvement plans and SIG applications. Depending on the number of applications, the state department may contract with distinguished educators to review and score improvement plans and SIG applications. SEA SIG funds will be utilized to pay for these expenditures for SIG schools if this option is utilized.

■ Statewide Technical Assistance

The ND DPI Federal Title Programs office has multiple ways of providing statewide technical assistance and sharing effective strategies for schools and districts identified for improvement. The following summarizes our key initiatives:

○ Extensive Website

The ND DPI Federal Title Programs office has developed an extensive website (<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/progress/index.shtm>) for schools and districts identified for improvement. This site contains a variety of resources including a link to all district and school Adequate Yearly Progress reports, information on reports due throughout the year, information, and application forms on additional funds available for schools in improvement, sample letters and sample reports, and resources and handouts from prior workshops. SIG funds pay a small portion of salary for Federal Title Programs staff to develop SIG resources and guidance for our website.

○ Assigned ND DPI Liaison

Every school and district identified for improvement is assigned a Federal Title Programs staff member to answer questions, review plans and applications, and provide technical assistance. These liaisons keep in close contact with their assigned schools by gathering information, answering questions on program improvement issues, acting as a guidance coach, and tracking a school's needs and efforts in a very comprehensive manner. All Federal Title Programs staff keeps a daily time and effort log and are paid from various funding sources. Time that staff spends providing technical assistance to SIG schools will be coded to SIG administrative funds.

- Contracted SIG Expert

As part of each LEA's SIG application, the ND DPI creates a detailed timeline of activities based on information submitted in each Tier I and Tier II approved application. The Federal Title Programs office creates an activity chart outlining the Tier I and Tier II initiatives in chronological order. The Federal Title Programs office then contracts with a SIG expert to assist with the oversight of each Tier I and Tier II school's SIG program. The contracted individual conducts quarterly conference calls with staff from each SIG school to discuss the status of the timeline of activities. The contracted SIG expert is required to submit a written summary of the call and status of the activity chart to the Federal Title Programs office. These calls are conducted on a regular basis to ensure that the outlined activities have been conducted as indicated in the SIG application and to ensure that timely assistance can be provided.

- Monthly Research Report

The Federal Title Programs office generates and distributes a monthly report which summarizes newly released research/resources on educational issues relevant to North Dakota schools. The monthly Research/Resource Report (RRR) is disseminated electronically to all principals, administrators, and Title I teachers and staff in schools identified for improvement.

- Sharing of Effective Strategies

The ND DPI frequently contracts with exemplary educators within the state or educational entities to create resources for North Dakota schools and districts. We believe it is critical to highlight what has been proven to be effective in other schools and districts across North Dakota.

- The ND DPI requested assistance from the North Central Comprehensive Center (NCCC) in highlighting and documenting seven schools in the state of North Dakota that have made substantial improvement in their student achievement scores. Interviews with seven school administrators were conducted by the NCCC to gather information on the specific strategies each school employed to improve student achievement. A summary capturing the most important processes and initiatives was created for each school. All seven summaries were compiled into one document and shared statewide to disseminate effective practices.
- The Federal Title Programs office created a "What Works" resource guide for schools and districts to provide educators with strategies, interventions, and components used in effective educational programs. This document contains one-page profiles containing an overview, research summary, and resource section on educational topics being used across the nation to improve education and raise academic achievement. The resources within this document are provided to assist schools and districts in their school improvement efforts.

- School Improvement Project

The Federal Title Programs office contracted with distinguished educators to create a toolbox of exemplary school improvement practices and strategies. Their knowledge and commitment enabled the department to generate this toolbox to be shared with other educators. The 34 school improvement documents outline a specific school improvement activity, provide the supporting research, and offer a sample budget for schools and districts to reference while developing their own school improvement initiatives.

The documents are posted on the ND DPI website at www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/index.shtm under "Key Title I Issues".

- Menus of Interventions

Within North Dakota's ESEA Flexibility Waiver Application submitted to the U.S. Department of

Education, priority and focus schools would have been required to submit an improvement plan to the department outlining interventions to address the identified needs and challenges at the school.

As part of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver Application, the ND DPI was required to generate a menu of interventions for priority and focus schools to reference. The interventions had to be separated into categories identified as areas of need in North Dakota. The ND DPI has withdrawn the state's ESEA Flexibility Waiver Application; however, these four menus of interventions continue to be available on our website for schools and districts to access.

[Menu of Interventions for Low Achieving Students](#)

[Menu of Interventions Geared for English Language Learners \(ELL\) Students](#)

[Menu of Interventions Geared for Native American Students](#)

[Menu of Interventions Geared for Students with Disabilities](#)

- Department Sponsored Conferences

The ND DPI sponsors several conferences each year. Each spring, a conference for schools and districts in improvement is held to disseminate key information regarding the school improvement requirements and to share effective strategies for making AYP. In the fall, a statewide conference is held for educators to promote effective research-based strategies designed to raise achievement. The ND DPI sponsors several SIG WebEx presentations specifically designed to provide technical assistance and guidance to Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. Numerous other trainings, via conference call or WebEx, are also offered each year to share and disseminate information statewide. Time that staff spends providing technical assistance to SIG schools will be coded to SIG administrative funds.

- WebEx Trainings

To further expand the number of training opportunities available to Title I personnel, the Federal Title Programs office periodically conducts WebEx trainings on relevant Title I issues. This form of training is very beneficial because the trainings are short (one hour), easy to access, and participants don't have to be away from their building. In addition, each training is recorded for viewing at times convenient for school personnel. The training that the ND DPI will hold for the Tier I and Tier II schools will be conducted through WebEx training.

SEA SIG funds will be used to provide statewide technical assistance for these key initiatives.

- NDSSOS

The ND DPI also provides a multitude of supports to all schools, no matter their designation as Title I or non-Title I. North Dakota has an established system titled the "North Dakota Statewide System of Support" (NDSSOS). This system supports schools and districts as they build their capacity to implement sustained and continuous school improvement strategies with fidelity. The ultimate goal is to improve teaching and learning so ALL North Dakota students can achieve their maximum potential as 21st century learners who are prepared to live and compete in a global world. The NDSSOS provides an overview of the ND DPI's available programs and resources to support district and school improvement in North Dakota.

The NDSSOS will assist in building capacity in districts and schools in the areas of leadership, curriculum and instruction, assessment, school climate and culture, and professional development/learning. The NDSSOS accomplishes this by supporting schools and districts in the following areas:

1. Focus on student achievement in all support efforts.
2. Provide resources and support to district and school leaders as they are the key to facilitating change and

increasing student achievement.

3. Assist in developing a shared vision and make decisions that are collaborative and data driven with the leadership team and all staff.
4. Provide professional learning on varied instructional strategies that accommodate all learning styles and require students to use higher-order thinking skills in all classrooms.
5. Align the curriculum to the North Dakota Common Core Standards, mapped across grade spans to eliminate gaps and unnecessary repetitions, and be made available to all students.
6. Provide multiple assessments which are frequent, rigorous and aligned to the North Dakota Common Core Standards and the North Dakota Common Core Assessment.
7. Provide opportunities to ensure all assessment data are analyzed and used to inform instruction.
8. Maximize instructional time, organizational resources, and state and federal funds for improved student achievement as facilitated by the leadership team.
9. Develop a planning process that engages representatives from all stakeholder groups, involves collecting and analyzing data, and is evaluated effectively.
10. Assist in providing a learning environment that is safe, orderly, and focused on high achievement for all types of diverse learners.
11. Engage families and communities as active partners in student learning and ensure all students come to school ready to learn.
12. Provide faculty and staff with ongoing and job-embedded professional development that is aligned with a comprehensive needs assessment.
13. Align data with identified needs, measurable goals, and allocation of funding (activities).
14. Implement research-based best practices.

The NDSSOS uses a model of delivery built around a framework designed to build capacity of districts and schools in their effort to meet the overall goal of increased student achievement. This includes outlining departmental supports provided in the areas of leadership, curriculum and instruction, assessment, school climate and culture, and professional development/learning, and incorporates the foundations of all schools improvement efforts. The NDSSOS manual provides a summary of the current efforts the ND DPI has in place to support districts and schools throughout the state. The ND DPI strives for inclusion and implementation of evidence and research-based best practices that support student achievement in North Dakota districts and schools.

■ Title I School Support Team/SSOS Consultant Team

A statewide School Support Team (SST) has been developed for North Dakota as required by federal law. Members of the School Support Team are comprised of distinguished educators regionally located throughout North Dakota. Members of the School Support Team are required to stay educated and current on the Title I programs and issues. The members provide in-depth technical assistance to schools identified for improvement, particularly those in the corrective action and restructuring phases, upon request.

SEA SIG funds will be used to provide training and support to our SST and SSOS Consultant teams as they work extensively with SIG schools.

■ North Dakota Moving to Improve Learning for Everyone (NDMILE)

NDMILE is a web-based system implemented by the ND DPI for schools to use to inform, coach, sustain, track, and report improvement activities. The NDMILE has indicators of evidence-based practices at the

district, school, and classroom levels to improve student learning. It is also customized so that the SEA or LEA can populate or enhance the system with its own indicators of effective practice or use those embedded in the tool. NDMILE is a tool that will guide improvement teams through a continuous cycle of assessment, planning, implementation, and progress tracking. Focus will be clear, responsibilities assigned, and efforts synchronized.

Schools participating in NDMILE will utilize the indicators that were selected for North Dakota. Schools will assess each indicator and determine the value the indicator has for improving student performance. Implementation plans will be developed and progress toward meeting goals for each indicator can be monitored through the tool.

North Dakota is one of several states that is partnering with the Academic Development Institute (ADI) to use a tailored version of the indicator-based systems and trainings as a key component of our comprehensive system of support for schools in improvement. SEA SIG funds will be used to provide supports to Tier I, II, and III schools utilizing NDMILE as their primary school improvement tool.

■ NDMILE SIG Online Tool

As indicated in Section D, the ND DPI uses the NDMILE SIG Online Tool to monitor Tier I and Tier II SIG grantees. Expenditures associated with the administrative costs of this tool will be charged to SIG administrative funds.

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.

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in

reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”) that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2013 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than [Please indicate number].

Assurance

The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

Waiver 3: Priority schools list waiver

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

Assurance

The State assures that its methodology for identifying priority schools, approved through its ESEA flexibility request, provides an acceptable alternative methodology for identifying the State’s lowest-performing schools and thus is an appropriate replacement for the eligibility requirements and definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools in the SIG final requirements.

Waiver 4: Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver

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

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

The State of North Dakota requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver

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

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

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

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2014–2015 school year in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

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

Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver

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

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

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

Assurances

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

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

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

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

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate school infrastructure, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
- (2) The LEA must ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that it commits to serve receives all those resources are aligned with the interventions.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, to meet the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected;
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, or closure model;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively;
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school.
- (5) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that receives school improvement funds.
 - Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics;
 - Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the model that the LEA will use.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its schools.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation.

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

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

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

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

Note: to imp...
to imp...
serve: the LEA

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

An LE...
to serv...

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET		
	Year 1 Budget	
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000	
Total Budget	\$6,279,000	

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics, and monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish a management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, include in its contract or agreement with the management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and hire staff who can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reform efforts that can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,
- (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant...

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with the waiver.

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

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

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

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	COHORT #	PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 13 ALLOCATION
TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 13:			

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

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

School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2013 Assurances

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

- Use FY 2013 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards² to its LEAs.
- Use the renewal process identified in [State]'s most recently approved SIG application to determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

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

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

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID#	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Fort Totten 30	3807170	Four Winds High School	00227	X				
Fort Yates 4	3807200	Fort Yates High School		X				
Fort Yates 4	3807200	Fort Yates Middle School	00744	X				
Mandaree 36	3811850	Mandaree High School	00006	X				
Selfridge 8	3816510	Selfridge High School	00574	X				
Warwick 29	3819260	Warwick High School	00672	X				
White Shield 85	3819680	White Shield High School	00808	X				
Gackle-Streeter	3800043	Gackle-Streeter High School	00231		X			
Kensal	3810260	Kensal High School	00330		X			
New Town 1	3813920	New Town High School	00015		X			
Parshall 3	381490	Parshall High School	00528		X			
Sawyer 16	3816470	Sawyer High School	00570		X			
Dickinson 1	3800038	A L Hagen Junior High School	00131			X		
Alexander 2	3801760	Alexander Elementary School	00003			X		
Harvey 38	3808890	B M Hanson Elementary School	00287			X		
Bottineau 1	3803060	Bottineau Elementary School	00067			X		
Bottineau 1	3803060	Bottineau Jr-Sr High School	00068			X		
Bowman Co 1	3803200	Bowman County Elementary School	00074			X		
United 7	3818730	Burlington-Des Lacs Elementary School	00646			X		
Solen 3	3816980	Cannon Ball Elementary School	00585			X		
Cavalier 6	3800018	Cavalier Elementary School	00094			X		
Center-Stanton 1	3800052	Center-Stanton Elementary School	00096			X		
Center-Stanton 1	3800052	Center-Stanton High School	00097			X		

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID#	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Central Cass 17	3804090	Central Cass Elementary School	00099			X		
Fargo 1	3806780	Clara Barton Elementary School	00195			X		
Minot 1	3813030	Dakota Elementary School	00434			X		
Dakota Prairie 1	3800040	Dakota Prairie Elementary School	00416			X		
Divide County 1	3805160	Divide County Elementary School	00139			X		
Bismarck 1	3800014	Dorothy Moses Elementary School	00048			X		
Drake 57	3800029	Drake High School	00149			X		
Drayton 19	3805340	Drayton Elementary School	00150			X		
Dunseith 1	3805460	Dunseith Elementary School	00155			X		
Dunseith 1	3805460	Dunseith High School	00157			X		
West Fargo 6	3819410	Eastwood Elementary School	00677			X		
New Town 1	3813920	Edwin Loe Elementary School	00495			X		
Eight Mile 6	3806010	Eight Mile Elementary School	00171			X		
Eight Mile 6	3806010	Eight Mile High School	00172			X		
Ellendale 40	3806090	Ellendale Elementary School	00177			X		
Emerado	3806360	Emerado Elementary School	00182			X		
Enderlin Area 24	3800061	Enderlin Area Elementary School	00183			X		
Minot 1	3813030	Erik Ramstad Middle School	00436			X		
Fessenden-Bowdon	3800049	Fessenden-Bowdon Elementary School	00212			X		
Mandan 1	3811820	Ft. Lincoln Elementary School	00081			X		
Fort Yates 4	3807200	Ft. Yates Elementary				X		
Glen Ullin 48	3807830	Glen Ullin Elementary School	00235			X		

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID#	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Glenburn 26	3807850	Glenburn Elementary School	00237			X		
Grafton 3	3808060	Grafton Central Middle School	00247			X		
Grafton 3	3808060	Grafton High School	00248			X		
Grenora 99	3808460	Grenora Elementary School	00273			X		
Griggs County Central 18	3804560	Griggs County High School	00164			X		
Williston 1	3819880	Hagan Elementary School	00758			X		
Hankinson 8	3808710	Hankinson Elementary School	00281			X		
Dickinson 1	3800038	Heart River Elementary School	00742			X		
Hillsboro 9	3809570	Hillsboro Elementary School	00301			X		
Bismarck 1	3800014	Jeannette Myhre Elementary School	00052			X		
Fargo 1	3806780	Jefferson Elementary School	00199			X		
Minot 1	3813030	Jim Hill Middle School	00439			X		
Kenmare 28	3810180	Kenmare Elementary School	00731			X		
Fargo 1	3806780	Kennedy Elementary School	00206			X		
Killdeer 16	3810270	Killdeer Elementary School	00331			X		
Kindred	3800025	Kindred Elementary School	00334			X		
Kulm 7	3810500	Kulm Elementary School	00338			X		
West Fargo 6	3819410	L E Berger Elementary School	00815			X		
Grand Forks 1	3808130	Lake Agassiz Elementary School	00256			X		
Lakota 66	3810600	Lakota Elementary School	00341			X		
Langdon Area 23	3810810	Langdon Area Elementary School	00347			X		
Leeds 6	3810980	Leeds Elementary School	00357			X		

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID#	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Fargo 1	3806780	Lewis and Clark Elementary School	00200			X		
Minot 1	3813030	Lewis and Clark Elementary School	00445			X		
Williston 1	3819880	Lewis and Clark Elementary School	00690			X		
Dickinson 1	3800038	Lincoln Elementary School	00135			X		
Fargo 1	3806780	Lincoln Elementary School	00201			X		
Lisbon 19	3811430	Lisbon Elementary School	00373			X		
Lisbon 19	3811430	Lisbon Middle School	00375			X		
Minot 1	3813030	Longfellow Elementary School	00441			X		
Fargo 1	3806780	Madison Elementary School	00203			X		
Mandaree 36	3811850	Mandaree Elementary School	00747			X		
Mandan 1	3811820	Mary Stark Elementary School	00390			X		
May-Port CG 14	3800041	May-Port CG Middle School	00019			X		
Minot 1	3813030	McKinley Elementary School	00443			X		
Midkota 7	3800042	Midkota Elementary School	00042			X		
Midway	3812920	Midway Elementary School	00424			X		
Minnewaukan 5	3812990	Minnewaukan Elementary School	00430			X		
Minnewaukan 5	3812990	Minnewaukan High School	00431			X		
Mott-Regent 1	3800046	Mott-Regent Elementary School	00460			X		
Mt Pleasant 4	3800046	Mt Pleasant Elementary School	00463			X		
Mt Pleasant 4	3800046	Mt Pleasant High School	00464			X		
Napoleon 2	3813510	Napoleon Elementary School	00468			X		
Nedrose 4	3813660	Nedrose Elementary School	00474			X		

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID#	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
North Sargent 3	3814290	North Sargent Elementary School	00504			X		
Oakes 41	3814500	Oakes Elementary School	00513			X		
Oberon 16	3814520	Oberon Elementary School	00515			X		
Parshall 3	3814940	Parshall Elementary School	00527			X		
Grand Forks 1	3808130	Phoenix Elementary School	00251			X		
Pingree-Buchanan 10	3815150	Pingree-Buchanan Elementary School	00818			X		
Devils Lake 1	3805040	Prairie View Elementary School	00129			X		
New Salem-Almont	3813870	Prairie View Elementary School	00494			X		
Dickinson 1	3800038	PS Berg Elementary School	00136			X		
Richardton-Taylor 34	3800048	Richardton-Taylor High School	00551			X		
Bismarck 1	3800014	Robert Place Miller Elementary School	00727			X		
Rolette 29	3816050	Rolette Elementary School	00558			X		
Roosevelt 18	3816090	Roosevelt Elementary School	00560			X		
Dickinson 1	3800038	Roosevelt Elementary School	00137			X		
Minot 1	3813030	Roosevelt Elementary School	00448			X		
Sawyer 16	3816470	Sawyer Elementary School	00569			X		
Bismarck 1	3800014	Saxvik Elementary School	00059			X		
Selfridge 8	3816510	Selfridge Elementary School	00573			X		
West Fargo 6	3819410	South Elementary School	00682			X		
St. John 3	3817460	St. John Elementary School	00599			X		
St. John 3	3817460	St. John High School	00600			X		
St. Thomas	3817520	St. Thomas Elementary School	00602			X		

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID#	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Stanley 2	3817570	Stanley Elementary School	00604			X		
Kidder County 1	3800389	Steele-Dawson Elementary School	00611			X		
New 8	3813760	Stony Creek Elementary School	00483			X		
Minot 1	3813030	Sunnyside Elementary School	00449			X		
Surrey 41	3817910	Surrey Elementary School	00618			X		
TGU 60	3800047	TGU Granville Elementary School	00271			X		
TGU 60	3800047	TGU Towner Elementary School	00498			X		
Belcourt 7	3802530	Turtle Mountain Elem School	00750			X		
Belcourt 7	3802530	Turtle Mountain High School	00752			X		
Belcourt 7	3802530	Turtle Mountain Middle School	00751			X		
Turtle Lake-Mercer 72	3818500	Turtle Lake-Mercer Elementary School	00640			X		
Twin Buttes 37	3818600	Twin Buttes Elementary School	00757			X		
Grand Forks 1	3808130	Valley Middle School	00265			X		
Valley City 2	3818850	Valley City Jr-Sr High School	00656			X		
Valley-Edinburg 118	3800397	Valley-Edinburg Elementary School-Crystal	00652			X		
Velva 1	3817040	Velva Elementary School	00590			X		
Warwick 29	3819260	Warwick Elementary School	00671			X		
Minot 1	3813030	Washington Elementary School	00450			X		
Grand Forks 1	3808130	West Elementary School	00267			X		
White Shield 85	3819680	White Shield Elementary School	00807			X		
Williston	3819880	Wilkinson Elementary School	00694			X		

LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID#	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Bismarck 1	3800014	Will-Moore Elementary School	00062			X		
Wing 28	3820130	Wing Elementary School	00704			X		
Grand Forks 1	3808130	Winship Elementary School	00269			X		

**North Dakota Department of Public Instruction
Kirsten Baesler, State Superintendent
600 E. Boulevard Ave., Dept. 201
Bismarck, ND 58505-0440**

North Dakota Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Descriptor (d)(1): Provide the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) that the State uses to identify such schools.

The NDDPI provides assurance that it has defined “persistently lowest-achieving schools” and that the NDDPI uses this definition to identify such schools for the purposes of public reporting.

The NDDPI has defined persistently lowest-achieving schools as specified in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, dated December 18, 2009.

The NDDPI identifies “persistently lowest-achieving schools” as follows:

- (a) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that –
 - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent (or five) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
 - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years;

And

- (b) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that –
 - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
 - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

A school that falls within the definition of (a) above is a “Tier I” school and a school that falls within the definition of (b) above is a “Tier II” school for purposes of using State Improvement Grant funds under ESEA section 1003(g). The NDDPI provides assurance that it will identify persistently lowest-achieving schools on an annual basis.

To identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, the NDDPI provides assurance that it takes into consideration both: (a) the academic achievement of the “all students” group in a school in

terms of proficiency on the State's assessments under ESEA Section 1111(b)(3) in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and (b) the school's lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group. The "all students" group is understood to include all students who participate in the North Dakota State Assessment in all applicable grades (grades 3-8 and 11) and among all subgroups, including ethnicity, limited English proficiency, economic disadvantage, and special education.

The NDDPI provides assurance that it uses the North Dakota State Assessment (NDSA) in reading/language arts and mathematics required under Section 1111(b)(3) in the determination of persistently lowest-achieving schools statewide. The NDSA is understood to include the State's general assessments, including its alternate assessments based on alternate and modified achievement standards. The NDDPI applies the definition of proficiency defined through the State's approved academic achievement standards setting process.

For the purpose of determining Tier I schools, the NDDPI generated a ranking of our 60 schools currently identified for improvement using a composite reading/mathematics score for a three-year period (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09). Lack of progress is defined as those schools not making AYP specific to the "all students" group. In addition, the NDDPI reviewed its graduation rates for a three-year period (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09) and added to Tier I any high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent for three consecutive years. The data showing the ranking of our Tier I schools can be accessed at <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/Legislative/sig/index.shtm> on the NDDPI website.

For the purpose of determining Tier II schools, the NDDPI generated a ranking our North Dakota high schools that are eligible for, but not receiving, Title I funds using a composite reading/mathematics score for a three-year period (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09). Lack of progress is defined as those schools not making AYP specific to the "all students" group. In addition, the NDDPI reviewed its graduation rates for a three-year period (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09) and added to Tier II any high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent for three consecutive years. The data showing the ranking of our Tier II schools can be accessed at <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/Legislative/sig/index.shtm> on the NDDPI website.

The list of North Dakota schools identified for Tier I and Tier II can be accessed at <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/Legislative/sig/index.shtm> on the NDDPI website.

The NDDPI provides assurance that it defines a secondary school as specified within North Dakota Century Code and further assures that a secondary school does not include any education beyond grade 12. A secondary school is understood to be eligible to receive Title I funds under ESEA Section 1113(a) or 1113(b). The NDDPI will follow its approved ranking protocols to determine which secondary schools are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds.

The NDDPI provides assurance that it conducts the identification of persistently lowest-achieving schools in a manner consistent with the multi-step guidance provided by ED.

The NDDPI provides assurance that it will publicly post this information on the State's SFSF website and on the NDDPI Title I website on or about February 1, 2010. The NDDPI foresees no obstacles to meeting this deadline.



TITLE I APPLICATION FOR ADDITIONAL PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT FUNDING

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Title I

SFN 52823 (rev. 01-2014)

RETURN TO:
Department of Public Instruction
Federal Title Program Office
600 E Boulevard Avenue, Dept. 201
Bismarck, ND 58505-0440

Part A – General Information

Application Funding:

1003 (a)

1003 (g) (SIG)

Name of Applicant			
Mailing Address	City	State	Zip Code
Name of District Authorized Representative	Telephone Number	Fax Number	
Authorized Representative Email Address			
Name of Building Principal	Telephone Number	Fax Number	
Building Principal Email Address			

Part B – Certification and Assurances

The applicant hereby assures the Superintendent of Public Instruction that:

1. Parents of participating children, school staff, the school district, and the state have jointly agreed to the selection of providers of technical assistance and the best use of funds for the effective implementation of the program improvement plan. (State Required)
2. If this application is approved, program improvement funds will be expended in compliance with the applicable federal laws and regulations and the NDDPI "General Requirements for Federal Programs" manual dated February 1998. (State Required)
3. The LEA will use its School Improvement Grant (SIG) to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the SIG final requirements. (Federally Required)
4. The LEA will establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the SIG final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds. (Federally Required)
5. If the LEA implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, it must 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 SIG final requirements. (Federally Required)
6. The LEA will report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the SIG final requirements. (Federally Required)

The signature of the Authorized Representative below indicates the awareness and agreement with the Certification and Assurances listed in this application.

Signature of District Authorized Representative	Date
Signature of Building Principal	Date

Part C – State Approval (For Department Use Only)

Funding Period	Signature of Authorized SEA Official	Date Approved
Year One Amount Approved	Total Amount Approved	

Continuation of SIG funds into years two and three are subject to submission, review, rubric score of annual reports, and achievement data.

Part D – Schools to be Served

The district must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve. The district must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the district commits to serve and identify the model that the district will use in each Tier I and Tier II school. A district that has a Tier I or Tier II school and does not apply for SIG funds to serve Tier I and Tier II schools may not apply for SIG funds to serve any Tier III schools.

School Name	NCES ID #	Targeted Assistance	Schoolwide	Tiers			Intervention Models <i>(Tiers I and II schools only)</i>			
				Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Turn-around	Restart	Closure	*Transfor-mation
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					

Any LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools. If applying to serve multiple schools within the district, each school must submit its own SIG application.

Part E – Descriptive Information

- Describe the needs assessment process that demonstrates the analyzation of needs at the school and the selected interventions at each school.
(Tiers I, II and III)

2. Describe the district/school's capacity to use these funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each of the schools identified in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected. Refer to criteria listed in Table A as to the areas that need to be addressed. *(Tiers I, II and III)*

Table A: Review Criteria for Capacity
Capacity Factors
High quality staff is available with the capability to implement the selected intervention model successfully.
The ability of the LEA to serve the overall number of Tier I and/or Tier II schools identified on the application has been addressed.
A commitment by stakeholder groups to support the selected intervention model has been addressed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher's union • Staff • Parents
Commitment of the school board to eliminate barriers and to facilitate full and effective implementation of the models.
A detailed and realistic timeline for getting the basic elements of the selected intervention model in place by the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year has been addressed.
A strategic planning process to successfully support the selection and implementation of the intervention model.
The historical success of recruiting new principals with the credentials and capability to implement the model has been described.
The ability of the LEA to successfully align federal, state, and local funding sources with grant activities and to ensure sustainability of the reform measures.

3. If the district is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why there is a lack of capacity to serve each Tier I school. Refer to criteria listed in Table B as to the areas that need to be addressed. *(Tier I only)*

Table B: Review Criteria for Lack of Capacity
Capacity Factors
High quality staff is available with the capability to implement the selected intervention model successfully.
The ability of the LEA to serve the overall number of Tier I and/or Tier II schools identified on the application has been addressed.
A commitment by stakeholder groups to support the selected intervention model has been addressed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher's union • Staff • Parents
Commitment of the school board to eliminate barriers and to facilitate full and effective implementation of the models.
A detailed and realistic timeline for getting the basic elements of the selected intervention model in place by the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year has been addressed.
A strategic planning process to successfully support the selection and implementation of the intervention model.
The historical success of recruiting new principals with the credentials and capability to implement the model has been described.
The ability of the LEA to successfully align federal, state, and local funding sources with grant activities and to ensure sustainability of the reform measures.

School Year:

- 2014-2015** *Includes Pre-Implementation
 2015-2016
 2016-2017

Part F-1 – Budget

The school must provide a budget that indicates the amount of funds it will need to implement the interventions in this application. Tier I and Tier II schools will duplicate this page as necessary as they need to submit a budget for each year of the three years in the grant.

Part F-1 – Budget – Pre-implementation

Pre-implementation enables the school to prepare for full implementation of a SIG model prior to the start of the 2014-2015 school year. As soon as the school receives approval, it may use part of its first year allocation for SIG-related activities. The pre-implementation activities that are not deemed necessary for the full implementation may not be paid for with Title I School Improvement Grant funds.

School Name

Object Code Number	Object Code Description	Requested Budget	<i>For Department Use Only</i>
			Final Approved Budget
110	Professional Salaries		
120	Non-professional Salaries		
200	Benefits		
300	Purchased Professional & Technical Services		
430	Maintenance		
500	Other Purchased Services/Travel		
600	Materials/Supplies		
730	Equipment		
800	Dues/Memberships/Registration Fees		
900	Indirect Costs		
Total	<i>Total must match total on Part F-2</i>		

600 – These funds are specifically for high quality interventions and activities supported through a thorough needs assessment. Supplies/materials will only be considered if they are necessary to implement the application plan.

730 – Equipment cannot be purchased with these funds unless supported through a needs assessment.

NORTH DAKOTA STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Rating and Scoring Rubric
Title I Additional Program Improvement Funding

Applicant's Name	<input type="checkbox"/> Tier I <input type="checkbox"/> Tier II <input type="checkbox"/> Tier III	Reviewer
------------------	--	----------

Summary Page

Part A – General Information	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Part B – Certification and Assurances	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Part C – State Approval (<i>For Department Use Only</i>)	Not Applicable
Part D – Schools to be Served	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Part E – Descriptive Information	Points Awarded
Part F – Budget	Points Awarded
Total Points	Total Points Awarded:

Sections of the scoring rubric indicate scoring “0” when the section does not apply to a particular Tier. This score will not count against a district when reviewing for funding.

	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III
Maximum Points Possible	96	96	96
Minimum Points Needed to be Considered for Award	55	55	55

Any application that receives a score of “0” points in any category is ineligible to receive funding.

Point Summary

Part E – Descriptive Information	Points Awarded (indicate below)
1. Needs assessment. (Tiers I, II, and III)	
2. Capacity (Tiers I, II, and III)	
3. Lack of capacity (Tier I)	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
4. Pre-implementation activities (Tiers I and II)	
5. Intervention design and implementation plans (Tiers I, II and III)	
6. External providers (Tiers I, II, and III)	
7. Alignment between interventions and resources (Tiers I, II, and III)	
8. Modification of practices and/or policies (Tiers I and II)	
9. Sustainment of interventions (Tiers I, II, and III)	
10. Process used to monitor student achievement	
11. Accountability processes (Tier III)	
12. Stakeholder consultation (Tiers I, II, and III)	
13. Timeline (Tiers I, II, and III)	
Part F – Budget	Points Awarded (indicate below)
1. Budget (Tier I, II, or III)	
2. Budget Narrative (Tier I, II, or III)	
Total Points	Total Points Awarded:

Part A – General Information	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Part B – Certification and Assurances	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Part C – State Approval (For Department Use Only)	Not Applicable
Part D – Schools to be Served	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included

Part E – Descriptive Information

1. Describe the needs assessment process that demonstrates the analyzation of needs for the school and the selected interventions at each school. (*Tiers I, II, and III*)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The application provided a detailed overview of the needs of the school, students, and community it will serve. The description of the school attendance area was detailed, providing sufficient information for setting up the needs assessment. The description also included charts and/or graphs displaying the results of the data analysis.</p> <p>There is significant evidence to demonstrate an assessment of needs at the school.</p> <p>The application included information from all four measures of data—student achievement data, school programs/process data, student/teacher/parent perceptions data, and demographic data.</p> <p>The needs assessment creates a solid foundation for this grant.</p>	<p>The application provided a brief description of the school attendance area including the school neighborhood and economic factors affecting the school.</p> <p>The description included moderate evidence to demonstrate an assessment of needs at the school.</p> <p>The school may or may not have included information from all four measures of data. The school included an analysis of data on students attending the school and some of this data was disaggregated and cross analyzed to determine students' needs.</p> <p>After reviewing the grant some needs are highlighted, but the overall needs of the school remain unclear.</p>	<p>The application did not provide a detailed description of its school, its students, and/or its community.</p> <p>The needs assessment did not disaggregate data.</p> <p>There is limited evidence to demonstrate an assessment of needs at the school.</p>

Points Possible: 8

Points Awarded:

Comments:

2. Describe the district's/school's capacity to use these funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each of the schools identified in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected. (*Tiers I, II, and III*)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The required activities of the school intervention models were aligned to SIG final requirements (Tiers I and II).</p> <p>Application includes a detailed evaluation of capacity and implementation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High qualify staff • LEA ability • Stakeholder commitment • School board commitment • Timeline • Strategic planning of intervention model • Recruitment of school leaders • Alignment of resources <p>Evaluation of capacity relating to the implementation of the proposed SIG grant has been included (Tier III).</p>	<p>Some, but not all of the required activities of the school intervention models were aligned to SIG final requirements (Tiers I and II).</p> <p>Application includes a basic evaluation of capacity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High qualify staff • LEA ability • Stakeholder commitment • School board commitment • Timeline • Strategic planning of intervention model • Recruitment of school leaders • Alignment of resources <p>Evaluation of capacity relating to the implementation of the proposed SIG grant has been included (Tier III) and is moderately addressed.</p>	<p>The required activities of the school intervention models did not align to SIG final requirements.</p> <p>Application did not include evaluation of capacity outlined in Table A.</p> <p>Evaluation of capacity relating to the implementation of the proposed SIG grant was not included (Tier III).</p>

Points Possible: 8	Points Awarded:
--------------------	-----------------

Comments:

Part E – Descriptive Information (continued)

3. If the district is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why there is a lack of capacity to serve each Tier I school. (*Tier I*)

The district explained why they lack the capacity to serve each of its Tier I schools using criteria outlined in Table B (no points).
 Acceptable
 Not Acceptable
 Not Applicable

4. Describe, in detail, the activities that will occur during the pre-implementation period (spring 2014) and how each activity will better enable the school to implement the SIG activities during the 2014-2015 school year. (*Tiers I and II*)

Acceptable (No Points)	Not Acceptable (No Points)
<p>For Tier I or II schools, the intervention met SIG final requirements.</p> <p>Specific programs, professional development, or activities are fully defined and are necessary for the implementation of school improvement grant.</p> <p>The application includes pre-implementation activities. These activities may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family and Community Engagement • Rigorous Review of External Providers • Instructional Programs • Staffing/School Leadership • Professional Development and Support • Preparation for Accountability Measures 	<p>For Tier I or II schools, the interventions do not meet SIG final requirements.</p> <p>This section does not provide an overview of the main components of the interventions being proposed necessary for the implementation of school improvement grant.</p>

The school described the activities that will occur during the pre-implementation period (spring 2014) and how each activity will better enable the school to implement the SIG activities during the 2014-2015 school year. (no points)
 Acceptable
 Not Acceptable
 Not Applicable

5. Describe the design and implementation plans for the interventions identified at each school. Please note, in Tiers I or II, the interventions must meet SIG final requirements and clearly indicates the model selected. For Tier III, identify the services each Tier III school will receive or the activities each Tier III school will implement. (*Tiers I, II and III*)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>Interventions were described in great detail and focused on helping the school's students meet the state's standards. Interventions were research based.</p> <p>This section provided a comprehensive overview of the main components of the interventions being proposed.</p> <p>For Tier I or II schools, the intervention clearly met SIG final requirements.</p> <p>Specific programs, professional development, or activities are fully defined in detail and are critical to the school's overall plan of improvement.</p>	<p>Interventions were briefly described and focused on helping the school's students meet the state's standards.</p> <p>This section provided a basic overview of the main components of the interventions being proposed. Details were not complete.</p> <p>For Tier I or II schools, the intervention met most of the SIG final requirements.</p> <p>Application provides moderate detail on proposed programs, professional development, or activities to be implemented.</p>	<p>Interventions were not described and did not address the school's plans to meet the state's standards.</p> <p>This section does not provide an overview of the main components of the interventions being proposed.</p> <p>For Tier I or II schools, the interventions do not meet SIG final requirements.</p>

Points Possible: 8	Points Awarded:
--------------------	-----------------

Comments:

Part E – Descriptive Information (continued)

6. Explain the process used to recruit, screen, and select external providers to ensure quality, if applicable. (*Tiers I, II, and III*)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
The school has identified, in great detail, the experience level and qualifications of external providers to ensure quality.	The school minimally identified the experience level and qualifications of external providers. The level of quality is moderate.	The school has not identified the experience level or qualifications of external providers to ensure quality.
There is strong evidence to demonstrate that the external provider’s qualifications were a key consideration in the recruitment, screening, and selection process.	The external provider’s qualifications were somewhat considered in the recruitment, screening, and selection process.	The external provider’s qualifications were not considered in the recruitment, screening, and selection process.
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

7. Illustrate the alignment between the interventions outlined and other resources in the school. (*Tiers I, II, and III*)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
Interventions and other resources were outlined with specific detail. They were aligned in order to fully and effectively implement interventions.	Interventions and other resources were moderately outlined.	Interventions and other resources were not aligned and/or did not support the full and effective implementation of interventions.
The application outlined multiple (four or more) specific federal and state resources that can be aligned with SIG (i.e., Title I, Title II, Special Education, BIE, general funds, state funds, outside grants, etc.).	The application outlined a few (less than four) specific federal and state resources that can be aligned with SIG (i.e., Title I, Title II, Special Education, BIE, general funds, state funds, outside grants, etc.).	No other federal and state resources were outlined to help support interventions.
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

8. How has the school modified its practices and/or policies to implement the interventions fully and effectively? (*Tiers I and II*)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
There is significant evidence to demonstrate that the applicant thoroughly addressed the current barriers faced by Tier I and II schools. Modifications to practices/policies were described in detail.	There is moderate evidence to demonstrate that the applicant briefly addressed the current barriers faced by the Tier I or II schools. Modifications to practices/policies were described briefly.	Applicant did not address the current barriers faced by the Tier I or II school.
A detailed timeline was included in the description outlining the sequence of events for policy/practice reform.	A specific timeline may not have been included, but the narrative outlined the sequence of events.	
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

Part E – Descriptive Information (continued)

9. How does the school plan to sustain the interventions after the funding period ends? (*Tiers I, II, and III*)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The school directed resources to short-term, one-time expenditures that will have a long-term payoff for students and educators.</p> <p>For activities that depend on recurring funding, it included a detailed plan for improving systemic efficacy and sustaining systems and programs after funding ends.</p>	<p>The school included some activities that will depend on recurring funding.</p> <p>The school included a minimal plan for improving systemic efficacy and sustaining systems and programs after funding ends.</p>	<p>The school did not include a realistic plan for sustaining the interventions after funding ends; no portion of expenditures were directed toward transition costs or improving efficacy of existing systems.</p>
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:

Comments:

10. Outline the process the school will use to monitor student achievement. The process must reflect reading/language arts and mathematics specific to the North Dakota State Assessment. (*Tiers I, II, and III*)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The school outlined in detail how their process is connected to priority needs, the needs assessment, and portrayed a clear and detailed analysis of the North Dakota State Assessment in the areas of reading/language arts and mathematics.</p> <p>The proposal includes detailed realistic and measureable goals and objectives for each school to be served.</p> <p>The school's application included a rigorous plan for tracking and evaluating the success and cost-effectiveness of each proposed.</p> <p>The proposal included a plan for monitoring the progress of the SIG on a regular, ongoing basis.</p>	<p>The school moderately outlined a process that is connected to priority needs, the needs assessment, and portrayed a brief analysis of the North Dakota State Assessment in the areas of reading/language arts and mathematics.</p> <p>The proposal briefly outlines realistic and measureable goals and objectives for each school to be served.</p> <p>The school's application included a minimal plan for tracking and evaluating the success and cost-effectiveness of each proposed.</p> <p>The proposal included a plan for monitoring the progress of the SIG; however, it is not on a regular, ongoing basis.</p>	<p>The school did not out process that clearly related to the needs assessment and/or to the priority need areas.</p> <p>The proposal lacks realistic and measureable goals and objectives for each school to be served.</p> <p>Application did not include a plan for measuring and tracking effectiveness and results of proposed Tier III intervention.</p>
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:

Comments:

11. Describe the process the district has established in order to hold its Tier III schools accountable to receive these funds. (*Tier III*)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The proposal clearly defines a detailed and rigorous process that the LEA has set to hold the Tier III school accountable.</p> <p>The application specifically describes the activities for each Tier III school served.</p> <p>A timeline for implementation and accountability is included.</p>	<p>The proposal briefly defines the process the LEA has set to hold the Tier III school accountable.</p> <p>A vague description of services was included for each Tier III school served.</p> <p>A timeline may not have been included, but accountability events were referenced in the narrative.</p>	<p>The proposal does not define the process the LEA has set to hold the Tier III school accountable.</p> <p>No detailed description of services was included for each Tier III school served.</p> <p>No timeline was included.</p>
Points Possible: 8 Score "0" for Tier I and Tier II.		Points Awarded:

Comments:

Part E – Descriptive Information (continued)

12. Describe the school consultation with stakeholders regarding the application and implementation of the proposed interventions.
(Tiers I, II, and III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>There is clear and convincing evidence that the school consulted with numerous stakeholders regarding the application and implementation of the proposed interventions. Their opinions and thoughts were taken into consideration when writing the grant.</p> <p>The application clearly outlined how stakeholders were informed of their role and responsibility for sustained improvement.</p>	<p>There is moderate evidence that the school consulted with some stakeholders regarding the application and implementation of the proposed interventions.</p> <p>The application minimally outlined how stakeholders were informed of their role and responsibility for sustained improvement.</p>	<p>The school did not consult with stakeholder groups regarding the application, implementation of the proposed interventions, or shared responsibility for change.</p>

Points Possible: 8

Points Awarded:

Comments:

13. Describe the timeline outlining the steps the school will take to implement the selected interventions. If necessary, identify the intervention.
(Tiers I, II, and III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The actions the school will take to implement the interventions were sequentially addressed and thoroughly described in the timeline.</p> <p>The school identified interventions when applicable.</p> <p>A timeline demonstrates that all of the model's elements were included which will be implemented during the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year.</p>	<p>The actions the schools will take to implement the interventions were minimally addressed and briefly described in the timeline.</p> <p>The school may or may not have identified interventions.</p> <p>A timeline was included which outlined a few of the model's elements to be implemented during the pre-implementation period prior to the 2014-2015 school year.</p>	<p>The actions the school will take to implement the interventions were not addressed or lacked a description in the timeline.</p> <p>The school did not identify interventions when applicable.</p> <p>The timeline did not demonstrate any of the model's elements to be implemented through out the 2014-2015 school year.</p>

Points Possible: 8

Points Awarded:

Comments:

Part F – Budget (Tiers I, II, and III)

F-1 The school must provide a budget that indicates the amount of funds it will need to implement the interventions in this application. Schools will duplicate this page as necessary as they need to submit a budget for each year of the three years in the grant. The pre-implementation activities that are not necessary for the full implementation may not be paid for with Title I School Improvement Grant funds.

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The school submitted a line-itemed budget.</p> <p>The school submitted a budget that reflects amounts requested for each year of a three-year period. (Tier I and Tier II only).</p> <p>The budget reflects sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of selected model (Tier I and II) or School Improvement Grant (Tier III).</p> <p>The multi-year budget does not exceed \$2 million per year per school.</p> <p>The application includes pre-implementation activities that are imperative to the implementation of the school improvement grant. These activities may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family and Community Engagement • Rigorous Review of External Providers • Instructional Programs • Staffing/School Leadership • Professional Development and Support • Preparation for Accountability Measures 	<p>The school submitted a line-itemed budget.</p> <p>The school submitted a budget that reflects amounts requested for each year of a three-year period. (Tier I and Tier II only).</p> <p>The budget may not clearly demonstrate it is sufficient to support full implementation.</p> <p>The application may include pre-implementation activities. Not all activities are necessary in order for the LEA to prepare for full implementation of the school intervention model.</p>	<p>The school did not submit a line-itemed budget.</p> <p>Budgets amounts were omitted or not clearly indicated.</p>
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:

Comments:

F-2 For each line item in Part F-1, please provide a detailed description of the expenditures listed in F-1.

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The budget narrative clearly reflected the proposed interventions and activities as supported through the needs assessment.</p> <p>The budget demonstrated a commitment to utilizing federal dollars to support student achievement.</p> <p>The budget narrative aligns with the submitted budget, represents the contents of the proposal, and clearly focuses on the intervention (Tiers I and II) or School Improvement Grant (Tier III).</p> <p>All pre-implementation activities are defined and described in detail and are imperative to the successful implementation of the school improvement grant.</p>	<p>The budget narrative minimally aligned to the proposed interventions and activities.</p> <p>The budget may not demonstrate a commitment to utilizing federal dollars to support student achievement.</p> <p>The budget narrative aligns with some but not all of the submitted budget and moderately focuses on the intervention (Tiers I and II) or School Improvement Grant (Tier III).</p> <p>The pre-implementation activities are somewhat defined and described. These activities may not be necessary in order for the LEA to prepare for full implementation of the school intervention model.</p>	<p>The budget narrative did not reflect the proposed interventions and activities.</p>
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:

Comments:

**CONTINUATION APPLICATION FOR ADDITIONAL PROGRAM
IMPROVEMENT FUNDING FOR TITLE I
TIER I/TIER II SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

RETURN TO:
Department of Public Instruction
Title I Office
600 E Boulevard Avenue, Dept. 201
Bismarck, ND 58505-0440

Part A – General Information

Name of Applicant – Local Educational Agency			
Mailing Address	City	State	Zip Code
Name of District Authorized Representative	Telephone Number	Fax Number	
Authorized Representative Email Address			
Name of Contact Person for Program Improvement	Telephone Number	Fax Number	
Contact Person's Email Address			

Part B – Certification and Assurances

The applicant hereby assures the Superintendent of Public Instruction that:

1. Parents of participating children, school staff, the school district, and the state have jointly agreed to the selection of providers of technical assistance and the best use of funds for the effective implementation of the program improvement plan.
2. If this application is approved, program improvement funds will be expended in compliance with the applicable federal laws and regulations and the NDDPI "General Requirements for Federal Programs" manual dated February 2004.
3. The LEA will use its School Improvement Grant (SIG) to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the SIG final requirements.
4. The LEA will establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the SIG final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
5. If the LEA implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, it must 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 SIG final requirements.
6. The LEA will report to the SEA the school-level data required under Section III of the SIG final requirements.

The signature of the Authorized Representative below indicates the awareness and agreement with the Certification and Assurances listed in this application.

Signature of District Authorized Representative	Date
---	------

Part C – State Approval (For Department Use Only)

Funding Period	Signature of Authorized SEA Official	Date Approved
Year One Amount Approved	Total Amount Approved	

Continuation of SIG funds into years two and three are subject to submission, review, and approval of annual reports, achievement data, and this continuation application.

Part D – Required Components-Transformation Model

Implementation of the following ten components is required for all Tier I and Tier II schools completing the transformation model. For each component, outline in detail both the school's progress in each component for the 2014-2015 school year as well as the implementation plans for each component for the 2015-2016 school year. Provide supporting data to document progress for each component.

The school participates in NDMILE. Part D of this report is addressed through the “Interventions Annual Report” on NDMILE; therefore, the paper report for Part D is not required.

Component	2014-2015 Progress	2015-2016 Implementation Plans
1. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model.		
2. Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that — <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates; and (b) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement. <p><i>*This component in particular need to be addressed with specific detail.</i></p>		
3. Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.		
4. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.		
5. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.		
6. Use Instructional and Student Data Reform <p>An LEA implementing a transformation model must –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one 		

<p>grade to the next as well as aligned to the State academic standards; and</p> <p>(b) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) in order to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students.</p>		
<p>7. Employ Increased Learning Time An LEA implementing a transformation model must –</p> <p>(a) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time; and</p> <p>(b) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.</p>		
<p>8. Employ Strategies for Operational Flexibility An LEA implementing a transformation model must –</p> <p>(a) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and</p> <p>(b) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external provider/organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).</p>		
<p>9. Provide for Ongoing Family and Community Engagement In general, family and community engagement means strategies to increase the involvement and contributions, in both school-based and home-based settings, of parents and community partners that are designed to support classroom instruction and increase student achievement. Examples of mechanisms that can encourage family and community engagement include the establishment of organized parent groups, holding public meetings involving parents and community members to review school performance and help develop school improvement plans, using surveys to gauge parent and community satisfaction and support for local public schools, implementing complaint procedures for families, coordinating with local social and health service providers to meet family needs, and parent education classes (including GED, adult literacy, and ESL programs).</p> <p>To develop mechanisms to support family and community engagement, an LEA may conduct a community-wide assessment to</p>		

<p>identify the major factors that significantly affect the academic achievement of students in the school, including an inventory of the resources in the community and the school that could be aligned, integrated, and coordinated to address these challenges. An LEA should try to ensure that it aligns the family and community engagement programs it implements in the elementary and secondary schools in which it is implementing the transformation model to support common goals for students over time and for the community as a whole.</p>		
<p>10. Obtain Ongoing, Intensive Technical Assistance from the LEA, SEA, or External Provider. The application will need to outline in detail how the school plans to obtain technical assistance from the LEA, SEA, and/or external provider.</p>		

Part E – Optional Components-Transformation Model

In addition to the required activities for a transformation model, an LEA may also implement other comprehensive instructional reform strategies as indicated below. For each optional component, outline in detail both the school's progress in each component for the 2014-2015 school year as well as the implementation plans for each component for the 2015-2016 school year. If not applicable, please indicate as such.

Optional Component	2014-2015 Progress	2015-2016 Implementation Plans
<p>1. Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective.</p>		
<p>2. Implementing a schoolwide – response-to-intervention model.</p>		
<p>3. Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content.</p>		
<p>4. Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.</p>		
<p>5. In secondary schools – (a) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework, early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students</p>		

<p>can take advantage of these programs and coursework;</p> <p>(b) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;</p> <p>(c) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit recovery programs, reengagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or</p> <p>(d) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at-risk of failing to achieve to high standards or to graduate.</p>		
---	--	--

Part F – Student Achievement

Please summarize how the inception of SIG funding for the 2014-2015 school year has impacted student achievement in the Tier I school. Include charts and graphs displaying the results of changes in student achievement data.

Part H-1 – Budget

School Year:

 2015-2016*The district must provide a line item Year 2 budget.*

School Name			
Object Code Number	Object Code Description	Requested Budget	<i>For Department Use Only</i> Final Approved Budget
110	Professional Salaries		
120	Non-professional Salaries		
200	Benefits		
300	Purchased Professional & Technical Services		
430	Maintenance		
500	Other Purchased Services/Travel		
600	Materials/Supplies		
730	Equipment		
800	Dues/Memberships/Registration Fees		
Total	<i>Total must match total on Part H-2</i>		

600 – These funds are specifically for high quality interventions and activities supported through a thorough needs assessment. Supplies/materials will only be considered if they are necessary to implement the application plan.

730 – Equipment cannot be purchased with these funds unless supported through a needs assessment.

Part H-2 – Budget Narrative Year 2

For each line item in Part H-1, please provide a detailed description of the expenditures listed in H-1. If necessary, identify the corresponding schools. Duplicate this page as necessary.

Object Code Number	Description	Amount
110		
120		
200		
300		
430		
500		
600		
730		
800		
Total	<i>Total must match total on Part H-1</i>	

North Dakota Department of Public Instruction
Kirsten Baesler, State Superintendent
600 East Boulevard Avenue, Dept. 201, Bismarck, ND 58505-0440

SIG Tier I/Tier II Continuation of Funds Checklist

School

District

The ND Department of Public Instruction (NDDPI) has a tiered level of intervention to target our technical assistance, monitoring, and oversight to meet the needs of all schools accepting SIG funds while ensuring final requirements are met.

A review of the following documents and criteria will determine whether Tier I and Tier II schools will receive continued funding for the second and third year of the three-year funding cycle.

Annual Program Improvement Report (SFN 52820)

All schools and districts identified for program improvement are required to submit the Annual Program Improvement Report. The report will reflect the items outlined in your program improvement plan, as well as indicate how you spent your Title I program Improvement set-aside(s) (Supplemental Educational Services, School Choice, and 10% set-aside for professional development).

Comments:

Follow-Up Report for Additional Program Improvement Funding (SFN 52822)

All schools and districts that received additional program improvement funds (i.e., SIG) must submit a Request for Funds (SFN 14660) and a Follow-Up Report for Additional Program Improvement Funding (SFN 52822) to obtain reimbursement for additional program improvement funding. The Follow-Up Report for Additional Program Improvement Funding will monitor the fiscal expenditures of each SIG grant through a detailed paper review. Along with the Follow-Up Report, please submit a copy of the district’s ledger reporting the Title I SIG budget. At the end of the year, the total expenditures on your accounting system should equal the total expenditures for which you requested reimbursement from NDDPI.

Comments:

Continuation Application for Additional Program Improvement Funding for Tier I/Tier II Schools

In order to receive year two and three SIG funding, the district/school will need to show documentation of compliance with all SIG requirements by completing the Continuation Application for Additional Program Improvement Funding for Tier I/Tier II Schools. The Continuation Application for Additional Program Improvement Funding for Tier I/Tier II Schools will specifically review the progress that each Tier I and Tier II school has made toward the requirements outlined in the model that they selected to implement.

Comments:

NDMILE/ Native Star SIG Online Tool

The needs assessment, planning monitoring, and evaluation design utilized in the CII SIG Online Tool addresses three categories of indicators: (1) implementation indicators; (2) leading indicators; and (3) lagging indicators. The implementation indicators parallel the federal requirements for the Transformation model which is the model utilized by North Dakota Tier I schools.

Comments:

Timeliness

The school has met the requirement to submit all SIG reports, data, etc. in a timely manner.

Comments:

A thorough review of all criteria outlined has been conducted. The recommendation for continued funding is listed below.

- Recommend Continued Funding
- Do Not Recommend Continued Funding

--	--

Signature Federal Title Programs Director Date

--	--

Signature Federal Title Programs Contact Date