

APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Legal Name of Applicant:<br><br>Nevada Department of Education   | Applicant's Mailing Address:<br><br>700 East Fifth Street<br>Carson City, Nevada 89701 |
| State Contact for the School Improvement Grant<br><br>Name: Marcia Calloway<br><br>Position and Office: State Director<br><br>Contact's Mailing Address: 700 East Fifth Street<br>Carson City, NV 89701<br><br>Telephone: 775-687-9161<br><br>Fax: 775-687-9123<br><br>Email address: mcalloway@doe.nv.gov |  |
| Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):<br><br>Dale Erquiaga  | Telephone:<br><br>775-687-9221   |
| Signature of the Chief State School Officer:<br>  | Date:<br><br>November 5, 2013  |
| The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.                     |  |

School Improvement Grants

# Application for FY 2013 New Awards Competition

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

Fiscal Year 2013

CFDA Number: 84.377A

---

**State Name:** Nevada



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

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

### Paperwork Burden Statement

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

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

### **Purpose of the Program**

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

### **ESEA Flexibility**

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

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

### **Availability of Funds**

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

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

### **State and LEA Allocations**

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

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

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

# FY 2013 NEW AWARDS APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

## SUBMISSION INFORMATION

### **Electronic Submission:**

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

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

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

### **Paper Submission:**

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

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

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

### **Application Deadline**

Applications are due on or before November 15, 2013.

### **For Further Information**

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



## 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.

NDE will be utilizing the Priority Schools List that has been approved through Nevada’s ESEA flexibility request.

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

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

| SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS |               |             |                 |                          |        |         |          |           |                             |
|--|---------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| LEA NAME                               | LEA NCES ID # | SCHOOL NAME | SCHOOL NCES ID# | PRIORITY (if applicable) | TIER I | TIER II | TIER III | GRAD RATE | NEWLY ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup> |
|  |               |             |                 |                          |        |         |          |           |                             |

**Eligible List of Schools is located in Appendix B.**

**Please be advised that the attached list of eligible schools identifies Nevada’s remaining Priority schools only that have not received SIG funding in the past. Under the current ESEA Waiver, Nevada had nine**

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

**schools identified as Priority. Of those nine, six are currently receiving SIG funding from previous competitions.**

**EXAMPLE:**

| <b>SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2013 SIG FUNDS</b> |               |             |                 |          |        |         |          |           |                |
|---|---------------|-------------|-----------------|----------|--------|---------|----------|-----------|----------------|
| LEA NAME                                      | LEA NCES ID # | SCHOOL NAME | SCHOOL NCES ID# | PRIORITY | TIER I | TIER II | TIER III | GRAD RATE | NEWLY ELIGIBLE |
| LEA 1   | ##            | HARRISON ES | ##              |          | X      |         |          |           |                |
| LEA 1   | ##            | MADISON ES  | ##              |          | X      |         |          |           |                |
| LEA 2   | ##            | TAYLOR MS   | ##              |          |        |         | X        |           | X              |

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

N/A

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

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

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

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

**Part 1:**

The LEA application must demonstrate that the LEA has conducted a comprehensive needs assessment for each school to be served as a **Priority** school, and that it has chosen an intervention for that school that is aligned with the results of the comprehensive needs assessment. Although the NDE will not require a district to use a specific tool for conducting its needs analysis, it will be expected that the LEA employ one of several tools that are widely used throughout the state in conducting needs analyses for school improvement planning purposes. Those tools include the SAGE Data Analysis Guide, the Nevada Comprehensive Audit Tool for Schools (NCCAT-S), or the state-approved restructuring plan template, which includes a section designed to assist a school/district in conducting a comprehensive needs assessment. Any of these tools, when completed with fidelity and attention to detail, will provide the necessary content for an approvable needs assessment by an LEA for the purposes of the SIG grant. The key to a successful application in this area will be the LEA’s

inclusion of detailed; data-based evidence that clearly reflects the schools prioritized needs. With that said, the SEA will be looking specifically for the name of the data analysis tool that was used, the detailed data analysis as a result of the diagnosis, and last but not least, an interpretation from the LEA as to why this data was revealed and how the LEA plans to make this school a priority as well as support the school now that this diagnosis has come to the forefront.

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

In order for an LEA to demonstrate that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Priority school, the NDE will continue to utilize Dean Fixsen's Implementation Drivers as established through the work of the National Implementation Research Network to evaluate an LEA's expressed capacity. Therefore, as NDE reviews each LEA application, the NDE will look specifically for documentation that the LEA has the capacity and commitment to implement change in the following key areas, as well as the commitment to use all of the state and local funds it would additionally receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the intervention:

- Staff recruitment and selection--A strong application will demonstrate that the district is committed to reviewing and if necessary, revising job descriptions and/or hiring practices for staff members at the targeted schools; reviewing, and if necessary, modifying the methodology that has been used to recruit and select staff. Furthermore, the district demonstrates that it has the capacity to remove principals who have a history of low achievement (i.e., students have not on the whole, experienced growth in the test scores during the administrator's tenure at the school). The LEA also must demonstrate that preliminary conversations have been held with stakeholders such as union representatives regarding changes in recruitment and hiring practices. A strong application will also show how other state and local resources will be aligned in the absence of school improvement funds.
- Staff training--The LEA must present a strong and detailed description of how staff training will be used at the school(s) to be served in order to ensure fidelity of implementation of the chosen intervention model. Specifically, the LEA must demonstrate that it has well-established policies and procedures which are consistently implemented so that most or all professional development is planned in response to data-based needs; is delivered in accordance with established principals of adult learning (e.g., job-embedded, not one-shot; is evaluated and the results used for school improvement; and is individualized based on a given staff members' needs or on the needs of the majority of the staff at a school site). A strong application will also show how other state and local resources will be aligned in the absence of school improvement funds.
- Consultation and coaching--The LEA provides a detailed and focused discussion of how consultation and coaching will be implemented in the school to be served. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates that it has an effective coaching system in place for principals and teachers in which coaching is provided in authentic settings and is delivered according to well-established procedures including methods for determining who needs coaching, in what content areas, from whom, and of determining if behavior change is occurring in the person(s) being coached including why the coaching is effective, or if not, then

why not. A strong application will also show how other state and local resources will be aligned in the absence of school improvement funds.

- Staff evaluation--The LEA presents a detailed description of how staff evaluation processes will reflect those skills taught through staff training and coaching opportunities. The LEA has well-established policies and procedures in place to evaluate the degree to which skills taught through staff training and coaching come to fruition in improved student performance. When data reveal that individuals' skills are insufficient, systems of support are consistently and routinely accessed for all individuals who have demonstrated insufficient mastery of content (i.e., low student performance as assessed through multiple measures). Preliminary conversations have been held with stakeholders such as union representatives, regarding changes in recruitment and hiring practices. A strong application will also show how other state and local resources will be aligned in the absence of school improvement funds.
- Program evaluation--An approvable application will demonstrate how the LEA will evaluate the overall performance of the organization over time in implementing the intervention model that has been chosen for the school. The LEA will demonstrate that it has a comprehensive evaluation system in place to assess the degree to which system supports exist to sustain and scale up successful practices in schools. The LEA demonstrates that it has well-established policies and procedures to evaluate why schools achieve the results they do. This system pays particular attention to the fidelity with which implementation of a given variable occurs. Results continually help drive on-going implementation and progress. A strong application will also show how other state and local resources will be aligned in the absence of school improvement funds.
- Facilitative administrative supports--In its application, the LEA demonstrates that it has a sufficient number of personnel at the district level to support the number of schools targeted in the LEA's application. District staff members' roles must be clearly defined relative to the ways in which they will offer support to targeted schools. There is a plan to assess the ways in which targeted district support is assisting schools to improve, and to use those data accordingly (e.g., to leverage supports and/or apply consequences in response to such analyses; to change the way(s) in which support is provided, if necessary). A strong application will also show how other state and local resources will be aligned in the absence of school improvement funds.
- Systems interventions--The LEA has provided evidence that there is a detailed plan for how the LEA will evaluate the degree to which a targeted school is achieving preliminary success with the intervention model that is being implemented at the school and how, when necessary, the LEA will intervene when the model it has chosen for a school needs to be adjusted or realigned in order to ensure fidelity and sustainability of the intervention. Possible interventions might include tapping into and aligning external support systems to improve operating conditions, ensuring sufficient financial resources and flexibility, and providing additional organizational support and expertise. A strong application will also show how other state and local resources will be aligned in the absence of school improvement funds.

(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).

In an approvable application, the LEA will provide a detailed budget narrative that describes how the requested funds will be used to implement the selected model in each **Priority** school it commits to serve, and to conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's **Priority** school(s). Additionally, the budget summary pages in an approvable application will reflect an appropriate and clear breakdown and identification of administrative, support, and instructional expenses, and all calculations must be correct. All calculations in the supplemental budget pages must also be correct and the narrative extensions in the supplemental budget pages must link to the descriptions found in the overall budget narrative, demonstrating a clear tie between proposed expenditures and the school intervention model chosen.

In addition, the LEA's budget must include:

- The number of **Priority** schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
- The budget request for each **Priority** school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs, which may include pre-implementation activities.
- The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of each school intervention model in all **Priority** schools, which may also include pre-implementation activities.
- The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of **Priority** schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

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

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

## **Part 2:**

**Requirement 1:** In order to meet this requirement, an approvable LEA application must make a strong case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model for a particular school and how it will implement all the requirements of that intervention model; each requirement of the chosen model must be included in the LEA's description of how it will implement that model. For instance, if an LEA chooses to implement the **Turnaround model**, it must demonstrate that it has addressed the following aspects of the model: a) a detailed process whereby the principal will be replaced and the new principal will be given sufficient operating flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement; b) a detailed

description of the measure used to determine the effectiveness of staff, and a description of how it will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent of existing staff; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will use such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth and more flexible work conditions in order to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school; d) a compelling description of how it will provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program; e) a detailed description of how the LEA will implement a new governance structure for the school; f) a clearly delineated description of how the LEA will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and both horizontally and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards; g) a full description of how the LEA will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction; h) a well-defined plan for how the turnaround school will establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and i) provide strong evidence of the LEA's commitment to provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

For an LEA that chooses the **Restart Model**, the LEA must describe in detail how it will reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. The details of that review process must be clearly delineated in the application.

If an LEA chooses the **School Closure Model**, it must describe in detail how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

For LEAs that choose the **Transformation Model**, all the following components of the Transformation Model must be addressed in the LEA application including an in-depth consideration of how the LEA will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness, which must provide detail about all of the following activities: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation Model will be replaced; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors and that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a fully developed description of how the LEA will provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and is 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; and e) the LEA provides an in-depth description of how it will 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 School. Additionally, the LEA must provide detailed evidence of how it will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and both horizontally and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state standards and of how it will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students. The LEA must also demonstrate how it will increase learning time

and create community-oriented schools.

**Requirement 2:** If an LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its chosen intervention model, the LEA must present strong evidence as to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality. A fundable application must include the following strong evidence:

- A detailed discussion of the recruitment process the LEA will undertake to identify potential external providers;
- A detailed description of what roles the LEA will play in the implementation of the model(s) and of what specific services the external provider will be expected to offer;
- A copy of the LEA's application for external providers;
- A detailed description of the process that the LEA would utilize to evaluate these applications;
- A description of how final selections of the external providers will be made; and
- A detailed process for the monitoring and evaluation of the work of the external provider(s) by the LEA.

**Requirement 3:** The LEA must present a well-developed narrative describing how it will align other resources that are available to the school and the district with the SIG funding in order to carry out the chosen intervention model. A fundable application narrative for this requirement must include:

- A workable plan for aligning resources to implement the components of a given intervention model;
- Budget estimates of potential funding over the life of the grant. For example, the application discusses how the LEA will combine existing funding resources, such as Title I, Part A Basic funds, Title I (1003a), Title II, Title III, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC (if applicable), Early Childhood Education state funding (if applicable), state general funding, etc., with the SIG funding.

**Requirement 4:** In an approvable application, the LEA must provide a specific and detailed discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. This discussion should include consideration of such issues as modifying typical district hiring practices, allowing for additional flexibility in the use of funding, and for implementing an instructional program that is custom tailored for the students who attend the school.

**Requirement 5:** The LEA must provide a convincing and detailed discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. For instance, the LEA should specify how activities or personnel that will no longer be funded through the grant monies will continue to be implemented through other sources of funds after the grant period is over. A fundable application must include the following in terms of sustainability:

- A detailed discussion of how other federal, state, and local revenues, such as Title I, Part A Basic funds, Title I (1003a), Title II, Title III, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC (if applicable), Early Childhood Education state funding (if applicable), state general funding, etc., will be used to carry out the activities of the chosen model after the grant period is over; and
- A description of how any district wide infrastructures developed utilizing SIG funds, such as a Turnaround Office, will continue to operate after the grant period is over in order to sustain the reform initiatives.

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

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

**Requirement 1:** The NDE will require all LEAs that plan to apply for funds to carry out pre-implementation activities to submit a budget that covers a three-year period with the identified pre-implementation activities listed in a separate column located in the Year 1 column of the budget. In addition, pre-implementation expenses must be directly linked to the requirements of the chosen intervention model in order to enable the school to reach full implementation in the following school year. NOTE: Pre-implementation activities must be included in the first year budget total.

(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?

**Requirement 2:**

NOTE: All of the SIG funds an LEA uses in a **Priority** school must be used to support the LEA's implementation of one of the four school intervention models, each of which represents a comprehensive approach to addressing the particular needs of the students in a school as identified through the LEA's needs assessment. Accordingly, in determining whether a particular proposed use of SIG funds is allowable, the SEA will consider whether the proposed use is directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, whether it addresses the needs identified by the LEA, and whether it will advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Pre-implementation activities are not a requirement in order to obtain an approved grant, rather, carrying out SIG-related activities during a "pre-implementation" period enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014-2015 school year. The determining factors listed above will be applied to all pre-implementation activities as well. Examples of possible pre-implementation activities are listed below. However, this list IS NOT to be considered required or exhaustive; they are just examples: 1) Family and Community Engagement, 2) Rigorous Review of External Providers, 3) Staffing, 4) Instructional Programs, 5) Professional Development and Support, or 6) Preparation for Accountability Measures.

As part of the application process, the NDE will provide the LEA's with a list of allowable activities that may be implemented prior to the start of the 2014-15 school year. Should an LEA decide to carry out any pre-implementation activities, they will be required to submit a detailed description of all activities, along with a timeline with benchmarks included. The NDE will then review the identified activities against the list of allowable activities with the expectation that the activities will support and assist the Priority schools get a jump start on the chosen intervention model and that the model will be up and running 100% at the beginning of the 2014-15 school year.

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

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

| DATE  | ACTIVITY   |
|---|--|
| January 15, 2014  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEA SIG application process opens by NDE</li> <li>• USDOE awards SIG funds to NDE pending NDE's SIG application approval.</li> </ul>  |
| January - March, 2014   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDE provides technical assistance to eligible LEAs through development and dissemination of updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), videoconferencing, conference calls, and on an individual basis as needed.</li> </ul>  |
| March 31, 2014  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEA SIG applications due to NDE by 5:00 p.m.</li> </ul>   |
| April 1 – April 11, 2014  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of all LEA applications.</li> </ul>  |
| <p>April 14 – 25, 2014</p><br><p>May 14, 2014</p><br><p>Within 30 day of LEA awards</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDE provides LEAs opportunity to provide further clarification or to discuss potential revisions to its application, including potential budget adjustments.</li> <li>• NDE awards 3-year funds to LEAs in accordance with approved applications.</li> <li>• Awarded grant applications posted to the NDE website (<a href="http://nv.gov/nde_default.aspx">http://nv.gov/nde_default.aspx</a>).</li> </ul>   |
| May, 2014 through August, 2014  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDE provides eNOTE (electronic online monitoring system) training to all LEAs with approved applications.</li> <li>• LEAs with approved pre-implementation activities for the intervention(s) chosen for its Priority schools may begin activities in order to reach full implementation of the intervention(s) at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year;</li> <li>• LEAs with approved LEA-level SIG activities must begin or continue implementation of these activities to enable implementation of the intervention(s) at its Priority schools at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year.</li> </ul> |
| July 1, 2014  | First year grant period begins for LEAs without pre-implementation activities.   |
| September, 2014   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDE begins its quarterly onsite monitoring visits to the LEA and their Cohort V/Priority schools.</li> <li>• For Cohort III and Cohort IV schools, NDE proposes a gradual release method to be used to assist schools and districts as they slowly release the support from external providers, coaches and implementation specialists in order to build their own capacity for sustainability to occur.</li> <li>• NDE will conduct two onsite monitoring visits to the LEAs and their Cohort III and Cohort IV schools to ensure full implementation of their approved plans.</li> </ul>                        |

**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.

LEAs with **Priority** schools will be monitored on an ongoing basis as outlined in Section D(4) of this application to determine each applicable school's progress toward meeting its LEA-established annual goals and making progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements, including progress toward meeting the AYP benchmarks.

It is the expectation from NDE that all LEA's will be assisting their schools, first by establishing annuals goals that are significant but obtainable if the school is truly supported by the LEA, secondly, that the LEA helps the school monitor benchmarks on all formative assessments to ensure that they are on track for meeting their established goals on final summative assessments. It will be through monthly monitoring via eNOTE and quarterly onsite visits that NDE will be able to determine if the LEA's will meet its goals and whether or not the LEA should receive continued funding.

Based upon the outcomes from the monitoring process referenced above, NDE will use the following process annually for determination of whether to renew an LEA's SIG application if one or more **Priority** schools in the LEA are not meeting their annual goals and making progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements:

- Determination of whether the applicable school(s) is making progress toward meeting those goals; and
- Examination of other factors, such as the school's progress on the leading indicators or the fidelity with which it is implementing the chosen intervention model.

(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.

NA: NDE will be utilizing the Priority Schools List that has been approved through Nevada's ESEA flexibility request

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

LEAs serving **Priority** schools will be monitored by the following processes to ensure that the selected intervention model is being implemented fully and effectively in each **Priority** school identified within the LEA's application:

- Monthly monitoring of the electronic Nevada Online Tracking and Evaluation (eNOTE) system to oversee the continuous progress the LEA and SIG schools are making toward the implementation of their plan;
- Bi-monthly onsite visits beginning in September 2014 to each **Priority** school within the LEA identified in its application, as well as to the LEA office(s), which has management oversight for the LEA's SIG-served school(s). Such visits will utilize pre-established interview and observation protocols;
- Submission of required SIG Quarterly Implementation Reports from an external evaluator to the NDE that will document:
  - the LEA's progress on completion of the action steps delineated in its implementation timeline developed for each **Priority** school identified in its application, and
  - the progress of each **Priority** school toward meeting its LEA-established goals.

(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.

**Priority will be given to the LEAs with the lowest achieving schools that demonstrate the greatest need and the strongest commitment to improve the academic achievement of students.** If there are insufficient SEA SIG funds to award, for up to three years, a grant to each LEA that submits an approvable application, the NDE will also take into account the distribution of **Priority** schools among the eligible LEAs to ensure that **Priority** schools throughout the state can be served.

(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.

NA: NDE will be utilizing the Priority Schools List that has been approved through Nevada's ESEA flexibility request.

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

The NDE does not anticipate taking over any **Priority** schools in order to implement the interventions in the final requirements.

(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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NDE has in the past, and will continue to use it's five percent of its School Improvement Grant for technical assistance expenses. In previous years, NDE used its funds to send SIG-funded schools and districts to participate in the University of Virginia's School Turnaround Leadership Program, which has been a huge success. At this time, NDE plans to use these funds to support schools and district with travel expenses to SEA/WCC Regional Professional Development opportunities, as well as for Professional Learning Communities (PLC) across the state. Nevada is an extremely large demographic state whereas the bulk of our SIG schools are far away from each other and in order to allow them the opportunity to share best practices and learn from each others successes and challenges, NDE has chosen to support this SIG PLC opportunity for our schools without asking them to use their own funds, which have been identified to serve students in so many others ways as written in their application.

## **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.**

NEVADA 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**

[NEVADA] 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 **Priority**, 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 **Priority**, Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

**Waiver 5: School improvement timeline waiver**

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

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

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

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

Assurances

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

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

**Waiver 6: Schoolwide program waiver**

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

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

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

Assurances

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

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

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

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

**PART II: LEA APPLICATION**

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

**LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—
- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority school, it commits to serve;
  - Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools or priority schools;
  - Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

Note: An LEA's budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope

Note: An LEA's budget should cover three

to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.

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

to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.

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

**Example:**

| <b>LEA XX BUDGET</b>        |                           |                                     |                      |                      |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                             | <b>Year 1 Budget</b>      |                                     | <b>Year 2 Budget</b> | <b>Year 3 Budget</b> |
|                             | <b>Pre-implementation</b> | <b>Year 1 - Full Implementation</b> |                      |                      |
| <b>Tier I ES #1</b>         | \$257,000                 | \$1,156,000                         | \$1,325,000          | \$1,325,000          |
| <b>Tier I ES #2</b>         | \$125,500                 | \$890,500                           | \$846,500            | \$846,500            |
| <b>Tier I MS #1</b>         | \$304,250                 | \$1,295,750                         | \$1,600,000          | \$1,600,000          |
| <b>Tier II HS #1</b>        | \$530,000                 | \$1,470,000                         | \$1,960,000          | \$1,960,000          |
| <b>LEA-level Activities</b> | \$250,000                 |                                     | \$250,000            | \$250,000            |
| <b>Total Budget</b>         | <b>\$6,279,000</b>        |                                     | <b>\$5,981,500</b>   | <b>\$5,981,500</b>   |

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA serves with school improvement funds;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the LEA's assessments; monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold the school 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 terms and provisions to hold the school management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers;
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and the LEA's budget plan is implemented.

can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,

- (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

**E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate whether the LEA will implement each waiver.**

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must check the "No" box for each 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 |
|--|-------------|----------|--------------------------------------|
|  |             |          |                                      |
|  |             |          |                                      |
|  |             |          |                                      |
|  |             |          |                                      |
| <b>TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 13:</b> |             |          |                                      |

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 |
|---|-------------|---|---------------------------|
|   |             |   |                           |
|   |             |   |                           |
|   |             |   |                           |
|   |             |   |                           |
| <b>TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS:</b> |             |   |                           |

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

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

- Use FY 2013 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards<sup>2</sup> to its LEAs.
- Use the renewal process identified in [State]'s most recently approved SIG application to determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- Monitor and evaluate the actions the LEA has taken, as outlined in its approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and provide technical assistance to LEAs on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- If a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements.

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

---

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

# REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

## TITLE I – SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT Section 1003 (g)

### SEPARATE APPLICATION FOR A SUBGRANT UNDER THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001 P.L. 107-110

ISSUED BY:

**Nevada Department of Education  
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113  
Carson City, NV 89701**

Grant Period: April 15, 2014 – September 30, 2015, if applicable,  
September 30, 2017

Applications Due: Tentatively scheduled due date, March 31, 2014;  
5:00 PM; (dependent upon approval of the NDE's  
application by the USDOE

Grant Amounts: \$50,000 minimum - \$2,000,000 maximum is  
available per funded school per year

Source of Funding: U.S. Department of Education

Under Section 1003(g) of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) will make awards to LEAs that have one or more identified Priority, Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I, Part A served or eligible schools identified as In Need of Improvement (INOI).

Questions related to this funding should be addressed to:

Marcia Calloway, State Director  
Nevada Department of Education  
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113  
Carson City, NV 89701  
775-687-9161 (phone) or 775-687-9123 (fax)  
mcalloway@doe.nv.gov

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                 |   |           |
|-----------------|---|-----------|
| <b>Part I</b>   | <b>Application Guidance</b>                       |           |
|                 | <b>A. Introduction</b>                            | <b>4</b>  |
|                 | <b>B. Application Requirements and Guidelines</b> | <b>7</b>  |
| <br>            |   |           |
| <b>Part II</b>  | <b>Application</b>                                |           |
|                 | <b>A. Certification Page</b>                      | <b>13</b> |
|                 | <b>B. List of Schools To Be Served</b>            | <b>14</b> |
|                 | <b>C. Descriptive Information</b>                 | <b>15</b> |
|                 | <b>D. Budget Summary and Supplemental Summary</b> | <b>18</b> |
|                 | <b>E. Assurances</b>                              | <b>19</b> |
|                 | <b>F. Waivers</b>                                 | <b>20</b> |
| <br>            |   |           |
| <b>Part III</b> | <b>Appendices</b>                                 |           |
|                 | <b>A. Budget Guidance</b>                         | <b>22</b> |
|                 | <b>B. Budget Summary Form</b>                     | <b>23</b> |
|                 | <b>C. Pre-Implementation Table</b>                | <b>24</b> |
|                 | <b>D. Supplemental Schedule Form</b>              | <b>25</b> |
| <br>            |   |           |
| <b>Part IV</b>  | <b>Application Review Rubric</b>                  |           |
|                 | <b>A. Application Review Rubric</b>               | <b>27</b> |
|                 | <b>B. Rubric</b>                                  |           |

# NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## School Improvement, Section 1003(g) LEAs with Title I Schools in Need of Improvement

### Application

The Application document is organized into four (4) parts. Part I provides the Introductory Information and the Application Requirements and Guidelines. Part II contains the required Application documents, including the Application Certification Page, the Application Narrative, the Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedule, and Project Assurances and Waivers. Part III contains the rubric that will be utilized by the review panel in evaluating the applications. Part IV contains the appendices of forms to be used when completing the budget.

#### Part I

- A. Introduction***
- B. Application Requirements & Guidelines***

## A. INTRODUCTION:

The school improvement grants (SIG) program authorized under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, provides funding through State Educational Agencies (SEAs) to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) with the lowest achieving schools that have the greatest need for the funds and demonstrate the strongest commitment to use the funds to raise significantly the achievement of their students. To implement the SIG program, the U.S. Department of Education published final requirements in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

The October 28 SIG Final Requirements reflect Secretary Duncan's determination to ensure that SIG funds are used to implement one of four rigorous school intervention models – Turnaround Model, Restart Model, School Closure, and Transformation Model – in each States persistently lowest-achieving schools.

The enacted Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (Appropriations Act), which was signed into law by President Obama on December 16, 2009, included two critical changes to the SIG program. First, the law allows SEAs and LEAs to use SIG funds to serve certain “newly eligible” schools. In particular, SIG funds may now be used to serve Title I schools that are not in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds if those schools: (1) have not made adequate yearly progress for at least two years; or (2) are in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates. However, **the Appropriations Act has made this expansion of the list of eligible schools optional for the SEAs. The Nevada Department of Education has decided not to use this flexibility and will stand by its original list of schools designated as “persistently lowest-achieving schools”.**

Second, the Appropriations Act increased the amount that an SEA may award each school participating in the SIG program from \$500,000 annually to \$2 million annually per school per school year. This higher limit will permit an SEA to award directly the \$1 million or more annually that may be necessary for successful implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation models in most Priority schools (*e.g.*, a school of 500 students might require \$1 million and a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million).

## **Turnaround Model**

A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must do the following:

- (1) Replace the principal and grant the new principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
- (2) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,
  - (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and
  - (B) Select new staff;
- (3) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
- (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 that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
- (5) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
- (6) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
- (7) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
- (8) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and
- (9) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

## **Restart Model**

A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

## **School Closure**

School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

## **Transformation Model**

An LEA implementing a transformation model must:

- A. Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness:
  - (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 —
    - (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;
  - (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 (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) 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; and
  - (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.
- B. Comprehensive instructional reform strategies:
  - (1) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and
  - (2) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

C. Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented engagement:

- (1) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time; and
- (2) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

D. Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(1) 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

(2) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

## **B. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES:**

### **1. Eligible Applicants**

*There are two Nevada LEAs that currently have one or more identified Priority schools which are eligible to apply for Section 1003(g) funds; these districts are **Clark and Washoe**. This is a competitive grant award process, and each grant application will be reviewed based upon a number of criteria.*

**Priority will be given to the LEAs with the lowest achieving schools that demonstrate the greatest need and the strongest commitment to improve the academic achievement of students.** “Greatest need” has been determined through analysis of AYP data to priority rank schools based on whether the entire school and/or the identified special populations did not meet the AYP targets. “Strongest commitment” will be documented through specific actions taken by an LEA that support systemic changes designed to improve student achievement at its lowest achieving schools.

**Grant award amounts will be based on documentation of need and a description of what resources will be needed to implement a school’s chosen intervention model.** The narrative description for each school must include a detailed description of how that school and the LEA will implement each requirement of the chosen intervention model.

### **2. Grant Awards**

The initial funding period will be from ***April 15, 2014 through June 30, 2014***. Section 1003(g) awards to an LEA will be renewable for up to three additional one-year periods if schools in the LEA are meeting their identified goals and objectives as stated in their LEA application and which are documented through the NDE evaluation process. Section 1003(g) awards will not be less than \$50,000 for each school per school year and may not exceed the total amount of \$2 million for each school per school year.

### 3. Proposed Timeline

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| January 15, 2014         | Application available to all eligible applicants pending NDE's SIG application approval.  |
| January – March 2014     | NDE provides technical assistance to eligible LEAs through development and dissemination of updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), videoconferencing, conference calls, and on an individual basis as needed.   |
| March 31, 2014           | Applications due at the Nevada Department of Education by 5:00 p.m.   |
| April 1 – April 11, 2014 | Review of all LEA applications.   |
| April 14 – 25, 2014      | NDE provides LEAs opportunity to provide further clarification or to discuss potential revisions to its application, including potential budget adjustments.  |
| May 14, 2014             | NDE awards 3-year funds to LEAs in accordance with approved applications.<br><br>Within 30 days awarded grant applications posted to the NDE website ( <a href="http://nv.gov/nde_default.aspx">http://nv.gov/nde_default.aspx</a> ).   |
| May – August 2014        | NDE provides eNOTE training to all LEAs with approved applications.<br><br>LEAs with approved pre-implementation activities for the intervention chosen for its Priority schools may begin activities in order to reach full implementation of the intervention(s) at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year;<br><br>LEAs with approved LEA-level SIG activities must begin or continue implementation of these activities to enable implementation of the intervention(s) at its Priority schools at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year.                   |
| July 1, 2014             | First year grant period begins for LEAs without pre-implementation activities.  |
| September 2014           | NDE begins its quarterly onsite monitoring visits to the LEA and their Cohort V/Priority schools.<br><br>For Cohort III and Cohort IV schools, NDE proposes a gradual release method to be used to assist schools and districts as they slowly release the support from external providers, coaches and implementation specialists in order to build their own capacity for sustainability to occur.<br><br>NDE will conduct two onsite monitoring visits to the LEAs and their Cohort III and Cohort IV schools to ensure full implementation of their approved plans. |

### 4. Application Preparation/Submission:

All forms required for this Application are included in Part III. Applications are to contain the information identified below and the information is to be organized in the order listed below.

#### Section A. Certification Page

The Certification Page is found in Section A; inclusion of this page is mandatory.

### **Section B. List of Schools To Be Served**

A template to upload the list of schools to be served is found in Section B. Each LEA to receive funds must identify the school(s) to be served and the intervention model that will be implemented at that school(s).

### **Section C. Descriptive Information**

Directions for completing the Descriptive Information are found in Section C of the application. Each LEA that receives School Improvement Funds must implement one of the four intervention models described on page 14 of this application. As part of the Descriptive Information, each LEA must address the ten requirements that are listed in Section C.

### **Section D. Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedules**

Complete the Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedule found in Appendix B for the amount listed on the Certification page (Section A). An LEA must include a budget for each school to be served that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Priority school it commits to serve. Should a district choose to fund activities to take place during the pre-implementation period, those costs must be budgeted out of the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan. Each LEA that applies for SIG funds will be required to submit a three-year budget for each school it commits to serve separated by fiscal years.

Signatures on the Budget Summary page must be in **blue** ink. The total of the Budget Summary should equal the total of the Supplemental Schedule. There **MUST** be a detailed narrative supplied for items and amounts requested in the Supplemental Schedule; each budgeted item must be directly linked to the selected School Improvement Intervention Model Descriptive Information.

### **Section E. Assurances**

Signatures on the Assurances page must be in **blue** ink. Inclusion of this page is mandatory. The only page that must be included with the proposal is the signature page (Section E).

### **Section F. Waivers**

Inclusion of the "waiver" page is mandatory. As a reminder, if the NDE has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, the LEA **MUST** indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

**Please submit the original signed application and 3 copies of the LEA application to the NDE on or before March 31, 2014.**

**Application Questions:** All questions must be directed to Marcia Calloway at:

Marcia Calloway  
Nevada Department of Education  
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113  
Carson City, NV 89701  
775-687-9161 (phone) or 775-687-9123 (fax)  
mcalloway@doe.nv.gov

## **5. Process for Review of LEA Applications**

The Nevada Department of Education will establish a panel to review the School Improvement Section 1003(g) funding applications. Each LEA application will be reviewed by at least three panel members.

Each section/item will be reviewed for completeness. The review panel will utilize the attached scoring rubric to determine if the application has all of the required information and then it will be rated to determine if the information is acceptable under the terms of the application. LEAs are asked to refer to the scoring rubric, which is provided in Part II of this application, continuously as they complete their application.

LEAs will submit their written application containing all sections in detailed format to the NDE. If in the opinion of the review panel, the LEA's application meets the requirements of the application and demonstrates the potential capacity to serve the schools identified to be served, each LEA will then be given the opportunity to elaborate on its plan in an interview format. After the interview process, the NDE will determine the final grant awards.

# NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## School Improvement, Section 1003(g) LEAs with Title I Schools in Need of Improvement

### Application

#### Part II

- A. Certification Page*
- B. List of Schools to Be Served*
- C. Descriptive Information*
- D. Budget Summary & Supplemental  
Schedule*
- E. Assurance Certification*
- F. Waivers*

**SEPARATE APPLICATION FOR A SUBGRANT UNDER THE  
NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001  
P.L. 107-110**

**Title I School Improvement  
Section 1003(g)**

Return to: NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Special Education, ESEA & School Improvement Programs  
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113  
Carson City, NV 89701 ATTN: Marcia Calloway

**SECTION A: CERTIFICATION**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is correct.

The applicant designated below hereby applies for a subgrant of Federal funds to provide instructional activities and services to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children as set forth in this application. The local Board of Trustees has authorized me to file this application and such action is recorded in the minutes of the agency's meeting held on \_\_\_\_\_ (Date).

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Superintendent of Schools or Designated Representative

**PART I - APPLICANT**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Applicant (Legal Name of Agency)                           |   |
| Mailing Address (Street, P.O. Box, City/Zip)               | <b>Application for FY2013</b>   |
|  | Starting Date<br><b>April 15, 2014 if Pre-Implementation<br/>Activities; July 1, 2014</b> |
| Name, title and phone number of authorized contact person: | Ending Date<br><b>June 30, 2015</b>   |
| <b>Amount of application:</b>                              |   |

**PART II - STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION USE**

|                         |                   |          |
|-------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Date Received:          | Obligation Amount | \$ _____ |
| Panel Member Signature: | Date:             |          |

**SECTION B**

**LIST OF SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED**

**School Improvement Section 1003(g)**

**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 Priority school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each school.

| SCHOOL NAME | NCES ID # | Priority Turnaround Principles | INTERVENTION (Priority ONLY) |         |         |                |
|-------------|-----------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|----------------|
|             |           |                                | turnaround                   | restart | closure | transformation |
|             |           |                                |                              |         |         |                |
|             |           |                                |                              |         |         |                |
|             |           |                                |                              |         |         |                |
|             |           |                                |                              |         |         |                |
|             |           |                                |                              |         |         |                |

## SECTION C

### DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

**NOTE:** All of the SIG funds an LEA uses in a Priority school must be used to support the LEA's implementation of one of the four school intervention models, each of which represents a comprehensive approach to addressing the particular needs of the students in a school as identified through the LEA's needs assessment. Accordingly, in determining whether a particular proposed use of SIG funds is allowable, the SEA will consider whether the proposed use is directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, whether it addresses the needs identified by the LEA, and whether it will advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

New in the 2011 SIG grant was the addition of opportunities to assist an LEA in carrying out SIG-related activities prior to full implementation. Pre-implementation activities are not a requirement in order to obtain an approved grant, rather, carrying out SIG-related activities during a "pre-implementation" period enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2014-2015 school year. The determining factors listed above will be applied to all pre-implementation activities as well.

Examples of possible pre-implementation activities are listed below. However, this list IS NOT to be considered required or exhaustive; they are just examples: 1) Family and Community Engagement, 2) Rigorous Review of External Providers, 3) Staffing, 4) Instructional Programs, 5) Professional Development and Support, or 6) Preparation for Accountability Measures.

**Descriptive Information: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.** This information will be evaluated using the rubric, which begins on page 29. Please consult this rubric throughout this process in order to shape your application.

**Please provide a narrative explaining the following requirements. As a reminder, some of these requirements address the LEA as a whole while others address each school in the application.**

**Requirement 1:** For each Priority school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs for each school and selected an intervention that aligns with those identified needs.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 2:** The LEA must describe how it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Priority school identified in the

application in order to implement, fully, and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 3:** If the LEA is not applying to serve each Priority school, the LEA, as a whole, must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Priority school.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 4:** The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements at each Priority school to be served.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 5:** The LEA, as a whole, must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—

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

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 6:** The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Priority school identified in the LEA's application.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 7:** The LEA, must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor at each of its Priority schools that receives school improvement funds and how it will measure progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 8:** As appropriate, the LEA, as a whole, must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Priority schools.

*Insert narrative here:*

## **SECTION D**

### **BUDGET SUMMARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE**

**An LEA must include a budget, along with a narrative, for each school to be served that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Priority school it commits to serve.**

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

1. Implement the selected school intervention model in each Priority school it commits to serve; and
2. Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Priority school(s).

**NEW AND IMPORTANT: Should an LEA choose to support pre-implementation activities, the LEA application requires the LEA to provide a budget that lists any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period to be included in the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan.**

**NOTE:** There is no specific limit on the amount of SIG funds that an LEA may spend during pre-implementation. However, funds for activities that are designed to prepare for full implementation in the 2014-2015 school-year SIG grant, which may be no more than \$2 million per school being served with SIG funds. Therefore, the LEA needs to be thoughtful and deliberate when developing its budget and should consider, at a minimum, the following:

1. SIG funds awarded for the first year must cover full and effective implementation through the duration of the 2014-2015 school year, in addition to preparatory activities carried out during the pre-implementation period; and
2. All activities funded with SIG funds must be reasonable and necessary, directly related to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA, address the needs identified by the LEA, and advance the overall goal of the SIG program of improving student academic achievement in persistently lowest-achieving schools.

**An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Priority schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000, nor drop below the \$50,000 minimum grant award per school.**

**\*\*\*The budgetary forms found in Appendices A and B must be used for each of the fiscal periods listed below:**

1. April 15, 2014 to June 30, 2014 (**Pre-implementation activities - Part of first year budget**)
2. July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015
3. July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016
4. July 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017

**SECTION E**

**STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE  
CERTIFICATION - FY2014**

**Name Of District Or Agency:**

**Printed Name And Title Of The District's (Agency's) Signatory:**

The LEA must assure that it will –

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Priority school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Priority school that it serves with school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Priority school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
- (4) Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
- (5) Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.
- (6) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.
- (7) Ensure that each school it commits to serve receives all of the state and local funds it would otherwise receive in the absence of these funds and that the uses are aligned with the interventions.

By signing below, it indicates the individual has read and agrees to follow all of the assurances.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature of Authorized Person**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

## **SECTION F**

### **WAIVERS**

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

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Priority schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
  
- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Priority school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

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

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF  
EDUCATION**

**School Improvement, Section 1003(g)  
LEAs with Title I Schools in  
Need of Improvement**

**Application**

**Part III**

**Appendices**

- A. Budget Guidance***
- B. Budget Summary***
- C. Pre-Implementation Table***
- D. Supplemental Schedule***

## GRANTS AND FUNDING GUIDANCE

A strong budget narrative can help sell your proposal as well as prevent any misunderstanding, plus help reviewers determine if the amount you are requesting is reasonable and accurate. Therefore the NDE is requiring that the following information be used in the FY 2014 budget section.

- Budget narratives should explain every line item that appears on the budget form that contains a dollar figure. Salary and benefit line items, for example, should explain the annual salary for the position(s) of the people working on the project, their required experience or education, the percentage of their time they will spend on the project, and the percentage of fringe benefits that corresponds to the salary amount requested.
- In addition, each item included in the Budget narrative **must** be linked within the narrative to the chosen model(s).
- To illustrate, here is a [sample](#) personnel segment that the NDE would like to see portrayed in the budget:

### **Project Director (1.0 FTE) \$50,000**

*The project director will have oversight of the chosen intervention model(s). Duties include, but are not limited to, supervision, recruitment, and training of the implementation specialists, onsite monitoring of the plan, including monthly benchmark analysis and NDE site visits. At a minimum, this position requires a master's degree with an emphasis in social work or other related field.*

### **Implementation Specialists (2 @ 1.0 FTE) (2 x \$35,000) = \$70,000**

*Two implementation specialists will be responsible for day-to-day school/community outreach activities as they are related to the intervention model. Implementation specialists will be responsible for coordinating and/or providing all professional development based on identified school needs as related to the chosen model. At a minimum, staff will hold a bachelor's degree (or equivalent) in the social services field.*

### **Staff Assistant (1.0 FTE) \$25,000**

*The staff assistant will perform all clerical duties for the project staff. This position requires a high school diploma or equivalent.*

Here are sample fringe benefits examples for the same proposal:

*Happy Days School District will pay 100% medical, dental, vision, life, and disability for fulltime employees and is calculated at .25% of annual salary. The calculations are as follows:*

**Program Director (\$50,000 x .25) = \$12,5000**

**(2) Implementation Specialists (\$70,000 x .25) = \$17,500**

**Staff Assistant (\$25,000 x .25) = \$6,250**

If you are purchasing equipment, it is helpful to indicate where the cost for the equipment originated. This might be a website, for example, or from a vendor quote. Again, let the reviewers know that these numbers are actual numbers provided by a reputable source.

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**State or Federal Budget Expenditure Summary**

Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Fiscal Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Check One:      Budget       Budget Amendment       Final Report

| OBJECT                                 | DESCRIPTION   | INSTRUCTION COST | SUPPORT SERVICES | TOTAL |
|--|---|------------------|------------------|-------|
| 100                                    | Salaries  |                  |                  |       |
| 200                                    | Benefits  |                  |                  |       |
| 300                                    | Purchased Professional/Technical Services                             |                  |                  |       |
| 400                                    | Purchased Property Services   |                  |                  |       |
| 500                                    | 510 Student Transportation Services                                   |                  |                  |       |
|  | 580 Staff Travel  |                  |                  |       |
|  | Other (520, 530, 540, 550, 560, 570, 590)                             |                  |                  |       |
|  | <b>Total 500</b>  |                  |                  |       |
| 600                                    | 610 General Supplies (exclude 612)                                    |                  |                  |       |
|  | * 612 Non-Technology Items of Higher Value                            |                  |                  |       |
|  | 620 Energy  |                  |                  |       |
|  | 630 Food  |                  |                  |       |
|  | 640 Books and Periodicals (exclude 641)                               |                  |                  |       |
|  | 641 Textbooks   |                  |                  |       |
|  | 650 Supplies - Information Technology Related (exclude 651, 652, 653) |                  |                  |       |
|  | 651 Software  |                  |                  |       |
|  | * 652 Technology Items of Higher Value                                |                  |                  |       |
|  | 653 Web-based and Similar Programs                                    |                  |                  |       |
|  | <b>Total 600</b>  |                  |                  |       |
| 800                                    | 810 Dues and Fees   |                  |                  |       |
|  | 890 Other Miscellaneous   |                  |                  |       |
|  | Other (820, 830)  |                  |                  |       |
|  | <b>Total 800</b>  |                  |                  |       |
| <b>Subtotal 100 – 600 &amp; 800</b>    |   |                  |                  |       |
| ** Approved Indirect Cost Rate: _____% |   |                  |                  |       |
| 700                                    | 730 Equipment   |                  |                  |       |
|  | Other (710, 720, 740, 790)  |                  |                  |       |
|  | <b>Total 700</b>  |                  |                  |       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                           |   |                  |                  |       |

\* All items of value must be itemized in the budget detail

\*\* Indirect cost rates must be approved by the Department of Education before the subgrantee may budget for and charge those costs to the grant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Authorized Agency Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

| Department of Education Use Only |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
|                                  |               |
| Initial                          | Date Approved |

## Pre-Implementation Budget Table

If an LEA is considering implementing pre-implementation activities, the LEA must complete the following table in addition to the Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedule.

### Sample

| <b>LEA XXX BUDGET</b>                      |                           |                                     |                      |                      |                         |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
|  | <b>Year 1 Budget</b>      |                                     | <b>Year 2 Budget</b> | <b>Year 3 Budget</b> | <b>Three-year Total</b> |
|  | <b>Pre-implementation</b> | <b>Year 1 – Full Implementation</b> |                      |                      |                         |
| <b>Priority XXX ES</b>                     | \$400,000                 | \$800,000                           | \$1,000,000          | \$900,000            | \$3,100,000             |
| <b>LEA level activities, if applicable</b> | \$200,000                 | \$400,000                           | \$250,000            | \$250,000            | \$1,100,000             |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                           | <b>\$600,000</b>          | <b>\$1,200,000</b>                  | <b>\$1,250,000</b>   | <b>\$1,150,000</b>   | <b>\$4,200,000</b>      |
| <b>Total Budget</b>                        | <b>\$1,800,000</b>        |                                     | <b>\$1,250,000</b>   | <b>\$1,150,000</b>   | <b>\$4,200,000</b>      |

### Table for Use

| <b>LEA BUDGET</b>                          |                           |                                     |                      |                      |                         |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
|  | <b>Year 1 Budget</b>      |                                     | <b>Year 2 Budget</b> | <b>Year 3 Budget</b> | <b>Three-year Total</b> |
|  | <b>Pre-implementation</b> | <b>Year 1 – Full Implementation</b> |                      |                      |                         |
| <b>School Name</b>                         |                           |                                     |                      |                      |                         |
| <b>LEA level activities, if applicable</b> |                           |                                     |                      |                      |                         |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                           |                           |                                     |                      |                      |                         |
| <b>Total Budget</b>                        |                           |                                     |                      |                      |                         |

**STATE OR FEDERAL FINAL REPORT OF EXPENDITURES  
SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE/DETAIL \***

**Project Number:**

**Page Number:**

| <b>A</b>               | <b>B</b>  | <b>C</b>                          | <b>D</b>        | <b>E</b>                               | <b>F</b>                   | <b>G</b>                   |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>OBJECT<br/>CODE</b> | <b>TITLE OF<br/>POSITION/PURPOSE OF<br/>TIME/NARRATIVE **</b> | <b>PROJECT<br/>TIME<br/>(FTE)</b> | <b>QUANTITY</b> | <b>SALARY, RENTAL<br/>OR UNIT COST</b> | <b>BUDGETED<br/>AMOUNT</b> | <b>EXPENDED<br/>AMOUNT</b> |
|                        |   |                                   |                 |  |                            |                            |

**\* If additional space is needed, duplicate this page and number pages.**

**\*\* Explain each item in specific terms. All items must be named, directly related and necessary to the operation of the program.**

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF  
EDUCATION**

**School Improvement, Section 1003(g)  
LEAs with Title I Schools in  
Need of Improvement**

**Application**

**Part IV**

***Application Review Rubric***



**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 |
|---------------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------|---------|----------|-----------|
| Clark County  | 3200060       | Del Sol High School            | 320006000571     | X                        |        |         |          | X         |
| Clark County  | 3200060       | Valley High School             | 320006000107     | X                        |        |         |          | X         |
| Washoe County | 3200480       | Washoe Innovations High School | 320048000209     | X                        |        |         |          | X         |

**REVIEW PROCESS FOR SCORING LEA SIG APPLICATIONS:**

Each reviewer will receive a copy of each application with one rubric to complete per copy.

- The application rubric allows an application to receive a maximum of 500 points:
  - Section A – Certification page (required but no points)
  - Section B – Identification of school(s) to be served (25 points)
  - Section C – Descriptive Information (300 points)
  - Section D – Budget Summary & Supplemental Schedule (175 points)
  - Section E – Assurances (required but no points)
  - Section F – Waivers
- The point ranges cross three columns in each Section, with approximately one-third of the maximum points spread across the columns. To determine where parts of an application align within each element, identify descriptions in the rubric that align with what is provided in the application for that element. *[For example, on page 5 of the rubric (Section C, Requirement #2, Staff evaluation), an LEA might provide a general description of how evaluations will reflect skills taught through training and coaching but with little detail given on how often such training and coaching opportunities will be provided to staff and/or if student achievement data will be used as part of the process. Based upon the rubric, the rating for this element would fall in the middle column between 17-33 points.]*

Each reviewer reads each application and notes questions and gives preliminary rating on the rubric prior to group review.

All reviewers meet (in person or via teleconference) to discuss questions and preliminary ratings. Application receives one formal First Review score and reviewers draft follow up questions for the applicants. Both are sent to the applicant approximately two weeks prior to the NDE-District Interview.

Interviews with each applicant are held so that districts may provide an overall view of the Priority School Plan and responses to questions provided to applicant approximately two weeks prior to interview.

**SECTION A: CERTIFICATION PAGE**

**Maximum Points for this Section: 0 points** - Although no points are allocated for this section, failure to include a signed Certification Page makes the applicant ineligible to receive funding.

**SECTION B: SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED**

**Maximum Points for Section: 25 points**

**Recommended Points \_\_\_\_\_**

**Requirement 1:** The LEA has identified each Priority school the LEA commits to serve and the model that the LEA will use in each school.

| Level I<br>1-8 Points   | Level II<br>9-17 Points   | Level III<br>18-25 Points   |
|---|---|---|
| The required chart is completely missing or so many components are incomplete that it is unclear which schools will be served or what model will be used. | The required chart is mostly complete, but some required information maybe incomplete or incorrect (for example, NCES numbers are missing). | The required chart is complete with all of the required components. |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |   |   |
|   |   |   |
|   |   |   |
|   |   |   |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b>  |   |   |

**SECTION C: DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION**

Maximum Points for this Section: 250 points

Recommended Points: \_\_\_\_\_

**Requirement 1:** For each Priority school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs for each school and selected an intervention.

| Level I<br>1-8 Points  | Level II<br>9-17 Points  | Level III<br>17-25 Points  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>The LEA has not used one of Nevada’s established tools for conducting a needs assessment; rather, the needs assessment seems haphazard and disorganized.</p> <p>The needs assessment does not establish a clear, databased link between the data itself and the schools needs. There is a disconnect between the problems and the proposed solutions.</p> | <p>The LEA has attempted to use an established tool for conducting its needs assessment, but the results of that attempt may be somewhat incomplete or limited.</p> <p>The needs assessment provides some evidence of the school’s needs, but it is unclear if the proposed solutions track closely to the data.</p> | <p>The LEA has employed an established tool for conducting its needs assessment (such as the SAGE Data Analysis Guide, the NCCAT-S, or the needs assessment tool contained in the state approved restructuring plan template).</p> <p>The needs assessment provides detailed, databased evidence that clearly shows the schools prioritized needs.</p> |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b>   |  |  |

**Requirement 2:** The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Priority school identified in the application in order to implement, fully, and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

| Level I<br>1-16 Points   | Level II<br>17-33 Points  | Level III<br>34-50 Points   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>The LEA provides little or no evidence that it has the capacity to implement whatever intervention models it has chosen. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates competency in either very few or none of the areas discussed below. The reviewer sees little evidence that the district possesses the capacity to successfully put the specific change drivers in place.</p> <p>a.) <u>Staff recruitment and selection</u>—Staff selection processes for the school to be served are not discussed in any detail and the reviewer does not have a clear picture in mind of how staff selection processes will change at the schools to be served. Some guidance may be available from the LEA to support schools in recruiting personnel. Job descriptions have not been revisited in some time and there is no plan to analyze them for possible changes. Principals have not been removed or relocated and no appetite exists to do so at</p> | <p>LEA provides evidence that it has some capacity to implement whatever intervention models it has chosen, but the evidence may be somewhat thin or lacking. Specifically, the LEA may demonstrate competency in some of the areas discussed below, but fail to address others in sufficient detail, causing the reviewer to wonder if the compensatory nature of some of the change drivers is enough to ensure fidelity and sustainability.</p> <p>a.) <u>Staff recruitment and selection</u>—From the description provided, it is evident that some district-wide policies exist, individual schools determine the methodology they use for recruiting and selecting personnel. Job descriptions are rigidly in place and are not evaluated to determine if changes are needed. Principals have not been removed from schools when there is evidence to suggest that they should be, or they have been moved from one school to another, without the application of supports to</p> | <p>LEA demonstrates in a strong and convincing manner that it has the capacity to fully and effectively implement whatever intervention models it has chosen. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates that it has the capacity to implement change in the following key areas:</p> <p>a.) <u>Staff recruitment and selection</u>—From the description provided, it is evident that the district is committed to reviewing and if necessary revising job descriptions and/or hiring practices for staff members at targeted schools, reviewing and if necessary, modifying the methodology that has been used to recruit and select staff. Furthermore, the district demonstrates that it has the capacity to remove principals who have a history of low achievement (i.e., students have not on the whole, experienced growth in test scores during</p> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>this time.</p> <p>b.) <u>Staff training</u>—The LEA presents little evidence as to how staff training will be used at the school to be served in order to ensure fidelity of implementation of the intervention model. There is no district-wide plan for professional development.</p> <p>c.) <u>Consultation and coaching</u>—The LEA provides little or no detail on how consultation and coaching will be implemented in the school to be served. Specifically, a system for coaching principals and teachers has not yet been attempted, or attempts have not resulted in positive behavior change in those who have been coached.</p> | <p>increase the administrators’ capacity to improve.</p> <p>b.) <u>Staff training</u>—The LEA presents a moderate level of evidence as to how staff training will be used at the school to be served in order to ensure fidelity of implementation of the intervention model. Specifically, Professional development may be inconsistently planned and/or delivered across the district with regard to the criteria established under Level III.</p> <p>c.) <u>Consultation and coaching</u>—The LEA provides some detail on how consultation and coaching will be implemented in the school to be served. Specifically, a system of coaching for both principals and teachers may exist, but is not fully conceptualized with regard to the attributes listed under Level III. Policies and procedures are in development but are</p> | <p>the administrator’s tenure at the school). The LEA also demonstrates that preliminary conversations have been held with stakeholders such as union representatives regarding changes in recruitment and hiring practices.</p> <p>b.) <u>Staff training</u>—The LEA presents a strong and detailed description of how staff training will be used at the school to be served in order to ensure fidelity of implementation of the intervention model. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates that it has well-established policies and procedures which are consistently implemented so that most or all professional development is planned in response to data based needs; is delivered in accordance with established principles of adult learning (e.g., job-embedded, not one-shot; is evaluated and the results used for school improvement; and is individualized based on a given staff member’s needs or on the needs of the majority of the staff at a school site).</p> <p>c.) <u>Consultation and coaching</u>—The LEA describes with detail and focus how consultation and coaching will be implemented in the school to be served. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates that it has an effective coaching system in place for principals and teachers in which coaching is provided in authentic settings, and which is delivered according to well-</p> |
|--|--|---|

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>d.) <u>Staff evaluation</u>—The LEA provides little or no description of how staff evaluation processes will reflect those skills taught through staff training and coaching opportunities. There is little or no evidence that the evaluations system is designed to yield changes in staff members’ capacity (i.e., consequences for staff members that result in increased performance, as measured by data, or removal of staff members when necessary).</p> <p>e.) <u>Program evaluation</u>—The LEA demonstrates little evidence as to how it will evaluate the overall performance of the organization over time in implementing the intervention model that has been chosen for the school. A comprehensive evaluation</p> | <p>not yet fully established, and/or are being tried in limited situations.</p> <p>d) <u>Staff evaluation</u>—The LEA provides a description of how staff evaluation processes will reflect those skills taught through staff training and coaching opportunities. Well-established policies are in place to evaluate staff members, yet these measures do not consider student achievement data as part of the analysis. When evaluations reveal that individuals’ skills are insufficient, systems of support are accessed, but perhaps not consistently and routinely across most or all school setting, or perhaps not for all of most of those individuals who need such support.</p> <p>e) <u>Program evaluation</u>—The LEA demonstrates with some detail how it will evaluate the overall performance of the organization over time in implementing the intervention model that has been chosen for the school. The LEA has a</p> | <p>established procedures including methods for determining who needs coaching, in what content areas, from whom, and ways of determining if behavior change is occurring in the person(s) being coached, including why the coaching is effective, or if not, then why not.</p> <p>d) <u>Staff evaluation</u>—The LEA presents a detailed description of how staff evaluation processes will reflect those skills taught through staff training and coaching opportunities. The LEA has well-established policies and procedures in place to evaluate the degree to which skills taught through staff training and coaching come to fruition in improved student performance. When data reveal that individuals’ skills are insufficient, systems of support are consistently and routinely accessed for all individuals who have demonstrated insufficient mastery of content (i.e., low student performance as assessed through multiple measures). Preliminary conversations have been held with stakeholders such as union representatives, regarding changes in recruitment and hiring practices</p> <p>e) <u>Program evaluation</u>—The LEA effectively demonstrates how it will evaluate the overall performance of the organization over time in implementing the intervention model that has been chosen for the school. The LEA demonstrates that</p> |
|---|---|---|

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>system is not in place to determine the degree to which a school is able to sustain and scale up successful practices.</p> <p>f.) <u>Facilitative administrative supports</u>—The LEA provides little or no detail as to how the LEA will provide support at the district level. Technical assistance is not routinely available to schools, even when they have failed to achieve targeted performance measures for a year or more.</p> <p>g.) <u>Systems interventions</u>—The LEA provides little or no evidence of how it will facilitate system intervention when the implementation of the model it has chosen for a school needs to be adjusted or realigned in order to ensure fidelity and sustainability of the intervention. A plan is</p> | <p>protocol for program evaluation but it is not sufficiently comprehensive to determine the necessary supports that a school needs in order to improve, and/or those supports are not consistently and routinely applied to all schools that demonstrate such a need. Fidelity of implementation is not consistently assessed or analyzed.</p> <p>f) <u>Facilitative administrative supports</u>—The LEA demonstrates that it has some capacity to provide support at the district level, but typically schools must request assistance from the LEA when staff members believe support is needed. An evaluation system is not in place to determine which schools are accomplishing targeted objectives versus those that may need greater than typical support.</p> <p>g.) <u>Systems interventions</u>—The LEA provides moderate evidence of how it will facilitate system intervention when the model it has chosen for a school needs to be adjusted or realigned in order to ensure fidelity and sustainability of the intervention. A plan exists but contains</p> | <p>it has a comprehensive evaluation system in place to assess the degree to which system supports exist to sustain and scale up successful practices in schools. The LEA has well-established policies and procedures to evaluate why schools achieve the results they do. This system pays particular attention to the fidelity with which implementation of a given variable occurs. Results continually help drive on-going implementation and progress.</p> <p>f.) <u>Facilitative administrative supports</u>—The LEA demonstrates that it has a sufficient number of personnel at the district level to support the number of schools targeted in the LEA’s application. District staff members’ roles are clearly defined relative to the ways in which they will offer support to targeted schools. There is a plan to assess the ways in which targeted district support is assisting schools to improve, and to use those data accordingly (e.g., to leverage supports and/or apply consequences in response to such analyses; to change the way(s) in which support is provided, if necessary.</p> <p>g.) <u>Systems interventions</u>—The LEA has provided evidence that there is a detailed plan for how the LEA will evaluate the degree to which a targeted school is achieving preliminary success with the intervention model that is being implemented at the school and how, when</p> |
|--|--|---|

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>for realignment and adjusted is either not provided at all or it contains so little detail that it is evident that no clear plan of action exists.</p> | <p>limited details on what criteria will be used to make such decisions and/or how intervention will be undertaken.</p> | <p>necessary, the LEA will intervene when the model it has chosen for a school needs to be adjusted or realigned in order to ensure fidelity and sustainability of the intervention. Possible interventions might include tapping into and aligning external support systems to improve operating conditions, ensuring sufficient financial resources and flexibility, and providing additional organizational support and expertise.</p> |
| <p><b>Comments:</b></p>   |   |   |
|   |   |   |
|   |   |   |
|   |   |   |
| <p><b>Pre-Interview Score:</b><br/><b>Post-Interview Score:</b></p>   |   |   |

**Requirement 3: If the LEA is not applying to serve each school, the LEA must explain why it lacks the capacity to serve each Priority school.**

| Level I<br>1-8 Points  | Level II<br>9-17 Points   | Level III<br>18-25 Points   |
|--|---|---|
| The LEA fails to provide a rationale as to why the LEA lacks the capacity to serve each Priority school, nor does it show a clear alignment with its needs analysis. | The LEA provides a somewhat vague or limited rationale as to why the LEA lacks the capacity to serve each Priority school or the rationale may not be in clear alignment with its needs analysis. | The LEA provides a strong detailed rationale as to why the LEA lacks the capacity to serve each Priority school. The rationale shows a clear alignment with its needs analysis. |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |   |   |
|  |   |   |
|  |   |   |
|  |   |   |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b>   |   |   |

**Requirement 4: The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements at each Priority school to be served.**

| Level I<br>1-16 Points   | Level II<br>17-33 Points  | Level III<br>34-50 Points   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>The LEA makes a very weak case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model. The evidence underlying the choice is non-existent or very limited.</p>   | <p>The LEA makes a case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model, but the evidence might not be as convincing as it could be.</p>  | <p>The LEA makes a strong case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model for a certain school and how it will implement <u>all</u> of the requirements of that intervention model; each requirement of the chosen model must be included in the LEAs description of how it will implement that model.</p>   |
| <b>TURNAROUND MODEL</b>  |   |   |
| <p>In the case of the turnaround model, the following items may not be addressed at all or in only the most limited of ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The LEA provides little or no description of the process whereby the principal will be replaced, and the description of how the new principal will be given sufficient operational flexibility is also missing or extremely weak;</li> <li>2. The LEA provides little or no description of the measure it will use to determine the effectiveness of staff and of how will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent;</li> <li>3. The LEA offers little or no description of how it will use such strategies as</li> </ol> | <p>In the case of the turnaround model, the following items are addressed, but perhaps not to the extent that the reviewer might hope for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The LEA describes a process whereby the principal will be replaced, but this description may lack focus. Additionally, the description of how the new principal will be given sufficient operational flexibility may lack detail as well;</li> <li>2. The LEA provides some description of the measure it will use to determine the effectiveness of staff and of how it will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent;</li> <li>3. The LEA offers some limited description of how it will use such</li> </ol> | <p>In the case of the turnaround model, the following items are addressed in detail:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The LEA describes a detailed process whereby the principal will be replaced and the new principal will be given sufficient operational flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement;</li> <li>2. The LEA describes fully the measure used to determine the effectiveness of staff, and provides a detailed description of how it will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent;</li> <li>3. The LEA describes completely such strategies as financial incentives,</li> </ol> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;</p> <p>4. The LEA provides little or no description of how it will provide staff with professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instruction program. What description that is offered of the planned professional development does not demonstrate how the professional development is ongoing, high-quality, or job-embedded;</p> <p>5. The LEA has provided little or no description of how it will implement a new governance structure, for the school;</p> <p>6. The LEA provides little or no description of how it will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards;</p> <p>7. The LEA does not demonstrate with any degree of specificity how it will promote the continuous use of student data</p> | <p>strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;</p> <p>4. The LEA presents a description of how it will provide staff with professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instruction program but the professional development described may not meet all the descriptors of being on-going, high-quality, or job-embedded;</p> <p>5. The LEA has provided some description of how it will implement a new governance structure for the school, but the vision for these changes may not be described in much detail;</p> <p>6. The LEA provides some limited description of how it will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards;</p> <p>7. The LEA has demonstrated with a limited degree of specificity how it will promote the continuous use of student data</p> | <p>increased opportunities for promotion and career growth and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;</p> <p>4. The LEA presents a compelling description of how it will provide staff with on-going, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program;</p> <p>5. The LEA has described in detail how it will implement a new governance structure for the school;</p> <p>6. The LEA has provided detailed information about how it will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and both horizontally and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards;</p> <p>7. The LEA has fully demonstrated how it will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate</p> |
|--|---|---|

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>to inform and differentiate instruction;</p> <p>8. The LEA has provided little or no description of how the schools to be served by the turnaround model will establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and</p> <p>9. The narrative provides little or no evidence of the LEA’s commitment to provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for schools.</p> | <p>to inform and differentiate instruction;</p> <p>8. The LEA has provided some description of how the schools to be served by the turnaround model will establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time, but the description may be somewhat lacking in detail; and</p> <p>9. The narrative provides some evidence of the LEA’s strong commitment to provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for schools.</p> | <p>instruction;</p> <p>8. The LEA has clearly described how the schools to be served by the turnaround model will establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and</p> <p>9. The narrative demonstrates the LEA’s strong commitment to provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.</p>          |
| <b>RESTART MODEL</b>   |  |   |
| <p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the Restart model, the following requirements are either not addressed at all or are discussed with little or no supporting detail:</p> <p>1. The LEA offers little or no detail on how it will reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO), nor does it offer much description of the review process that was used.</p>   | <p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the Restart model, the following requirements are addressed, but without precision, focus, or much detail:</p> <p>1. The LEA describes in some detail how it will reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a review process. The process may not be described in much detail.</p>  | <p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the Restart model, the following requirements are addressed in detail:</p> <p>1. The LEA describes in detail how it will reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. The details of the review process are clearly delineated in the application.</p> |
| <b>SCHOOL CLOSURE MODEL</b>  |  |   |
| <p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the School Closure model, the following requirements are either not discussed at all or are discussed but only in the most sketchy or tangential way:</p>   | <p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the School Closure model, the following requirements are addressed, but not in great detail:</p>  | <p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the School Closure model, the following requirements are addressed in detail:</p>  |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>1. The LEA provides little or no description of how the students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. The application does not demonstrate evidence that the schools where these students will be sent are within a reasonable proximity to the closed school nor does the application demonstrate how charter schools or new schools for which there is no achievement data will be considered as possible sites for student transfer.</p>  | <p>1. The LEA describes how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher performing schools within the district. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available. However, the description of the process for closing the school and dispersing the students to other schools leaves the reader with some questions about the process.</p>  | <p>1. The LEA describes in detail how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.</p>   |
| <b>TRANSFORMATION MODEL</b>  |   |   |
| <p>In the case where an LEA has chosen to implement the Transformation model, the following items may addressed in only the most limited way or not at all:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides little or no consideration of how it will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness. Descriptions of the following activities may be extremely limited or not found in the application: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation model will be replace; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers that take into account data on student</p> | <p>In the case where an LEA has chosen to implement the Transformation model, the following items are addressed, but perhaps not to the extent that the reviewer might hope for:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides a limited consideration of how it will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness, including all of the following activities: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation model will be replaced; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors</p> | <p>In the case where an LEA has chosen to implement the Transformation model, all of the following requirements must be addressed in detail:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides an in-depth consideration of how it will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness, including all of the following activities: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation model will be replaced; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors</p> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p>growth as a significant factor as well as other factor sand that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a description of how the LEA will provide staff with 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; and e) the LEA provides a description of how it will 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 skill necessary to meet the needs of the students in a Transformation school.</p> <p>2. The LEA provides little or no consideration of how it will use data to</p> | <p>and that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a description of how the LEA will provide staff with 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; and e) the LEA provides a description of how it will 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 skill necessary to meet the needs of the students in a Transformation school. While descriptions of all these elements must be present for the application to be scored as Level II in this area, the descriptions may lack depth and detail.</p> <p>2. The LEA provides a limited consideration of how it will use data to</p> | <p>and that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a fully developed description of how the LEA will provide staff with 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; and e) the LEA provides an in-depth description of how it will 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 school.</p> <p>2. The LEA provides a detailed consideration of how it will use data to</p> |
|---|--|--|

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards and of how it will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.</p> <p>3. The LEA provides little or no description of how it will increase learning time and create community oriented schools through establishing schedules and strategies that lead to an increase in learning time and that promote family and community engagement.</p> <p>4. The LEA presents little or no detail on how it will provide operational flexibility and sustained support to schools implementing the Transformational model. The application contains no or extremely sketchy descriptions of how such operational flexibility will be granted to schools or of how the LEA will ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive</p> | <p>identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards and of how it will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students. Although the application addresses all areas in which data must be used, the overall impression for the reviewer may be that the description is somewhat lacking in necessary detail.</p> <p>3. The LEA provides a limited demonstration of how it will increase learning time and create community oriented schools through establishing schedules and strategies that lead to an increase in learning time and that promote family and community engagement. However, the description provides may leave the reviewer wondering if the LEA has a full-blown vision for how it will accomplish these requirements.</p> <p>4. The LEA demonstrates with a limited degree of detail how it will provide operational flexibility and sustained support to schools implementing the Transformational model by describing the operational flexibility that will be granted to such schools and ensuring that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support</p> | <p>identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and both horizontally and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards and of how it will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.</p> <p>3. The LEA provides an in-depth demonstration of how it will increase learning time and create community oriented schools through establishing schedules and strategies that lead to an increase in learning time, and that promote family and community engagement.</p> <p>4. The LEA demonstrates in detail how it will provide operational flexibility and sustained support to schools implementing the Transformational model by describing the operational flexibility that will be granted to such schools and ensuring that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated</p> |
|---|---|--|

|   |  |                                     |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| technical assistance from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization. | from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization. However, the description of operational flexibility and sustained support is not detailed enough that the reviewer can easily grasp the breadth and depth of flexibility and technical assistance that will be offered. | external lead partner organization. |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |  |                                     |
|   |  |                                     |
|   |  |                                     |
|   |  |                                     |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>   |  |                                     |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b>  |  |                                     |

\* Please note that some activities related to the Transformation Model are permissible, but not required. Specifically, in regard to each of the following areas, these “permissible activities” are listed:

- Developing teacher and school leader effectiveness: An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers’ and school leaders’ effectiveness, such as--
  - A) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;
  - B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or
  - C) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher’s seniority.
  
- Comprehensive instructional reform strategies: An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--
  - A) 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;
  - B) Implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model;
  - C) 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;

D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and  
E) In secondary schools--

(1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement; International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;

(2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;

(3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessment, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or

(4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

- Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools: An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--

(A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith-and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;

(B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff:

(C) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or

(D) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

- Providing operational flexibility and sustained support: An LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--

(A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA: or

(B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

**Requirement 5: The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—**

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

| Level I<br>1-8 Points  | Level II<br>9-17 Points  | Level III<br>18-25 Points  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>If the LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its chosen intervention model, the LEA present little or no evidence to support the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality.</p> | <p>If the LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its chosen intervention model, the LEA presents some limited evidence as to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality.</p> | <p>If the LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its chosen intervention model, the LEA presents strong evidence as to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality. A fundable application must include the following strong evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A detailed discussion of the recruitment process the LEA will undertake to identify potential external providers;</li> <li>b) A detailed description of what roles the LEA will play in the implementation of the model(s) and of what specific services the external provider will be expected to offer;</li> <li>c) A copy of the LEA’s application for external providers;</li> <li>d) A detailed description of the process that the LEA would utilize o evaluate these applications;</li> <li>e) A discussion of how final selections of external providers will be made;</li> <li>and 7) A detailed process for the monitoring and evaluation of the work of the external provider(s) by the LEA.</li> </ul> |

- **Align other resources with the interventions;**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>The LEA presents little or no evidence as to how it will align other resources available to the school and the district to carry out its chosen intervention model.</p> | <p>The LEA demonstrates in a limited manner how it will align other resources available to the school and the district to carry out its chosen intervention model.</p> | <p>The LEA demonstrates in a convincing manner how it will align other resources available to the school and the district to carry out its chosen intervention model. A fundable application narrative for this requirement must include: a) a workable plan for aligning resources to implement the components of a given intervention model.</p> |
|--|--|--|

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

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>The LEA provides little or no discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.</p> | <p>The LEA provides some discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; however, the details about these proposed modifications may be sketchy.</p> | <p>The LEA provides a specific and detailed discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.</p> |
|--|--|---|

- **Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.**

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>The LEA presents little or no discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.</p> | <p>The LEA presents some discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends, but the discussion lacks sufficient detail for the reviewer to be convinced that the reforms will indeed be sustained after the funding is gone.</p> | <p>The LEA presents a convincing and detailed discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. For instance, the LEA specifies what areas, items, or personnel will no longer be budgeted in order to continue this endeavor.</p> |
|---|--|---|

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| <b>Comments:</b>             |
|                              |
|                              |
|                              |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>  |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b> |

**Requirement 6:** The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Priority school identified in the LEA’s application.

| Level I<br>1-8 Points   | Level II<br>9-17 Points   | Level III<br>18-25 Points  |
|---|---|--|
| The LEA fails to provide a description of the timeline for each intervention selected to be implemented in each Priority school identified. | The LEA provides a description of the timeline, which vaguely delineates steps, benchmarks and persons responsible for each intervention selected to be implemented in each Priority school identified. | The LEA provides a detailed timeline delineating the steps, benchmarks, and persons responsible for each intervention selected to be implemented in each Priority school identified. |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |   |  |
|   |   |  |
|   |   |  |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>   |   |  |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b>  |   |  |

**Requirement 7:** The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Priority school(s) that receive school improvement funds.

| Level I<br>1-8 Points   | Level II<br>9-17 Points  | Level III<br>18-25 Points   |
|---|--|---|
| The LEA fails to provide a description of how determined goals for student achievement in both ELA and Math will monitor Priority school(s) that receives school improvement funds. | The LEA provides a limited description of how selected annual goals for student achievement in both ELA and Math on State assessments will be used to monitor Priority school(s) identified. | The LEA provides a clear description of how predetermined annual goals for student achievement on State assessments in both ELA and Math will be used to monitor Priority school(s) identified. |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |  |   |
|   |  |   |
|   |  |   |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b>  |  |   |

**Requirement 8:** As appropriate, the LEA, as a whole, must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Priority school(s).

| Level I<br>1-8 Points   | Level II<br>9-17 Points   | Level III<br>18-25 Points   |
|---|---|---|
| The LEA fails to provide a description of how it consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEAs application and implementation of school improvement models in its Priority school(s). | The LEA provides a vague or limited description of how it consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEAs application and implementation of school improvement models in its identified Priority school(s). | The LEA provides a detailed description of the process it used to consult with relevant stakeholders (i.e., staff, parents, community, etc.) regarding the LEAs application and implementation of school improvement models in its identified Priority school(s). |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |   |   |

|                              |
|------------------------------|
|                              |
|                              |
|                              |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>  |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b> |

**SECTION D: BUDGET**

**Maximum Points for Section: 175 Points**

**Recommended Points: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Requirement 1:** An LEA must include a budget, and narrative, for each school to be served that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Priority school it commits to serve.

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

1. Implement the selected model in each Priority school it commits to serve; and
2. Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Priority school(s).

**NOTE: An LEA’s budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Priority school the LEA commits to serve.**

**An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Priority schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.**

| Level I<br>1-58 Points   | Level II<br>59-117 Points  | Level III<br>118-175 Points  |
|--|--|--|
| The LEA provides an extremely limited budget narrative or none at all. The narrative provides the reader with no clearly delineated description of how the funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Priority school it | The LEA provides a budget narrative that provides some description of how the funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Priority school it commits to serve, and conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation models | The LEA provides a detailed budget narrative that describes how the requested funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Priority school it commits to serve; conduct LEA-level activities designed to support |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>commits to serve; does not demonstrate how the LEA will conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEAs Priority school(s).</p> <p>Calculations on the Budget Summary pages may contain numerous errors, and the breakdown of activities into proper administrative, support, and instructional categories may seem totally wrong.</p> <p>The narrative extensions in the supplemental budget pages show little or no link to the descriptions found in the overall budget narrative, and demonstrate a very limited or no linkage between proposed expenditures and the school intervention model chosen.</p> <p>Calculations in the supplemental budget may contain numerous errors.</p> | <p>in the LEAs Priority school(s).</p> <p>All calculations on the Budget Summary are accurate, but the breakdown of activities into proper administrative support, and instructional categories may not always seem appropriate.</p> <p>The narrative extensions in the supplemental budget pages show some link to the descriptions found in the overall budget narrative, and show a limited linkage between proposed expenditures and the school intervention model chosen.</p> <p>All calculations in the supplemental budget are correct.</p> | <p>implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEAs Priority school(s).</p> <p>The budget summary pages reflect an appropriate and clear breakdown and identification of administrative, support, and instructional expenses, and all calculations are correct.</p> <p>The narrative extensions in the supplemental budget pages clearly link to the descriptions found in the overall budget narrative, and show a clear linkage between proposed expenditures and the school intervention model chosen.</p> <p>All calculations in the supplemental budget are correct.</p> |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b>   |  |  |

## **SECTION E: ASSURANCES**

**Maximum Points for Section: 0 points** – Although no points are allocated for this section, failure to include signed Assurances makes applicant ineligible to receive funding.

**Requirement 1: 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 Priority school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
2. Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Priority school that it serves with school improvement funds;
3. If it implements a restart model in a Priority school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
4. Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

## **SECTION F: WAIVERS**

**Maximum Points for Section: 0 Points** - Although no points are allocated for this section, failure to include the checked Waiver page makes the applicant ineligible to receive funding.

**Requirement 1: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.**

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

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

NOTE: If an SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to ALL LEAs in the State.

- "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Priority schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

**SECTION G: PRE-IMPLEMENTATION**

**Maximum Points for Section: 50 Points**

**Requirement 1:** If applicable, the LEA must identify the services and/or activities that the LEA commits to implement during the pre-implementation period in order for Priority schools to be prepared for full implementation in the following school year.

| Level I<br>1-8 Points   | Level II<br>9-17 Points  | Level III<br>18-25 Points  |
|---|--|--|
| The LEA fails to provide a list of Priority schools to be served, nor does it identify the services the school should receive or the activities to be implemented during the pre-implementation period. | The LEA provides a list of each eligible Priority school to be served, but the list does not include a detailed description of the services the school would receive or activities to be implemented during the pre-implementation period. | The LEA provides a list of Priority school(s) to be served and identifies all of the detailed services the schools will receive or the activities the schools will implement during the pre-implementation period. |
| <b>Comments:</b>  |  |  |
|   |  |  |
|   |  |  |
|   |  |  |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b>  |  |  |

**Requirement 2: An LEA must include a budget, and narrative, for each school to be served that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use for pre-implementation activities in each Priority school it commits to serve.**

| Level I<br>1-8 Points  | Level II<br>9-17 Points  | Level III<br>18-25 Points  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>The LEA provides an extremely limited budget narrative or none at all. The narrative provides the reader with no clearly delineated description of how the funds will be used to provide pre-implementation activities or services to each Priority school it commits to serve; does not demonstrate how the LEA will conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Priority school(s).</p> | <p>The LEA provides a budget narrative that provides some description of how the funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Priority school it commits to serve; conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation models in the LEA's Priority school(s).</p> | <p>The LEA provides a detailed budget narrative that describes how the requested funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Priority school it commits to serve; conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Priority school(s).</p> |
| <b>Comments:</b>   |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| <b>Pre-Interview Score:</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Post-Interview Score:</b>   |  |  |

## **Nevada Department of Education Applies for FY13-14 SIG Waiver January 8, 2014**

This notification is being provided with information regarding the most recent Nevada Department of Education's (NDE) School Improvement Grant (SIG) application that has been submitted to the U.S Department of Education.

As part of the application process, NDE is seeking approval from U.S.E.D. on the following waiver request due to the changes that occurred with the approval of Nevada's ESEA Flexibility Waiver. NDE is requesting approval for the following waivers;

1. NDE is requesting a waiver to replace its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with its list of Priority schools under its approved ESEA flexibility waiver, by waiving the school eligibility requirements in Section I.A.I of the SIG final requirements.

Nevada believes that the requested waiver will increase the quality of the instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Priority schools by supporting the implementation of one of the four intervention models in those schools.

2. NDE is requesting a waiver of Section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)), also known as the Tidings Amendment, to extend the availability of fiscal year (FY) 2013-2014 School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds authorized under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), from September 30, 2015 to September 30, 2017. As indicated in Nevada's SIG application, it is the intent of the NDE to run a new competition with this year's allocation. The extension of the availability of funds would allow the NDE to provide 3-year, rather than one-year, awards to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that are approved for funding.

NDE 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 the waiver.

NDE is sharing this information with the public at this time to provide them with a reasonable amount of time and opportunity to comment on this request. NDE is encouraging the public to provide comment on the waiver process no later than 5:00 on Wednesday, January 15, 2014 to:

Marcia Calloway  
Nevada Department of Education  
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113  
Carson City, NV 98701

or [mcalloway@doe.nv.gov](mailto:mcalloway@doe.nv.gov)

*For additional information about the general requirements for waiver requests under Section 9401 of the ESEA, please consult Sec. A of USED's Non-Regulatory Guidance on Title I, Part A Waivers (July 2009) (available at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/programs.html>).*

**Subject:** RE: FY13-14 SIG Application Waiver Request Posted for Comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 14, 2014 12:08:15 PM PT  
**From:** Marcia Calloway  
**To:** Opal Ingram  
**Category:** Clark

Excellent news on getting me the TA grant! as for the other questions:

It is the former: using the Priority schools list that was generated for the waiver and includes Del Sol and Valley.

It is the intent to do just that: just like we did for Desert Pines, we will make a three year award for these schools as well.

Hope this answers your questions!  
Marcia

---

From: Opal Ingram [[opingram@interact.ccsd.net](mailto:opingram@interact.ccsd.net)]  
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 11:46 AM  
To: Marcia Calloway  
Subject: Re: FY13-14 SIG Application Waiver Request Posted for Comments

Hi Marcia,

I have a couple of questions regarding the waiver requests below.

1. Is the first NDE request to replace the old SIG schools list with the new Priority schools list that include Valley and Del Sol or is this request to replace the current list with Valley and Del Sol and generate a new list of Priority schools?
2. Is the intent of the extension request to make sure the schools we are completing the new application for, Valley and Del Sol, will have a three- year (from FY 15 to FY 17)?

On another note, I will send you our Technical Assistance Application on Thursday evening.

Take care,

Opal

Opal Ingram, Grant Coordinator  
Grants Development and Administration Department (GDA)  
5100 West Sahara | Las Vegas, NV 89146  
(702) 799-5048  
Website: [grants.ccsd.net](http://grants.ccsd.net)

Marcia Calloway <[mcalloway@doe.nv.gov](mailto:mcalloway@doe.nv.gov)<<mailto:mcalloway@doe.nv.gov>>> on Thursday, January 09, 2014 at 9:51 AM -0800 wrote:

Good morning. The FY13-14 SIG Application to the U.S. Department of Education is nearing its final approval, and as part of that process NDE is applying for two different waivers. One is for permission to replace the lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with NDE's list of Priority schools developed and approved under the ESEA Flexibility

Waiver, and the second is to extend the life of the FY13-14 funds to september 30, 2017.

I have attached the FY13-14 SIG Application Waiver Request to this email; it is also posted on the NDE website ([www.doe.nv.gov](http://www.doe.nv.gov)<<http://www.doe.nv.gov>> ) under "What's New" at the top of the page. Please note that any comments or questions should be directed to me, and we need to collect all comments no later than next Wednesday, Jan. 15th, so that I can submit them to U.S.D.O.E. No later than the end of next week. We are still on target to have the applications due to the NDE no later than February 28, 2014.

Also attached as I promised are the LEA SIG application and accompanying rubric so that you will continue to have time to work on this prior to the final approval from U.S.E.D on our SEA SIG application.

Marcia  
Marcia Calloway, Director  
Office of Educational Opportunity  
Nevada Department of Education  
775-687-9161

CONFIDENTIALITY - This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, may be covered by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) 20 U.S.C. § 122g; 34 CFR Part 99 and may contain confidential information or Protected Information intended for the specified individual(s) only. If you are not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, copying, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. Violations may result in administrative, civil, or criminal penalties. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender immediately by e-mail, and delete the message. The Nevada Department of Education will not accept any liability in respect of such communication that violates our e-mail policy.

**Subject:** RE: FY13-14 SIG Application Waiver Request Posted for Comments

**Date:** Saturday, January 11, 2014 11:34:38 AM PT

**From:** Frazier, Brian

**To:** Marcia Calloway

Sounds good to me. I like the idea of providing the 3 year supports rather than just one year. If I am understanding correctly, this would allow schools to submit a more comprehensive plan (eg - 3 year, reviewed annually) rather than just year to year.

Has my support.

-B

Brian Frazier  
Director of Assessments & Grants  
Douglas County School District  
1638 Mono Avenue  
Minden, NV 89423  
775-782-5160  
[bfrazier@dcsd.k12.nv.us](mailto:bfrazier@dcsd.k12.nv.us)

-----Original Message-----

From: Marcia Calloway [<mailto:mcalloway@doe.nv.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, January 09, 2014 11:07 AM

To: Valerie Dockery; Sue Chambers; Frazier, Brian; Shawn Carsrud; Patty Perez; pam teal; Lise Coudriet; Karen Holley; Shea Murphy; Lynn Rauh; Deanna Owens; Sue Steaffens; Kim Wooden; Kathy Robson; Steve Galloway; Janis Horn; Patrick Beckwith; Christine Hedges

Subject: FW: FY13-14 SIG Application Waiver Request Posted for Comments

Good morning. The FY13-14 SIG Application to the U.S. Department of Education is nearing its final approval, and as part of that process NDE is applying for two different waivers. One is for permission to replace the lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with NDE's list of Priority schools developed and approved under the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, and the second is to extend the life of the FY13-14 funds to september 30, 2017.

I have attached the FY13-14 SIG Application Waiver Request to this email; it is also posted on the NDE website ([www.doe.nv.gov](http://www.doe.nv.gov)) under "What's New" at the top of the page. Please note that any comments or questions should be directed to me, and we need to collect all comments no later than next Wednesday, Jan. 15th, so that I can submit them to U.S.D.O.E. by no later than the end of next week. We are still on target to have the LEA SIG applications due to the NDE no later than February 28, 2014.

As always, please contact me if there are any questions.

Marcia  
Marcia Calloway, Director  
Office of Educational Opportunity  
Nevada Department of Education  
775-687-9161

CONFIDENTIALITY - This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, may be covered by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) 20 U.S.C. § 122g; 34 CFR Part 99 and may contain confidential information or Protected Information intended for the

specified individual(s) only. If you are not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, copying, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. Violations may result in administrative, civil, or criminal penalties. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender immediately by e-mail, and delete the message. The Nevada Department of Education will not accept any liability in respect of such communication that violates our e-mail policy.

**Subject:** Re: FY13-14 SIG Application Waiver Request Posted for Comments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 16, 2014 6:05:17 AM PT  
**From:** Rauh, Lynn  
**To:** Marcia Calloway  
**CC:** McNeill, Kristen, Ohlin, Lauren  
**Category:** Washoe

Good morning, Marcia,  
Very good; this is what we thought. Thank you so much!  
Lynn

On Jan 15, 2014, at 8:21 PM, "Marcia Calloway" <[mcalloway@doe.nv.gov](mailto:mcalloway@doe.nv.gov)> wrote:

Hello, ladies. In response to the following questions, please see the following:

1. Yes, this is correct. This is requesting the waiver to replace our former Tier 1, II, and III lists with the Priority School list developed under the ESEA waiver application and approved by USED.
2. Yes. In order to receive SIG funds the school would need to implement one of the four intervention models, and I am thinking it would be transformation. As for the replace-the-principal piece, We would want you to include in that section of the application how long Taylor has been at the school, and if it is longer than 2 years (which I don't think it is), the district would need to document the changes that she had implemented since she assumed leadership at the school. Even if this is the case, I don't think the district will struggle with that requirement.

Thank you!

Marcia

Marcia Calloway, Director  
Office of Educational Opportunity  
Nevada Department of Education  
775-687-9161

CONFIDENTIALITY - This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, may be covered by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) 20 U.S.C. § 122g; 34 CFR Part 99 and may contain confidential information or Protected Information intended for the specified individual(s) only. If you are not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, copying, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. Violations may result in administrative, civil, or criminal penalties. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender immediately by e-mail, and delete the message. The Nevada Department of Education will not accept any liability in respect of such communication that violates our e-mail policy.

---

From: Rauh, Lynn [[LRauh@washoeschools.net](mailto:LRauh@washoeschools.net)]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 6:08 PM  
To: Marcia Calloway  
Cc: McNeill, Kristen; Ohlin, Lauren  
Subject: Re: FY13-14 SIG Application Waiver Request Posted for Comments

Hi Marcia,

There are only a couple of questions from WCSD:

1. Does this mean that all Tier I, II, III schools would go off of the state list and Washoe Innovations would be the only WCSD school on the SIG list?
2. In the waiver notice, does the statement "Nevada believes that the requested waiver will increase the quality of the instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Priority schools by supporting the implementation of one of the four intervention models in those schools" imply that we will have to implement one of the four intervention models? And does it count as an automatic that Taylor Harper would

be considered the 'replacement' Principal under those options?

These are our only questions, otherwise WCSD is in support of the proposal.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if you need further information.

Thank you,

Lynn

On Jan 9, 2014, at 9:51 AM, "Marcia Calloway" <[mcalloway@doe.nv.gov](mailto:mcalloway@doe.nv.gov)<<mailto:mcalloway@doe.nv.gov>>> wrote:

Good morning. The FY13-14 SIG Application to the U.S. Department of Education is nearing its final approval, and as part of that process NDE is applying for two different waivers. One is for permission to replace the lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with NDE's list of Priority schools developed and approved under the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, and the second is to extend the life of the FY13-14 funds to september 30, 2017.

I have attached the FY13-14 SIG Application Waiver Request to this email; it is also posted on the NDE website ([www.doe.nv.gov](http://www.doe.nv.gov)<<http://www.doe.nv.gov>> ) under "What's New" at the top of the page. Please note that any comments or questions should be directed to me, and we need to collect all comments no later than next Wednesday, Jan. 15th, so that I can submit them to U.S.D.O.E. No later than the end of next week. We are still on target to have the applications due to the NDE no later than February 28, 2014.

Also attached as I promised are the LEA SIG application and accompanying rubric so that you will continue to have time to work on this prior to the final approval from U.S.E.D on our SEA SIG application.

Marcia

Marcia Calloway, Director

Office of Educational Opportunity

Nevada Department of Education

775-687-9161

CONFIDENTIALITY - This message and accompanying documents are covered by the electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, may be covered by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) 20 U.S.C. § 122g; 34 CFR Part 99 and may contain confidential information or Protected Information intended for the specified individual(s) only. If you are not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, copying, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. Violations may result in administrative, civil, or criminal penalties. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender immediately by e-mail, and delete the message. The Nevada Department of Education will not accept any liability in respect of such communication that violates our e-mail policy.

<13-14 SIG Application Waiver Notice.doc>

<13-14\_SIG\_LEA\_Application NV.doc>

<SIG Application Rubric Part IV.doc>