

School Improvement Grants

Application for Fiscal years 2015 and 2016

New Awards Competition

Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left
Behind Act of 2001

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: California



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 100 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 required to obtain or retain benefit (authorized under section 1003(g) of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by No Child Left Behind (ESEA). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1810-0682. Note: Please do not return the completed 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, as amended by No Child Left Behind (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. The Department published final requirements for the SIG program in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). In 2015, the Department revised the final requirements to implement language in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, and the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, that allows LEAs to implement additional interventions, provides flexibility for rural LEAs, and extends the grant period from three to five years. The revisions to the requirements also reflect lessons learned from four years of SIG implementation. Finally, since the final requirements for the SIG program were published in 2010, 44 SEAs received approval to implement ESEA flexibility, pursuant to which they no longer identify Title I schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. To reflect this change, the revised requirements make an LEA with priority schools, which are generally a State's lowest-achieving Title I schools, and focus schools, which are generally the schools within a State with the largest achievement gaps, eligible to receive SIG funds. The SIG final requirements, published on February 9, 2015, are available at <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/02/09/2015-02570/final-requirements-school-improvement-grants-title-i-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act>.

Availability of Funds

The Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, provided approximately \$506 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2015 and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 provided approximately \$450 million in FY 2016.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas is eligible to apply to receive a SIG grant. The Department will allocate FY 2015 and FY 2016 SIG funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2015 and FY 2016 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. The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2015/2016 SIG application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, **not** as a PDF.

Each SEA should submit its FY 2015/2016 application to its individual State mailbox address at: [OSS.\[State\]@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.[State]@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:

Michael Wells, Group Leader
Office of State Support, OESE
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W103
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 no later than May 27, 2016.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact your OSS State contact or Michael Wells at (202) 453-6689 or by e-mail at Michael.Wells@ed.gov. Additional technical assistance, including webinars for State staff, will be provided in the spring.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

| | |
|---|--|
| Legal Name of Applicant: California Department of Education | Applicant's Mailing Address: 1430 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814-5901 |
| State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Lori Marshall Position and Office: Education Administrator, School Turnaround Office Contact's Mailing Address: 1430 N Street, Suite 6208 Sacramento, CA 95814-5901 Telephone: 916-319-0671 Fax: 916-319-0123 Email address: STO@cde.ca.gov | |
| Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Tom Torlakson | Telephone: 916-319-0800 |
| Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X  | Date: May 25, 2016 |
| The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application. | |

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

The directions below indicate information an SEA must provide in its application for a School Improvement Grant. Where relevant, these directions distinguish between the information that must be provided by SEAs that have approved requests for ESEA flexibility and those that do not. For any section that is not applicable to a particular SEA, the SEA should write “Not Applicable.”

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

For SEAs not approved for ESEA Flexibility: Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools and Eligible Schools: As part of its FY 2015/2016 application, an SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. 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.

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.

California’s Response: California will provide its list of eligible schools in July 2016. In an effort to ensure an orderly, well-coordinated, and comprehensive transition to the Every Student Succeeds Act, California will use its new Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System to determine its list of eligible schools for the SIG program. This methodology is determined using two dimensions—outcome and performance over time—based on the following three indicators: (1) graduation rates, (2) suspension rates, and (3) California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) scores in Reading/English language arts and mathematics. A detailed explanation of California’s methodology is located at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-dsib-amard-apr16item04.doc>.

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

EXAMPLE:

| SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2015/2016 SIG FUNDS | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| LEA NAME | LEA NCES ID # | SCHOOL NAME | SCHOOL NCES ID# | TIER I | TIER II | TIER III | GRAD RATE | NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹ |
| LEA 1 | ## | HARRISON ES | ## | X | | | | |

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016. 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.

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|----|------------|----|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| LEA 1 | ## | MADISON ES | ## | X | | | | | |
| LEA 2 | ## | TAYLOR MS | ## | | | X | | X | |

For SEAs approved for ESEA flexibility: Eligible Schools List: Each SEA should provide a link to the page on its Web site or a link to the specific page(s) in its approved ESEA flexibility request that includes a list of its current priority and focus schools. That list should clearly indicate which schools are SIG-eligible (*i.e.*, meet the definition of priority or focus school in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*).

For all SEAs: Awards not renewed, or otherwise terminated: 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 2016-2017 school year. For each such school, note the date of nonrenewal or termination, reason for nonrenewal or termination, the amount of unused remaining funds, and explain how the SEA or LEA plans to use those funds. **If all schools have been renewed, please indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:**

| LEA NAME | SCHOOL NAME | DATE OF NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION | REASON FOR NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION | DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED | AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS: | | | | | N/A |

California's Response: The California Department of Education (CDE) has not terminated any SIG awards for which funding was previously awarded.

B. STATE-DETERMINED MODEL (OPTIONAL)

An SEA may submit one State-determined model for the Secretary's review and approval. Submission of a state-determined model is not required. An SEA that previously submitted, and received approval for, a State-determined model need not re-submit that model. (*Check applicable box below*)

SEA is submitting a State-determined model for review and approval. (Please attach to the application.)

The California State-determined model is included in the attached Request for Applications (RFA). See page 8 and Appendix C of the RFA.

SEA is not submitting a State-determined model.

To be approved, a State-determined model must meet the definition of whole-school reform model:

A whole-school reform model is a model that is designed to:

- (a) Improve student academic achievement or attainment;
- (b) Be implemented for all students in a school; and

- (c) Address, at a minimum and in a comprehensive and coordinated manner, each of the following:
1. School leadership
 2. Teaching and learning in at least one full academic content area (including professional learning for educators).
 3. Student non-academic support.
 4. Family and community engagement.

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

The actions listed in this section are ones that an LEA must take to receive 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 these criteria.

If applicable, the SEA should attach an LEA application review rubric that it will use to evaluate each of the actions listed below. If a rubric is attached, provide relevant page numbers below and a description if needed. If a rubric is not attached, provide a description of the evaluation criteria to be used.

Check here if an LEA application review rubric is attached.

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school that is designed to meet the specific needs of the school, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the school improvement needs identified by families and the community, and takes into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention for each school.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Section B*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

- (2) The LEA has designed and will implement interventions consistent with the SIG requirements.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Section M*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

- (3) The LEA has demonstrated it will use the School Improvement Grants funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each school it commits to serve in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Section N*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

- (4) The LEA has demonstrated how it has, or will, recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Sections E & F*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

- (5) The LEA has demonstrated how it will align other resources with the selected intervention.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Section G*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

- (6) The LEA has demonstrated how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Section H*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

- (7) The LEA has demonstrated how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school that it proposes to serve, such as by creating an LEA turnaround office.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Section I*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

- (8) The LEA has demonstrated how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Form C*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(9) The LEA has described how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.

Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Section J

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(10) The LEA has demonstrated how, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), it will implement one or more evidence-based strategies.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number in rubric: Rubric Section M*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(11) 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 and focus school, as applicable, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Section D*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria:*

(12) For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that proposes to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA has described how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric:*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria: Implementation Chart 2d*

(13) An LEA that proposes to use SIG funds to implement, in partnership with a whole school reform model developer, an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in a school, must demonstrate that (a) the evidence supporting the model includes a sample population or setting similar to that of the

school to be served; and (b) it has partnered with a whole school reform model developer that meets the definition of “whole school reform model developer” in the SIG requirements.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric:*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria: Implementation Chart 2h*

(14) For an LEA that proposes to use SIG funds to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA has demonstrated that it will conduct a rigorous review process, as described in the final requirements, of the charter school operator, charter management organization (CMO), or education management organization (EMO) that it has selected to operate or manage the school or schools.

*The evaluation criteria for this action are included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide page number(s) in rubric: Rubric Sections E; and*

*The evaluation criteria for this action are not included in the LEA application rubric.
Provide description of evaluation criteria: Implementation Chart 2e*

D. LEA BUDGETS: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section C, the SEA must describe how it will evaluate an LEA’s budget and application.

The SEA must describe how it will review each LEA’s budget, including a description of the processes the SEA will use to determine if it is appropriate to award an amount different than that requested in the LEA’s budget request.

California’s Response: The CDE will conduct a Readers’ Conference to score applications, including LEA and school budgets, to determine which applications demonstrate the greatest need and strongest commitment to fully and effectively implement the funds to improve educational outcomes for all students enrolled in the eligible school. Conference reader training will cover SIG program requirements; RFA requirements, including the LEA and school budgets; and the scoring rubric. Training content and the reading and scoring process will focus on analyzing and connecting the needs assessment and implementation plan to the proposed budgets, paying particular attention to whether or not a particular proposed use of SIG funds: (1) is allowable; (2) directly relates to the full and effective implementation of the model selected by the LEA; (3) appropriately supports the implementation design, methodology, activities, and strategies outlined in the application; and (4) that the proposed use of funds is reasonable and necessary. In addition, LEA and school-level budgets will receive a second review by CDE fiscal staff. Based on the outcomes, the CDE may determine it is appropriate to award an amount different than that requested.

California will use the following criteria to evaluate SIG LEA and school budgets:

- Implementation activities are directly related to the selected model; are designed to address a specific need or needs identified through the LEA’s needs assessment; represent a significant reform that goes beyond the basic educational program; and represent a meaningful change that could help improve student achievement from prior years.

- Budgets are complete; expenditures are accurately classified by object code; the full term of the grant is covered; and totals by year are provided.
- The budget includes detailed information to describe implementation activities and costs associated with each object code.
- Budget items accurately reflect the actual cost of implementing the selected intervention models, and other activities described for each participating school are included and are of sufficient size to support proposed implementation activities.
- Budgets are clearly aligned and, taken together, fully describe appropriate expenditures of funds in all categories that are clearly sufficient to support the design, goals, implementation, and ongoing maintenance of the proposed SIG activities. The proposed expenditures reflect research-based strategies likely to increase student achievement.

SIG Form 3 in the LEA RFA and the criteria listed above will be used to review each LEA and school budget.

*Please note that an SEA may make a SIG award to an LEA for up to five years for a particular school, of which the LEA may use one school year for planning and other pre-implementation activities and up to two school years for activities related to sustaining reforms following at least three years of full intervention implementation. The LEA budget should address the entire grant period. An LEA may not receive more than five years of SIG funding for a particular school.

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

[Insert the SEA’s timeline for the FY 2015/2016 SIG competition here]

| Grant Events | Dates |
|---|------------------------------------|
| (1) Request State Board of Education (SBE) Permission to Approve and Submit California's SIG FYs 2015 and 2016 Application for New Awards to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) (2) Notification of Funding to the Public | May 11–12, 2016 |
| Submit California's SIG Application for FYs 2015 and 2016 to the ED for approval | May 27, 2016 |
| (1) Post Proposed Draft LEA RFA to the CDE Web site (Pre-ED Approval). Include notification that the List of Eligible Schools will be posted in July. | June 2016 |
| The CDE Will Need the ED's Approval of California's SIG Application | June 2016 |
| (1) Submit California's List of Eligible Schools to the ED (2) Post California's List of Eligible Schools to the CDE Web page | June/July 2016 |
| Webinar and Technical Assistance Sessions (Application Walkthrough) | July 2016 |
| LEA RFAs Due to the CDE (LEAs will have approximately 3 weeks to complete their RFA) | August 8, 2016 |
| LEA RFA Readers' Conference | August 2016 |
| Sub-grant Award Notification Letters Sent to Sub-grantees | Fall 2016 |
| Award Period | July 1, 2016 to September 30, 2021 |

At a minimum, the timeline should include information regarding when the:

- (1) SEA will notify LEAs about the SIG competition;
- (2) LEA applications are due to the SEA;
- (3) SEA will conduct its review of LEA applications;
- (4) LEAs will be notified about their award status; and
- (5) SEA will award FY 2015/2016 SIG funds to LEAs.

Additionally, the SEA should specify if it is using FY 2015/2016 funds to make two-year awards or multi-year awards, through a waiver of the period of availability of funds, to grantees.

California Response: The CDE will make multi-year awards to grantees using FY 2014, FY 2015, and FY 2016 funds through a waiver of the period of availability of funds.

F. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information below.

- (1) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement to ensure they are rigorous, relevant, and attainable for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or for its priority and focus schools, as applicable, and describe 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 or focus schools, in an LEA that is not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.
- (2) Describe the SEA's process for renewing the SIG award of an LEA that received SIG funds for a school year of planning and other pre-implementation activities for a school, including the SEA's process for reviewing the performance of the school against the LEA's approved application to determine whether the LEA will be able to fully implement its chosen intervention for the school beginning the first day of the following school year.
- (3) Describe how the SEA will monitor, including the frequency and type of monitoring (*e.g.*, on-site, desk, self-reported) 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 priority and focus schools, as applicable, the LEA is approved to serve.
- (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.
- (5) For SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility, describe the criteria, if any, which the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.
- (6) For SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility, describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) to ensure they are rigorous, relevant, and attainable 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.

California's Response:

(1) Reviewing an LEA's Annual Goals for Student Performance and Progress

The LEA RFA Rubric outlines the criteria used to review and evaluate each SIG school's performance and progress goals. During the scoring process, Readers will consider the following factors:

- Goals are measurable, realistic, and time bound
- Goals align with the results of the SIG needs analysis
- Goals clearly reflect achievement gaps between all significant subgroups of students at each grade level.
- Goals use multiple measures for assessing student performance and progress, including the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP).

Throughout the grant period, CDE staff will use multiple results, including progress monitoring outcomes and the CAASPP, to identify technical assistance and support needs related to LEA and school improvement efforts. In addition, the CDE will collect baseline data on the federal nine leading indicators and review progress annually. Based on outcomes, CDE staff will facilitate regular discussions with the LEA on the impact of school improvement strategies against student performance and progress, and the LEA's roles in supporting its SIG schools in meeting its established improvement goals.

Through California's SIG annual renewal process the LEA will be required to reflect on, and assess, progress made in the prior year, identify areas for improvement, and set new performance and progress goals and focus areas for the next school year. In situations where a school is not making progress, CDE staff will partner with the LEA to prioritize areas for improvement and identify new strategies/actions/efforts that are designed to improve student and practice outcomes. If after a reasonable amount of time the school's performance does not improve, the LEA's sub-grant may be considered for a reduction equivalent to the annual award for the non-achieving school with the intent that the school(s) no longer receive funding.

(2) Reviewing Planning and Pre-Implementation Activities for Purpose of Renewing a SIG Award

To renew the SIG sub-grant of an LEA that receives funds for a full year of planning, and other pre-implementation activities for a particular school, the CDE will assess the readiness of the LEA and school(s) using a mid-year Report of Progress and Annual Renewal process. The mid-year Report of Progress will provide an evaluation of LEA and school progress toward accomplishing the goals of the planning year and allow the LEA to make corrections and/or adjustments to its plan, where needed.

At the end of the planning year and before the LEA can renew its grant to begin full implementation for the school beginning the first day of the following school year, California will assess the LEA's level of readiness including a review of all planning and pre-implementation activities funded with SIG funds and an analysis of current functioning related to the structural supports necessary to successfully and fully implement the intervention model. If the CDE determines that the LEA is able to begin full implementation of its chosen intervention for the school on the first day of the following school year, then the LEA will be allowed to continue to implement the SIG for an additional year.

(3) Monitoring LEAs That Receive a School Improvement Sub-grant

To monitor implementation of the selected intervention model, the CDE will require participating LEAs to submit appropriate fiscal and programmatic reports. As part of the reporting process, the CDE has created an online fiscal expenditure tracking system and requires quarterly expenditure reporting, detailed fiscal narratives, and submission of updated SIG implementation plans. The CDE reviews the reported information in addition to annual LEA and School student performance

and progress data to determine whether schools are making adequate progress in the implementation of the identified school intervention model(s) and in meeting its established student performance and progress goals. Once each LEA's progress is reviewed, CDE staff will make a recommendation on whether to renew an LEA's SIG when one or more schools are not meeting, or making adequate progress toward meeting its goals. When it has been determined that an LEA has not made adequate progress, the sub-grant may be considered for a reduction equivalent to the annual award for the non-performing school(s) with the intent that the school(s) no longer receive funding.

To support its SIG LEAs and schools, the CDE conducts periodic technical assistance Webinars based on a review of required fiscal and programmatic reports, monitoring data, survey data, and questions received from funded LEAs and schools. In addition, CDE staff hold regular telephone meetings with each LEA. In situations where the LEA is struggling to meet, or make adequate progress toward meeting its goals, or implement the intervention model with fidelity, CDE staff may conduct on-site technical assistance visits to the LEA to identify areas of need and set focus areas.

Annual Reports

The CDE will annually review the following information that is to be submitted by each participating LEA:

- Report annual accountability data to the CDE including, but not limited to:
 - Fiscal information on the use of sub-grant funds provided under ESEA Section 1003 (a) and (g) and the Consolidated Appropriations Act. All reviews of financial statements must and will be conducted in accordance with state and federal regulations.
 - Evidence of progress on the leading indicators. For those indicators for which the CDE does not currently collect data, the CDE will require that funded LEAs include this information in their annual reports for renewal purposes.
 - The CDE will use annual results from the CAASPP to determine progress made and compare them with LEA applicant improvement goals for each funded school in reading/language arts and mathematics for all students and student group categories.
 - Evidence of practice on the SIG implementation plan to demonstrate implementation of the research and evidence-based strategies identified in the sub-grant application.

For each participating school, the LEA must describe the actions and activities required to implement the selected intervention model, including a timeline with specific dates of implementation. The LEA must regularly report progress on these actions and activities. The CDE will annually evaluate whether the LEA has made adequate progress, on the implementation of each school's plan. In cases where the LEA has not made adequate progress the LEA's sub-grant may be considered for a reduction equivalent to the annual award for the non-achieving school(s) with the intent that the school(s) no longer receive funding.

- Respond to any specific data requests from the ED.

Site Visits

CDE staff will conduct a minimum of one site visit to SIG-funded LEAs and schools over the five-year grant period in order to verify implementation. LEAs are required to upload evidence of compliance with grant requirements in the California Monitoring Tool (CMT). Documents that have been uploaded into the CMT are reviewed by CDE staff prior to the on-site visit. The monitoring visits include interviews with LEA staff, school staff, and parents. In addition, LEA and school plans and financial documents are reviewed by CDE staff to ensure proper management of SIG funds.

(4) SIG Funding priority to LEAs

California anticipates that SIG funding will not be sufficient to fund all eligible schools in the State. LEA RFAs that demonstrate the greatest need and strongest commitment to improve the academic achievement of all students in the school will be considered for funding. LEA applications will be scored and ranked to determine funding eligibility using the rubric and scoring sheet identified in the LEA RFA.

An LEA's capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and other factors, such as the number of schools served, the selected intervention model, and the overall quality of LEA applications will be considered. In accordance with ED Guidance, if the CDE determines that the LEA does not have the capacity to meet the needs of all schools in the application, the CDE reserves the right to fund the LEA to serve only a portion of the schools included in the LEA's application. The CDE will only consider awarding funds to those LEAs that develop and submit a comprehensive application likely to improve student academic achievement.

If sufficient SIG funds are not available to allow each LEA to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model(s) at all of its eligible schools, the CDE will take into account the distribution of eligibility among such LEAs in the state to ensure that as many eligible schools as possible can be served throughout the state.

(5) Criteria to Prioritize Among Tier III Schools

California will not conduct a competition for any Tier III schools until all of its Tier I and Tier II schools have been served. It is anticipated that California will not have sufficient SIG funds to fund any Tier III schools. For LEAs that opt to serve Tier III schools, the LEA must identify and describe the services the school will receive and/or the activities the school will implement. The LEA must include any findings concerning each school's current condition and analysis of needs that informed the LEA's selection of the specific improvement activities to be implemented. LEAs that demonstrate the greatest need and strongest commitment to improve the academic achievement of all students in the school will be considered for funding. LEA applications for Tier III schools will be scored to determine funding eligibility using the rubric and scoring sheet identified in the LEA RFA.

(6) Reviewing LEA Annual Improvement Goals for Tier III Schools

As is required for each eligible school, each participating LEA must establish clear and measurable goals for student performance and progress in reading/language arts and mathematics using multiple measures, including the CAASPP. The CDE will use annual results from the CAASPP and compare them with LEA applicant student performance and progress goals for all students and student group categories to determine whether the school(s) have met its goals. In cases where one or more of the schools served in an LEA are not meeting, or making progress toward meeting, its improvement goals, the LEA's sub-grant may be considered for a reduction equivalent to the annual award for the non-achieving school(s) with the intent that the school(s) no longer receives funding.

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

By submitting this application for new awards, the SEA assures that it will do or has done the following (check each box):

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities outlined in the final requirements.
- Consult with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in this application.
- 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 or focus school, as

applicable, that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.

- Award each School Improvement Grant to an LEA based on an individual review of each application and a case-by-case determination of the amount needed to plan for implementation, as applicable, to fully implement a model, and sustain the model, as applicable, rather than make grant awards based on a formula.
- 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, including charter school operators and CMOs, to ensure their quality and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- 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.
- If a school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or CMO 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; amount of each LEA's grant; 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 and focus school, as applicable. An SEA must post all LEA applications, including those of applicants that did not receive awards, as well as applications to serve Tier III schools. Additionally, if an LEA amends an application, the SEA will post the amended application.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.
- If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, seek and obtain approval from the LEA to have the SEA provide the services directly prior to providing services.
- Prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, provide all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive School Improvement Grants with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and attach a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments received from LEAs to this application. The SEA also assures that it has provided notice and information regarding the waiver request(s) described below, if applicable, to the public in the manner in which the SEA 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.

H. 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 (*e.g.* funding staff positions, supporting statewide support, etc.) that the SEA plans to conduct with any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grants allocation.

H. SEA Reservation

California's Response: The CDE will reserve no more than five percent for its administration, evaluation, monitoring, and technical assistance expenses.

The CDE will use these funds for general personnel costs and to conduct annual data collection and analysis activities, provide general technical assistance activities related to application submission and appropriate uses of funds, and coordinate technical assistance for schools. In addition, a small portion of the state reservation will be used to facilitate the on-site monitoring review visits to funded schools as part of California's plan for SIG program monitoring and technical assistance. The SEA will conduct a series of Webinars and conference calls relating to the SIG LEA RFA application process, ongoing one-on-one technical assistance from CDE staff to eligible applicants, and CDE Web page postings for frequently asked questions and answers and other pertinent information concerning SIG implementation.

LEAs receiving SIG grant awards must participate in a statewide evaluation process and provide all required information on a timely basis. In addition, LEAs must respond to any additional surveys or other methods of data collection that may be required by the CDE or ED throughout the life of the sub-grant.

I. 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.

California requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated below. The SEA 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 and focus schools, as applicable, or will allow any 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.

Part 1: Waivers Available to All States

Waiver 1: Period of availability of FY 2015 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2015 funds for the purpose of making three- to five-year awards to eligible LEAs.

In order to extend the period of availability beyond September 30, 2017, waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2015 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2021.

Waiver 2: Period of availability of FY 2016 funds waiver

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2016 funds for the purpose of making three- to five-year awards to eligible LEAs.

In order to extend the period of availability beyond September 30, 2018, waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2015 school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2021.

Part 2: Waivers Available Only to States Not Approved for ESEA Flexibility

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 2015/2016 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 2015/2016 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 100.

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: School improvement timeline waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2014 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2015/2016 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a SIG model in the 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016 school years cannot request this waiver to "start over" their school improvement timeline again.

California's Response: Due to the ESSA and 2016-17 transition year, California will not require the Timeline waiver.

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I or Tier II title I participating schools that will fully implement a SIG model beginning in the 2016–2017 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 a SIG model beginning in the 2016–2017 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 and Tier II 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 4: Schoolwide program waiver

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2014 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2015/2016 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

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 or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the seven 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 and Tier II 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.

PART II: LEA APPLICATION

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of School Improvement Grant funds to eligible LEAs. SEAs should attach their LEA application.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

California's Response: See Attached LEA RFA

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 and focus 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 and focus school, as applicable.

The models the LEA may include are: (1) turnaround; (2) restart; (3) closure; (4) transformation; (5) state-determined model, if approved; (6) evidence-based whole school reform model; and (7) early learning model.

Example (LEAs in an SEA approved for ESEA flexibility):

| SCHOOL NAME | NCES ID # | PRIORITY | FOCUS (if applicable) ² | INTERVENTION |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Priority School ES #1 | xxxxx | X | | turnaround |
| Priority School HS #1 | xxxxx | X | | state-determined model |
| Priority School MS #1 | xxxxx | X | | transformation |
| Priority School ES #2 | xxxxx | X | | turnaround |

Example (LEAs in an SEA not approved for ESEA flexibility):

| SCHOOL NAME | NCES ID # | TIER I | TIER II | TIER III | INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II only) |
|---------------|-----------|--------|---------|----------|-----------------------------------|
| Tier I ES #1 | xxxxx | X | | | turnaround |
| Tier I ES #2 | xxxxx | | X | | early learning model |
| Tier I MS #1 | xxxxx | X | | | transformation |
| Tier II HS #1 | xxxxx | X | | | state-determined model |

²An LEA in which one or more priority schools are located must serve all of these schools before it may serve one or more focus 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 and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the needs identified by families and the community, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
- (2) For each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that it has taken into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement a plan consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, transformation model, evidence-based whole school reform model, early learning model, or state-determined model.
- (4) 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 and focus school, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.
- (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, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- (6) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to align other resources (for example, Title I funding) with the selected intervention.
- (7) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.
- (8) The LEA must describe how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school it proposes to serve (for example, by creating an LEA turnaround office).
- (9) The LEA must describe how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.
- (10) The LEA must describe how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (11) The LEA must describe how it will implement, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), one or more evidence-based strategies.
- (12) The LEA must describe how it will monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that receives school improvement funds including by
 - a. Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and,
 - b. Measuring progress on the leading indicators as defined in the final requirements.
- (13) An LEA must hold the charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or other external provider accountable for meeting these requirements, if applicable.

- (14) For an LEA that intends to use the first year of its School Improvement Grants award for planning and other pre-implementation activities for an eligible school, the LEA must include a description of the activities, the timeline for implementing those activities, and a description of how those activities will lead to successful implementation of the selected intervention.
- (15) For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that chooses to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA must describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.
- (16) For an LEA that applies to implement an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe how it will
 - a. Implement a model with evidence of effectiveness that includes a sample population or setting similar to the population or setting of the school to be served; and
 - b. Partner with a whole school reform model developer, as defined in the SIG requirements.
- (17) For an LEA that applies to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe the rigorous review process (as described in the final requirements) it has conducted or will conduct of the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO that it has selected or will select to operate or manage the school or schools.
- (18) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (19) 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.
- (20) 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.

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school, or each priority and focus school, it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use in each school it proposes to serve and the funds it will use to —

- 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 and focus schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application (SEAs without ESEA flexibility only).

Note: An LEA’s budget should cover all of the years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I, Tier II, priority, or focus 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 budget plan. Additionally, an LEA’s budget may include up to one full academic year for planning activities and up to two years to support sustainability activities. An LEA may not receive more than five years of SIG funding to serve a single school.

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, or the

Note: to imp
serve.
the LE

An LE

number of priority and focus schools, it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

Example: LEA Proposing a Planning Year for One or More Schools

| LEA XX BUDGET | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|-------------------------|
| | Year 1 Budget (Planning) | Year 2 Budget (Full implementation) | Year 3 Budget (Full implementation) | Year 4 Budget (Full implementation) | Year 5 Budget (Sustainability Activities) | Five- Year Total |
| Priority ES #1 | \$150,000 | \$1,156,000 | \$1,200,000 | \$1,100,000 | \$750,000 | \$4,356,000 |
| Priority ES #2 | \$119,250 | \$890,500 | \$795,000 | \$750,000 | \$500,750 | \$3,055,500 |
| Priority HS #1 | \$300,000 | \$1,295,750 | \$1,600,000 | \$1,400,000 | \$650,000 | \$5,245,750 |
| Focus MS #1 | \$410,000 | \$1,470,000 | \$1,775,000 | \$1,550,400 | \$550,000 | \$5,755,400 |
| LEA-level Activities | | | \$150,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 | \$400,000 |
| Total Budget | \$879,250 | \$4,812,250 | \$5,520,000 | \$4,950, 400 | \$2,550,750 | \$18,812,650 |

Example: LEA Proposing to Implement a Model in One or More Schools on the First Day of the Upcoming School Year

| LEA XX BUDGET | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|------------------------|
| | Year 1 Budget | | Year 2 Budget (Full implementation) | Year 3 Budget (Full implementation) | Year 4 Budget (Sustainability Activities) | Year 5 Budget (Sustainability Activities) | Five-Year Total |
| | Pre-implementation | Year 1 (Full Implementation) | | | | | |
| Tier I ES #1 | \$257,000 | \$1,156,000 | \$1,325,000 | \$1,200,000 | \$650,000 | \$450,000 | \$5,038,000 |
| Tier I ES #2 | \$125,500 | \$890,500 | \$846,500 | \$795,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 | \$2,907,500 |
| Tier I MS #1 | \$304,250 | \$1,295,750 | \$1,600,000 | \$1,600,000 | \$450,000 | \$300,000 | \$5,550,000 |
| Tier II HS #1 | \$530,000 | \$1,470,000 | \$1,960,000 | \$1,775,000 | \$800,000 | \$550,000 | \$7,085,000 |
| LEA-level Activities | \$250,000 | | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| Total Budget | \$6,279,000 | | \$5,981,500 | \$5,620,000 | \$2,200,000 | \$1,500,000 | \$21,580,500 |

Note: An LEA may fill out both charts if it is applying for a planning year for some, but not all, of the schools it proposes to serve.

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 and focus school, that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority and focus school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that

receive school improvement funds.

- (3) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.
- (4) Ensure that each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority and focus school, that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.

E. WAIVERS: If an SEA not approved for ESEA flexibility 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. **NOTE:** Only LEAs in SEAs not approved for ESEA flexibility may request the following waivers.

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a SIG 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 Application for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015/2016 School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program

California will not be using its FYs 2015 and 2016 allocations for continuation grants.

In the table below, list the schools that will receive continuation awards using FY 2015 and/or FY 2016 SIG funds. If no continuation awards will be made with FY 2015 and/or FY 2016 funds, indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:

| LEA NAME | SCHOOL NAME | YEAR SCHOOL BEGAN SIG IMPLEMENTATION | PROJECTED AMOUNT OF FY 15/FY 16 ALLOCATION |
|---|-------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| N/A | N/A | (e.g. 2013-14 school year) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTINUATION FUNDS PROJECTED FOR ALLOCATION IN FY 15/FY16: | | | N/A |

In the table below, list any LEAs with one or more schools for which funding under previously awarded SIG grants will not be renewed. For each such school, note the date of nonrenewal or termination, description of reason for nonrenewal or termination, 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). If all schools have been renewed, please indicate not applicable (“N/A”) in the chart:

| LEA NAME | SCHOOL NAME | DATE OF NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION | DESCRIPTION OF REASON FOR NONRENEWAL OR TERMINATION | DESCRIPTION OF HOW REMAINING FUNDS WERE OR WILL BE USED | AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|
| N/A | N/A | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| TOTAL AMOUNT OF REMAINING FUNDS: | | | | | N/A |

School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program FY 2015/2016 Assurances

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

- Use FY 2015/2016 SIG funds solely to make continuation awards and will not make any new awards³ to its LEAs unless the SEA has an approved new awards application.
- Use the renewal process described in Section II(C) of the final requirements 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 and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
- 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 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.
- If the SEA approves any amendments to an LEA application, post the LEA's amended application on the SEA website.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final SIG requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.

For states planning to use FY 2015 and FY 2016 SIG funds for continuation awards only: By submitting the assurances and information above, the SEA agrees to carry out its most recently approved SIG application and does not need to submit a FY 2015/2016 SIG application for new awards; however, the State must submit the signature page included in the application for new awards (page 3).

³ 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 2016–2017 school year. New awards may be made with the FY 2015 or FY 2016 funds or any remaining SIG funds not already committed to grants made in earlier competitions.