School Improvement Grants Application

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

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A

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

OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: 06/30/2010

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. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

Revised January 2010

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring 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 their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. Under the final requirements, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January 2010 (final requirements, attached as Appendix A), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are a State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools. Tier II schools are a State's persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible 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. An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools ("Tier III schools"). (See Appendix C for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) 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.

Availability of Funds

For fiscal year (FY) 2009, there is $3.546 billion available for School Improvement Grants under section 1003(g): $546 million through the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2009; and $3 billion through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA).

FY 2009 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2011. In its application for these funds, an SEA may request a waiver of the period of availability to permit the SEA and its LEAs to obligate the funds through September 30, 2013.

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 School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas, respectively, for the fiscal year (*e.g.*, FY 2009) under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA.

An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (summarized in Appendix B). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance, which the Department has awarded to each SEA.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement 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.

State Application Process

To apply for a School Improvement Grant, an SEA must submit an application to the Department. This revised School Improvement Grant application form is available on the Department's Web site at: http://www.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html.

Please note that an SEA's submission must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- A list, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.

- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

Electronic Submission: The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's School Improvement Grant application electronically. The SEA should submit it to the following address: school.improvement.grants@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.

Paper Submission: In the alternative, an SEA may submit the original and two copies of its School Improvement Grant application to the following address:

Dr. Zollie Stevenson, Jr., Director
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs
U. S. Department Of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in processing 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 **February 22, 2010.**

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Zollie Stevenson, Jr. at (202) 260-0826 or by e-mail at Zollie.Stevenson@ed.gov.

Legal Name of Applicant:	Applicant's Mailing Address:
Alabama State Department of Education	**P.O. Box 302101** **Montgomery, AL 36130-2101**

State Contact for the School Improvement Grant

Name: **Dr. Deann Stone**

Position and Office: **Director, Federal Programs**

Contact's Mailing Address:

P. O. Box 302101

Montgomery, AL 36130-2101

Telephone: **334-242-8199**

Fax: **334-242-0496**

Email address: **dstone@alsde.edu**

Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):	Telephone: **334-242-9700**
Dr. Joseph B. Morton	
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X Joseph B. Morton	Date: **February 22, 2010**

The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III 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. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

LEA NAME, NCES ID #						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE[1]

An SEA should attach a table with this information to its School Improvement Grant application. If an SEA is providing the definition it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools rather than a link to its definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, it should also attach the definition to its application.

Link to Alabama's Definition of Persistently Lowest-achieving Schools:
http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/doc_download.asp?section=114&id=12063&sort=

Link to Alabama's Persistently Lowest-achieving Schools:
http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/doc_download.asp?section=114&id=12250&sort=

[1] As noted above, an SEA must identify newly eligible schools on its list only if it chooses to take advantage of this option.

Alabama's Definition of Persistently Lowest-achieving School

Alabama defines persistently lowest-achieving schools as elementary and secondary schools that do not meet the State's reading/language and mathematics annual measurable achievement objectives (AMOs) at a proficient level, over a three year period, for the all students group attending a full academic year. This definition defines elementary as a school with any combination of grades K – 8, but that does not contain a grade above 8. This definition defines secondary schools as a school with any combination of grades 5 – 12, but that must contain a grade above 8. A school with an N count of less than 40 in the all students group will be removed from funding consideration, and identified in a separate list of persistently lowest-achieving schools. And

(a) Any school that falls within the definition of (a) is a "Tier I" school and

i. Is among the lowest achieving five (5) of all Title I served schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, because five is greater than five percent;

ii. Is a Title I served high school containing a grade 12 that has a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) and is less than 60% over the past three years;

iii. Is an elementary school that is Title I eligible, both served and not served, that is among the bottom 20% of all schools. The schools identified in this part can be no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school previously identified in Tier I; and

iv. Is among the schools described in (a)(i), (a)(ii), and (a)(iii) that has shown consistent increases in the percent of students scoring proficient over the most recent three years is removed from this part and included in part (c).

(b) Any school that falls within the definition of (b) is a "Tier II" school and

i. Is among the lowest achieving five (5) Title I eligible, but not served, secondary schools, because five is greater than five percent;

ii. Is a Title I eligible, but not served, high school containing a grade 12 that has a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) and is less than 60% over the past three years;

iii. Is a secondary school that is Title I eligible, both served and not served, that is among the bottom 20% of all schools. The schools identified in this part can be no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school previously identified in Tier II; and

iv. Is among the schools identified as described in (b)(i), (b)(ii), and (b)(iii) that has shown consistent increases in the percent of students scoring proficient over the most recent three years is removed from this part and included in part (c).

(c) Any school that falls within the definition of (c) is a "Tier III" school and

i. Is among the remaining Title I schools identified as in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that were not included in Tier I; and

ii. Is among the remaining schools, both elementary and secondary, both served and not served, that are among the bottom 20% of schools and that do not qualify as Tier I or II schools.

iii. Weights will not be applied to schools in this part for the purpose of excluding potential applicants from the pool of eligible schools.

Alabama's Persistently Lowest-achieving Schools

ANNISTON CITY, 00090						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Anniston Middle School	01725	X				X
Anniston High School	00011			X		
Cobb Elementary School	01782			X		X
Constantine Elementary School	00015			X		X
Tenth Street Elementary School	00021			X		X
ATTALLA CITY, 00180						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Etowah Middle School	00034			X		X
AUTAUGA COUNTY, 00240						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Autaugaville School	01408			X		X
Billingsley High School	00045			X		
BARBOUR COUNTY, 00300						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Barbour County Middle School	1670	X				X
Barbour County Intermediate School	1641			X		X
BESSEMER CITY, 00330						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
James A Davis Middle School	00086			X		X
Charles F Hard Elementary School	00084			X		X
BIBB COUNTY, 00360						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Bibb County High School	00092			X		
Centreville Middle School	00094			X		X
Randolph Elementary School	00096			X		X
BIRMINGHAM CITY, 00390						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Robinson Elementary School	00179	X				X
Glenn Middle School	01717			X		X
Green Acres Middle School	00133			X		X
WE Putnam Middle School-Magnet	00175			X		X
Arrington Middle School	01649			X		X
Barrett Elementary School	00106			X		X
Charles A Brown Elementary School	00107			X		X
Bush Middle School-Magnet	00108	X				X
George Washington Carver High School	01468			X		
Center Street Middle	00111			X		X
Councill Elementary School	00115			X		X
Daniel Payne Middle School	01645			X		X
Gaston Kindergarten-Eighth School	01745	X				X
Gate City Elementary School	00127			X		X
Gibson Elementary School	00128			X		X
Hill Elementary School	00137	X				X
Hudson K-Eight School	00139			X		X
Inglenook School	00142			X		X
Jackson-Olin High School	00164			X		X
Robert E Lee Elementary School	00149			X		X
Lewis Elementary School	00150	X				X

Martha Gaskins Middle School	01446			X		X
Minor Elementary School	00156			X		X
Powderly Elementary School	00170			X		X
Sun Valley Elementary School	01762			X		X
Smith Middle School	00184			X		X
South Hampton Elementary	01421			X		X
Washington Elementary School	00190			X		X
Wenonah High School	00192			X		X
Whatley Kindergarten-Eighth School	00195	X				X
Wylam Elementary School	00201			X		X
BLOUNT COUNTY, 00420						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Appalachian School	00203			X		X
JB Pennington High School	00209			X		X
Susan Moore High School	00213			X		X
Blount County Multi-Needs Center	00676			X		X
BULLOCK COUNTY, 00480						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Merritt Elementary School	00220	X				X
Bullock County High School	00218			X		X
South Highlands Middle School	00221			X		
Union Springs Elementary School	00222			X		X
BUTLER COUNTY, 00510						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Greenville High School	00226			X		
Greenville Middle School	00228			X		
CHAMBERS COUNTY, 00600						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Lafayette Eastside Elementary School	00256	X				X
John P Powell Middle School	00269	X				X
Five Points Elementary School	00259	X				X
W F Burns Middle School	00272			X		X
CHEROKEE COUNTY, 00630						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Centre Middle School	00276			X		X
Sand Rock High School	00282			X		
CHILTON COUNTY, 00660						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Thorsby High School	00270			X		
CHOCTAW COUNTY, 00690						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Choctaw County High School	00291			X		X
CLARK COUNTY, 00720						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Coffeeville High School	00300			X		X
Jackson Middle School	00304			X		X
Wilson Hall Middle School	00306			X		X
CLAY COUNTY, 00750						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Lineville High School	00313			X		X
COFFEE COUNTY, 00810						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**

New Brockton High School	01494			X		X
COOSA COUNTY, 00900						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Central Middle School	02075	X				
CULLMAN COUNTY, 01020						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Cullman Child Development Center	01497		X			
Cold Springs High School	00374			X		
DALE COUNTY, 01050						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
South Dale Middle School	00393			X		X
DALEVILLE CITY, 01080						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Daleville High School	00394			X		
DALLAS COUNTY, 01110						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Keith Middle-High School	00402	X				
Brantley Elementary School	00395	X				X
Dallas County High School	00397			X		
Five Points Elementary School	00398	X				X
Shiloh Elementary School	00405			X		X
Southside High School	00406			X		
Tipton Durant Middle School	00408			X		X
William R Martin Middle School	00814	X				X
DECATUR CITY, 01170						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Brookhaven Middle School	00428			X		X
Austinville Elementary School	00427			X		X
Woodmeade Elementary School	00438			X		X
DEKALB COUNTY, 01140						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Crossville High School	01860			X		
Geraldine School	00416			X		
Ruhuma Junior High School	00423			X		X
Fyffe High School	00415			X		
Valley Head High School	00425			X		X
DOTHAN CITY, 01230						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Beverlye Magnet School	01499			X		X
Dothan High School	00445			X		X
Girard Middle School	00447			X		X
Honeysuckle Middle School	01500			X		X
Northview High School	01501			X		X
Faine Elementary School	00456			X		X
ELBA CITY, 01260						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Elba High School	00461			X		X
ESCAMBIA COUNTY, 01350						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Escambia County High School	00484			X		
W S Neal Middle School	01506			X		X
ETOWAH COUNTY, 01380						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**

Gaston High School	00496			X		
FAIRFIELD CITY, 01440						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Forest Hills Middle School	00517	X				X
Fairfield Preparatory High School	00516			X		
Robinson Elementary School	00519			X		X
FAYETTE COUNTY, 01470						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Berry High School	00521			X		
FRANKLIN COUNTY, 01590						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Tharptown High School	01869			X		X
GADSDEN CITY, 01620						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Litchfield Middle School	00552	X				X
Sansom Middle School	00559			X		X
Thompson Elementary School	01666			X		X
W. E. Striplin Elementary School	00564			X		X
GENEVA COUNTY, 01660						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Samson Elementary School	01771			X		X
Samson Middle School	01772	X				X
GREENE COUNTY, 01680						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Carver Middle School	01520			X		X
Paramount Junior High School	00578			X		X
HALE COUNTY, 01710						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Akron Community School East	01522			X		X
Akron Community School West	01523			X		X
Hale County High School	00588			X		X
HENRY COUNTY, 01740						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Abbeville Middle School	00601			X		X
Headland Middle School	00605			X		X
HOUSTON COUNTY, 01770						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Houston County High School	00614			X		
HUNTSVILLE CITY, 01800						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
West Mastin Lake Elementary School	00650	X				X
The Seldon Center	00254		X			
SR Butler High School	00619			X		
Chapman Middle School	01527	X				X
East Clinton Elementary School	00626			X		X
Edward White Middle School	00627	X				X
Highlands Elementary School	00630			X		X
JO Johnson High School	00633			X		
McDonnell Elementary School	00638			X		X
Montview Elementary School	00640			X		X
Davis Hills Middle School	01528			X		
Martin Luther King Jr Elementary School	00623			X		X
Lakewood Elementary School	00635			X		X

Westlawn Middle School	00652	X				
JACKSON COUNTY, 01830						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Pisgah High School	01532			X		
Section High School	00667			X		
Skyline High School	00668			X		
Woodville High School	00671			X		
JEFFERSON COUNTY, 01920						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Brighton Middle School	00691			X		X
Bottenfield Middle School	00687			X		X
Erwin Elementary School	00701			X		X
Erwin High School	00702			X		X
Fultondale High School	00704			X		X
W E Burkett Multi-Handicapped Center	01680			X		X
LANETT CITY, 01980						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Lanett Junior High School	00760			X		X
W. O. Lance Elementary	01544			X		X
LEE COUNTY, 02070						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Beulah High School	00791			X		X
Loachapoka High School	00792			X		X
Loachapoka Elementary School	00290			X		X
Sanford Middle School	00793			X		X
Wacoochee Junior High School	00796			X		X
LEEDS CITY, 00011						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Leeds Middle School	02095			X		X
LINDEN CITY, 02130						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
George P Austin Junior High School	00811			X		X
Linden Elementary School	00812			X		X
LOWNDES COUNTY, 02160						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Calhoun High School	00815	X				
Central Elementary School	00816			X		X
Fort Deposit Elementary School	01635			X		X
Lowndes County Middle School	01637	X				X
Hayneville Middle School	01636	X				X
Jackson-Steele Elementary School	00821	X				X
MACON COUNTY, 02190						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Notasulga High School	00824		X			X
G W Carver Elementary School	01863			X		X
Tuskegee Institute Middle School	00826			X		X
MARENGO COUNTY, 02250						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
John Essex High School	00854	X				
Marengo High School	00856			X		X
Amelia L. Johnson High School	00852			X		X
Sweet Water High School	00857			X		
MARION COUNTY, 02310						

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Brilliant High School	00862			X		X
Phillips High School	00869			X		X
MARSHALL COUNTY, 00006						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Asbury School	00872	X			X	
Brindlee Mountain High School	01583			X		
MIDFIELD CITY, 02350						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Midfield Elementary School	00890	X				X
Midfield High School	00891			X		
Rutledge School	00892			X		X
MOBILE COUNTY, 02370						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Continuous Learning Center	01686		X			
Augusta Evans School	01618		X			
Jeremiah A Denton Middle School	00897			X		X
Booker T Washington Middle School	00901			X		X
Mae Eanes Middle School	00918			X		X
Mobile County Training Middle School	00939			X		X
Pillans Middle School	00946			X		X
CL Scarborough Middle School	00954			X		X
Elizabeth S Chastang Middle School	00963			X		X
Westlawn Elementary School	00966			X		X
MONROE COUNTY, 02400						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Monroe Intermediate School	00981			X		X
Monroeville Junior High School	00982	X				X
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, 02430						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Hayneville Road Elementary School	01019	X				X
Childrens Center	01691		X			X
Houston Hill Junior High School	01023			X		X
McIntyre Middle School	01029			X		X
Walter T McKee Junior High School	01524			X		X
Bellingrath Junior High School	00993	X				X
Brewbaker Junior High School	01563			X		X
Capitol Heights Junior High School	00995		X			X
Goodwyn Junior High School	01017			X		X
Brewbaker Intermediate School	01392			X		X
Dunbar-Ramer School	01010			X		X
Floyd Elementary School	00512			X		X
Georgia Washington Junior High School	01016			X		X
Jefferson Davis High School	01024			X		
Johnson Elementary School	01025			X		X
Lanier Senior High School	01036			X		X
Lee High School	01035			X		
Fitzpatrick Elementary School	01777			X		X
Southlawn Middle School	01111	X				X
MORGAN COUNTY, 02480						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Ryan School	01049			X		X
PELL CITY CITY, 02650						

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Duran Junior High School	01570			X		X
PERRY COUNTY, 02670						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Marion High School	01735			X		X
Robert C Hatch High School	01577			X		X
PHENIX CITY, 02700						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Phenix City Intermediate School	01090			X		X
PICKENS COUNTY, 02730						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Aliceville High School	01098			X		X
Pickens County High School	01102			X		X
PIKE COUNTY, 02790						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Goshen High School	01114			X		X
RANDOLPH COUNTY, 02820						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Randolph County High School	01119			X		X
RUSSELL COUNTY, 02880						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Russell County Middle School	01441			X		X
Ladonia Elementary School	01133			X		X
Russell Elementary School	01138			X		X
SELMA CITY, 02970						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Selma Middle Chat Academy	01161			X		X
Sophia P Kingston Elementary School	00152			X		X
Knox Elementary School	01156			X		X
Payne Elementary School	01158			X		X
SHEFFIELD CITY, 03000						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Sheffield Junior High School	00160			X		X
WA Threadgill	01167			X		
L E Willson Elementary School	01168			X		
SHELBY COUNTY, 03030						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Montevallo Middle School	01178			X		X
SUMTER COUNTY, 03090						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
North Sumter Junior High School	01193			X		X
York West End Junior High School	01195			X		X
Kinterbish Junior High School	01592			X		X
Livingston High School	01191			X		
Sumter County High School	01593			X		
Livingston Junior High School	01192			X		
TALLADEGA CITY, 03150						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
C L Salter Elementary School	01201			X		X
Zora Ellis Junior High School	01208			X		X
TALLADEGA COUNTY, 03180						

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
BB Comer Memorial High School	01210			X		X
Winterboro High School	01226			X		
TALLAPOOSA COUNTY, 03210						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Dadeville Elementary School	01228			X		X
Councill Middle School	01857			X		X
Edward Bell High School	01231			X		
TARRANT CITY, 03270						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Tarrant Elementary School	01239			X		X
Tarrant Intermediate School	2138			X		X
Tarrant Middle School	01241			X		X
Tarrant High School	01240			X		
TUSCALOOSA CITY, 03360						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Westlawn Middle School	01268	X				
Oakdale Primary School	01257			X		X
Central High School	01608	X			X	
Central Primary	1252			X		X
Alberta Elementary School	01250			X		X
Paul W Bryant High School	02101			X		X
Eastwood Middle School	01255	X				X
Martin L King Jr Elementary School	01271			X		
Northridge High School	02102			X		X
Northington Elementary School	01256			X		X
Skyland Elementary School	01260			X		X
TUSCALOOSA COUNTY, 03390						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Holt Elementary School	01272	X				X
Davis-Emerson Middle School	02088	X				X
Holt High School	01282			X		X
Myrtlewood Elementary School	01285			X		X
WALKER COUNTY, 03450						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Parrish High School	01322			X		X
Sipsey Junior High School	01324			X		X
T S Boyd School	01326			X		X
WASHINGTON COUNTY, 03480						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
McIntosh Elementary School	01332			X		X
McIntosh High School	01338			X		X
WILCOX COUNTY, 03510						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Camden School Of Arts & Technology	01809			X		X
WINSTON COUNTY, 03580						
SCHOOL NAME	**NCES ID**	**TIER I**	**TIER II**	**TIER III**	**GRAD RATE**	**NEWLY ELIGIBLE**
Double Springs Middle School	01464			X		X

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 identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

Needs Assessment

Beginning with the first year of not making AYP and under the direction of the local education agency (LEA), a school team must develop a plan that utilizes scientifically research-based strategies to address student achievement challenges as identified by an in-depth analysis of the school's data. Three templates are available to prepare Alabama's Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) based on the specific school scenario: Title I Schoolwide, Title I Targeted Assistance, or Non-Title. The templates include a school-specific, detailed needs assessment to be used by all schools in improvement. To maintain consistency across all School Improvement programs, this needs assessment will also comprise the School Needs Assessment for School Improvement Grant (SIG) funding purposes. All three templates include the use of the specific school data needed to develop goals and action steps for both academic and behavioral improvement.

Under the leadership of the local education agency (LEA), the SIG Needs Assessment is to be developed with a school team that is representative of the challenges being addressed. If the LEA seeks additional support with this endeavor, the Regional School Improvement Coach will be available to work at the LEA level to build capacity in needs assessment analysis. A Regional School Improvement Coach is a member of the Statewide System of Support and is trained in specific school improvement processes and assigned to serve in one Regional Inservice Center to provide direct LEA support. Alabama is divided into eleven regional inservice center areas. These inservice centers provide professional development opportunities based on the needs of LEAs within the designated area. School team members who should participate in the development of the needs assessment include the new principal (if applicable), guidance counselor(s), appropriate content-area teachers, parent representatives, and student representatives (as appropriate) in addition to the LEA School Improvement Specialist (the central office specialist with the primary duty of assisting all schools identified for School Improvement) or other central office designee. Depending on the data, additional team members such as special population representatives (Special Education teacher, ELL teacher, graduation coach etc.), LEA Federal Programs Coordinator, LEA Chief School Finance Officer, community stakeholders, or any other member as appropriate may be included.

As indicated, the SIG Needs Assessment is designed to be an ongoing reflection of the school's actions in response to student achievement challenges. The State Department of Education (SDE) Federal Programs Section is responsible for monitoring and supporting this process. To aid in this process, all SIG Needs Assessments must be posted online in the Related Documents SIG section of the Alabama electronic Grant Application Process *(eGAP*). eGAP is a web-based application that allows districts to plan and submit LEA Consolidated Applications, as well as other funding applications, electronically. The SDE Federal Programs staff reviews and approves applications online. The web-based application also allows districts to upload relevant documentation in specified locations. Schools upload complete CIPs in the LEA's document library in eGAP. The needs assessment will be scored as explained in the SEA Scoring Rubric (Appendix A).

(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 identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

Demonstrated Capacity

The SDE expects each LEA to demonstrate the capacity to use SIG funds, 1003(a) school improvement funds, and other State and/or local funds to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention(s) identified for each school in the LEA's application. To demonstrate capacity, the LEA is required to identify a chosen intervention model for each Tier I and Tier II school and provide a description of the process for analyzing the potential effectiveness of the chosen intervention model. If an LEA chooses to use an Education Management Organization (EMO) within any tier level, the LEA must include the names of available EMOs under consideration, information pertaining to availability of staff to serve the selected school(s), the consultants' educational background and, detailed experiences of the experts hired by the EMO.

The LEA must also provide information regarding the EMO's levels of success in persistently lowest–achieving schools based on state assessments, examples of benchmark testing indicating progress monitoring, minutes of grade-level/subject-level data meetings to substantiate the EMO's ability to use data effectively. Also included will be an explanation of the way the EMO assists LEAs to implement the Response to Instruction (RtI) framework.

The Alabama SIG state transformation model of support will utilize the RtI framework as a means of applying and extending the RtI principles. RtI refers to an instructional framework that promotes a well-integrated system connecting general, gifted, supplemental, and special education services in providing high quality, standards-based instruction and intervention that is matched to students' academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs. RtI combines core instruction, assessment, and intervention within a multi-tiered system to increase student achievement and reduce behavior problems. The effectiveness of RtI is maximized through a school-based collaborative problem-solving approach to identify student needs and implement targeted interventions.

An LEA selecting the state model must ensure, through an LEA SIG Memo of Understanding, that each school participating in the grant will be expected to incorporate the following RtI principles into their plan for improving student achievement:

- Provide high-quality, research-based instruction by highly qualified staff in their general education setting.
- Use screening and progress monitoring data as the basis for instructional decisions.
- Use a multi-tiered model of service delivery to facilitate differentiated instruction and early intervening services for struggling learners.
- Use a data-driven decision-making process to guide students' movement between tiers.

If an LEA elects to participate in the State Transformation Model, a District School Improvement Grant Coach will also be required and must be paid with SIG funds. This coach will be trained in the areas of data analysis, effective instruction, formative assessments and, other school improvement processes. Through monthly training, the SEA will provide District Grant Coaches with capacity-building processes at both the district and school levels throughout the grant period.

Additionally, the LEA will fully explain each School Improvement activity it plans to deploy in any served Tier III schools with relevant research if not part of the state model. Once each model or activity has been named, the LEA will list specific support and resources to be used in conjunction with SIG funds to assist each school demonstrate progress. See the LEA application form on page 4, 5, and 8.

(3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

Initially, LEAs requesting SIG funding will complete a paper budget (Appendix B). Included, however, in written SEA notification of SIG acceptance will be information pertaining to regional eGAP training. After completion of training, the completed LEA budget will be located in the SIG portion of the electronic Grant Application process (eGAP).

eGAP includes two locations for grant information, Improvement Planning and Funds Application. The Improvement Planning side provides the opportunity to list goals, strategies and action steps for each anticipated SIG expenditure (Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III) as well as the various federal funds that will be utilized to support the selected reform model.

The Funds Application requires LEAs to delineate specific categories of allowable expenditures needed to fully support the implementation of the selected intervention model(s) for each Tier I and Tier II school(s) along with any improvement activities planned for each Tier III school. Because of the SIG requirements to identify potential spending for the Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013, a funding location to designate anticipated amounts will be available and each LEA will be required to specify on the Improvement Planning side of eGAP intended uses of SIG funds for those fiscal years.

The ALSDE will further review all LEA budgets to assure that they have sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively by:

(a) Requiring the LEA to submit a budget, between $50,000 - $2,000,000, of which funds requested are of sufficient size and aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of selected interventions and school improvement activities;

(b) Requiring the LEA to provide appropriate documentation regarding the alignment of federal, state, and local resources to ensure short-term and long-term support of the selected interventions or school improvement activities;

(c) Requiring the LEA to provide appropriate documentation, from the intervention provider on appropriate letter head, in the form of a detailed cost-analysis of the selected intervention of annual salaries, services and materials;

(d) Requiring a high level of transparency from the LEA regarding accounting procedures and processes through the use of Alabama's electronic grant application process (eGAP) which includes both budget planning and funding information. The Federal Programs Director is responsible for final approval of all federal budgets. All budget revisions will be done on eGAP. Documents posted on eGAP are available for public viewing.

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 how it will assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

(a) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

(b) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

(c) Align other resources with the interventions.

(d) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

(e) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The LEA Application requires each participating LEA to explain intervention model selection processes consistent with grant requirements, as well as align other resources to support the proposed intervention(s). An LEA may elect to implement their own Transformation Model or they may select from a menu of services that will be provided by

the SDE. The State Transformation Model has interventions consistent with the final requirements including the requirements that they replace the principal; implement a growth-model teacher evaluation system; reward staff who are increasing student achievement; implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff; base the instructional program on student needs aligned vertically and to the Alabama Courses of Study around scientifically research-based strategies. Embedded PD and continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instructions are also a requirement of the model. Additionally, the school will be required to increase learning time for staff and students, develop an ongoing mechanism for community and family engagement, and partner with community agencies to provide social-emotional and community oriented services and supports. The new principal will be granted operating flexibility and the LEA must ensure at least weekly support is provided to the selected school(s).
The Alabama Transformation Model (Appendix C) also requires using the Response to Instruction (RtI) framework, employing a District Grant Coach to build both school level and LEA level capacity, and participation in the state's evaluation C-BAM model. LEAs are permitted to work with individual schools to select interventions that match the needs of the school(s) with cautions being: 1. Be careful when dollar signs get in your eyes, honestly budget for what can be accomplished in a single school year; 2. Remember that it is very important to spread school improvement activities out over the three year period to avoid overwhelming the faculty.

Modification of practices and/or policies will be addressed during technical assistance visits and onsite visits; practices and policies will be amended as recommended by SEA staff, if needed. Recognizing that LEA commitment is paramount to successful implementation, the SEA has designed a scoring rubric that includes critical checkpoints in all five areas listed above. In addition to the rubric, each LEA will participate in a screening process to monitor commitment via a live video interview. A standardized scoring rubric (Appendix A) will be used to guide these interviews and assess commitment. Building capacity to sustain reform is a central component of Alabama's SIG application.

A District Grant Coach (required by state model) at each participating LEA will be responsible for ensuring all elements of the LEA's commitment to this grant are met with fidelity and that each LEA is capable of sustaining all reforms instituted during this funding period. District Grant Coaches are highly experienced educators or administrators who work under the direction of the SEA to provide support to LEAs focusing on turning around challenging schools. These coaches are trained and supervised by the Statewide System of Support School Improvement Leaders.

Each District Grant Coach will be assigned to a SIG participating LEA to provide timely on-site support to the district and to accompany the district School Improvement Specialist to selected school(s) in order to assure quality performance and to ensure successful implementation of school improvement processes. Examples of support components include: analyzing and using data, implementing and monitoring continuous improvement processes, maximizing district leadership teams, and promoting collaborative relationship relevant to established goals to ensure implementation of the required model(s).

In the unlikely event that the District Grant Coach is unsuccessful, School Improvement leaders will provide additional coaching and increase oversight of coaching activities. If the coach is unable to develop the necessary skills, the coach will be released and the School Improvement leaders will provide assistance until another coach can be secured.

1. *Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.*
   The ALSDE will assess the LEA's commitment to design and implement an appropriate intervention model and school improvement activities by requiring the LEA to document a process that may include, but will not be limited to:

   (a) Assessing the completed SIG School Needs Assessment to identify the greatest needs;

   (b) Assessing the LEA and school's capacity (staff, resources, etc.) to implement specific interventions and school improvement activities;

(c) Assessing the alignment of the LEA and school improvement processes for supporting the designed interventions;

(d) Assessing other resources that will support the design and implementation efforts of selected interventions;

(e) Assessing the engagement of stakeholders (staff, parents, community, etc.) to provide input into the design and implementation process;

(f) Assessing the effectiveness of state support team representative(s) for the grant period and regularly evaluating and adjusting services as needed;

(g) Assessing the scheduling of regular (at least biweekly) data meetings to identify school/teacher/student weaknesses and to adjust plans for supports to address those weaknesses;

(h) Assessing the communication with selected provider(s) to plan Professional Development and support based on assessed needs (at least biweekly),

(i) Maintaining accurate documentation of meetings and communications,

(j) Following and/or revising schedules, goals, and timeline as needed, and

(k) Submitting all data/forms to the SDE and/or USDE in accordance to timeline.

Exceptional (7-9 points)	***Adequate (4-6 points)***	***Inadequate (1-3 points)***
a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive plan designed to meet the needs identified and to implement, with fidelity, the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA plan for its design to meet the needs identified and to implement, with fidelity, of the selected model.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed or inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities and does not meet the needs identified.

2. *Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.*
The ALSDE will assess the LEA's commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers by requiring the LEA to document a process for assessing external provider quality which may include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Identifying external providers based on each school's SIG needs;

(b) Interviewing and analyzing external providers to determine evidence-based effectiveness, experience, expertise, and documentation to assure quality and efficiency of each external provider based on each schools identified SIG needs;

(c) Selecting an external provider based upon the provider's commitment of timely and effective implementation and the ability to meet school needs;

(d) Aligning the selection with existing efficiency and capacity of LEA and school resources, specifically time and personnel;

(e) Assessing the regular (at least biweekly) communication with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs,

(f) Assessing the utilization of multiple sources of data to evaluate the effectiveness of the supports provided (at least biweekly) and reporting the results to the SDE.

(g) Assessing the monitoring of records for quality and frequency of supports provided by the selected service provider(s),

(h) Assessing the in-school presence (at least one day a week) to monitor the interactions of the school administration, faculty, and staff with the selected service provider(s) to ensure the full implementation of supports; and

(i) Assessing the recording and reporting of progress to school, LEA, SDE, and USDE.

Although the State Transformational Model interventions have been thoroughly assessed for quality through a rigorous process by the ALSDE, and have been utilized and shown to be effective in selected schools and districts in the State, intervention and school improvement activity providers will be held to the same criteria as external providers.

Exceptional (7-9 points)	*Adequate (4-6 points)*	*Inadequate (1-3 points)*
a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider does not meet the identified needs.

3. *Align other resources with the interventions.*
   The ALSDE will assess the LEA's commitment to align other resources with the interventions by requiring the LEA to document a process which may include, but will not be limited to:

   (a) Identifying resources currently being utilized in an academic support capacity;

   (b) Identifying additional and/or potential resources that may be utilized in an academic support capacity;

   (c) Assessing the alignment of other federal, state, and local resources based on evidence-based effectiveness and impact with the design of interventions;

   (d) Assessing the alignment of other federal, state, and local resources with the goals and timeline of the grant (e.g., fiscal, personnel, time allotments/scheduling, curriculum, instruction, technology resources/equipment);

   (e) Conducting regularly scheduled reviews of the resource alignment to ensure all areas are operating fully and effectively to meet the intended outcomes or making adjustments as necessary;

   (f) Redirecting resources that are not being used to support the school improvement process; and

   (g) Assessing the presence (minimum of one day per week the first year) in the school to monitor the implementation of the interventions by school administration, faculty, and staff as well as interactions with the selected service provider(s) to ensure the full implementation of supports.

Exceptional (7-9 points)	*Adequate (4-6 points)*	*Inadequate (1-3 points)*
a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities does not meet the identified needs.

4. *Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.*
The ALSDE will assess the LEA's commitment to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively by requiring the LEA to document a process which may include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Identifying ALSDE and/or LEA challenges that may slow or halt the school improvement implementation process;

(b) Assessing, designing, and implementing a policy modification protocol that includes input that may include state and local education agency administrators, board members, and personnel; and

(c) Developing an ongoing process to assess areas that may be considered for policy and process modification that include, but will not be limited to: (i) school administrator and staff hiring practices; (ii) school administrator and staff transfer procedures; (iii) teacher-performance rewards; and (iv) altering the traditional school day and/or calendar to include additional instructional and planning time.

Exceptional (7-9 points)	*Adequate (4-6 points)*	*Inadequate (1-3 points)*
a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities does not meet the identified needs.

5. *Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.*
The ALSDE will assess the LEA's commitment to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends by requiring the LEA to document a process that may include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Developing school improvement planning processes that support sustainability of education reform protocol;

(b) Developing processes to assure effective training of school leadership staff to ensure the understanding and efficient implementation of interventions into operating flexibility of the school;

(c) Developing processes to assure effective training of school staff to ensure the understanding and efficient implementation of interventions into the classroom curriculum and activities;

(d) Identifying alternative funding sources to sustain operational protocol that may require financial support;

(e) Identifying meaningful professional development for school leadership and staff that support short-term and long-term initiatives of educational improvement;

(f) Demonstrating a commitment to the continuous development of teacher knowledge and skills to incorporate changes into their instruction as evidenced by an extensive action plan;

(g) Developing an evaluation system that measures short-term and long-term, multi-level implementation of interventions, as well as the measurement of effectiveness of supporting initiatives and policy;

(h) Development of a process to embed interventions and school improvement activities in an extensive strategic long-term plan to sustain gains in student achievement;

(i) Developing an evaluation system to monitor strategic checkpoints and end of the year results and outcomes to inform and assist practitioners with problem-solving and decision-making that supports short-term and long-term educational fidelity;

(j) Developing a process to sustain alignment of resources with the school's mission, goals, and needs;

(k) Planning a growth model for both the fiscal and human capital within the LEA for implementation and sustainability of interventions and school improvement activities;

(l) Establishing and implementing accountability processes that provide effective oversight of the interventions, school improvement activities, financial management, and operations of the school.

Exceptional (7-9 points)	***Adequate (4-6 points)***	***Inadequate (1-3 points)***
a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends does not meet the identified needs.

C. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

The SEA will apply a decision model to assess the LEA's capacity to serve the maximum number of Tier I schools. This decision model will consist of the following steps: a.) Application of Capacity-Building/Commitment Scoring Rubric (Appendix D); b.) Live video interviews with LEA Central Office key staff to assess commitment and capabilities to serve the maximum number possible; c.) The SEA Conference Committee will meet and compare ratings gathered during the interview, using the Capacity/Commitment Rubric (Appendix D). The LEA will be notified of the SEA's decision in writing. If the SEA determines additional capacity exists for a Tier I school and the LEA is not in agreement with the decision, the SEA will provide an opportunity for the LEA to meet with the Deputy Superintendent of Education to present their case. If the LEA still refuses to serve additional Tier I schools, the SEA will not award funding for the LEA to serve identified Tier II or Tier III schools. If the LEA determines that there is

capacity for more Tier I schools than the SEA determines, extra support will be given to the LEA but no funding for Tier III schools will be awarded until the LEA satisfies the SEA that it does have sufficient capacity to operate additional schools or elects to serve as SEA requests.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school. The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

The ALSDE will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school by requiring the LEA to document a process that shall include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Assessing the extent to which the LEA can recruit qualified new staff to effectively implement educational reform interventions;

(b) Assessing the commitment of the LEA, school board, school staff, and stakeholders to support the implementation of educational reform in the district;

(c) Assessing the alignment of the school improvement process to identified school needs to ensure effective short-term and long-term implementation of the selected intervention model or school improvement activities;

(d) Assessing the alignment of federal, state, and local resources to identified school needs to ensure short-term and long-term support of the selected intervention model or school improvement activities;

(e) Assessing the capacity of time and personnel to ensure the initial fundamentals of the intervention are implemented effectively and efficiently (C-BAM).

(f) Assessing the availability of all other necessary resources unique to each intervention model or school improvement activity to ensure timely transition of implementation protocol.

Exceptional (7-9 points)	*Adequate (4-6 points)*	*Inadequate (1-3 points)*
a) There is exceptional evidence of the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process to assess the lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process to assess the lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process to assess the lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school does not meet the identified needs.

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth below.

(1) Describe the SEA's process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Each SIG application will be independently reviewed by three outside readers that will score the Tier I and Tier II applications using a scoring rubric. Assurances will be made to prevent biases. After the external review process, SEA personnel will contact selected applicants to arrange video conferences regarding the capacity and commitment portions of the application. Three member teams will interview applicant teams. Interviews will be scored using the interview rubric. To determine the total application score, the composite application score and the composite interview score will be combined. Schools will be selected by score and will be notified after the selection process has been completed (see application timeline).

February 2010

- Train SDE School Improvement Staff to provide support to eligible LEAs in Application Development (2/11/10)
- Application due to USDOE (2/22/10)
- Notify selected LEAs of opportunity to serve identified schools (2/22/10)
- Conduct SIG webinar and announce regional training events (2/25/10)
- Receive grant approval from USDOE

March 2010

- Provide regional training meetings to provide support to LEAs eligible to apply for 1003(g) Funds (3/1/10 3/15/10)
- **School Improvement staff begins work with individual LEAs to prepare application (3/15/10)**

April 2010

- **School Improvement staff completes work with individual LEAs for grant applications (4/12/10**)
- **LEA Tier I and II School Improvement grant applications due to SDE (4/15/10)**
- **SEA review of SIG applications rankings, contact with LEAs for Video Conferencing Interview (4/16/10)**
- **SEA conducts Video Conferences regarding Capacity/Commitment (4/19/10 – 4/27/10)**

May- June 2010

- SEA receives grant award from USDOE
- SEA awards funds for Tier I and Tier II schools and offers technical assistance to LEAs as needed (5/3/10)
- SEA posts reviewed applications on website (selected and non-selected) (5/5/10)
- SEA trains selected LEAs in eGAP procedures (5/12/10)

- SEA awards funds for Tier III schools and offers technical assistance to LEAs as needed (6/ 3/ 2010)

- LEA posts all Tier III applications on website (selected and non-selected) (6/4/2010)

Summer 2010

- LEAs prepare for selected model implementation

- SEA continues technical assistance as requested

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools 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 in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

During the course of grant implementation, each Tier I and Tier II school will follow the school improvement timeline for monthly Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) reviews which are held seven times during the school year. Beginning in August 2010, these monthly reviews conducted by the LEA and school staff (with the assistance of the district grant coach, initially) provide the opportunity to review program fidelity of implementation for both the LEA and school. Toward the end of the school year, focus shifts to planning for the next school year.

In order to assure fidelity of implementation of the specific model interventions, the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) will be employed (Appendix E-1/E-2). The CBAM Model will be used in conjunction with the CIP benchmark data, onsite reviews, and CBAM online surveys(s) to address immediate concerns regarding goal attainment. In addition all collected data will be analyzed annually to assess yearly progress.

CBAM is an evaluation tool that measures, describes and explains the change that teachers and school leaders experience while implementing or leading transformational changes in school. The evaluation components will include the following:

1. Evaluation Tools

- The *Innovation Configuration Maps* will be developed with descriptions of the components of each Transformational model. This description will describe what individuals in each school will be doing as they are implementing each component, with variations of practice measured along the continuum from "poor" to "ideal."

- The *Stages of Concern Questionnaire* will be distributed three times each year. This instrument is a quantitative instrument that measures what a teacher is feeling about an innovation.

- The *Levels of Use Interview* instrument will be used annually to measure the teachers' and principals' actions in eight behavioral profiles along a continuum.

2. Process Tools - Timeline elements will consist of the following:

- Customize Evaluation Tools for each school project.

- Develop CBAM Train the Trainer Module.

- Train the School Improvement Team, i.e. ELL coaches, Grant Coaches, Peer Mentors and Regional School Improvement in the CBAM process and recording of observational data.

- Develop the online Stages of Concern Questionnaire, and appropriate CBAM Report Templates.

- Conduct Classroom observations using CBAM report tools.

- Assess Levels of Use Interview Scripts with teachers and school leaders.

3. Reports - Reports will be submitted at the: a.) *beginning* of the project; b.) *mid-year point* for each of the three years per project; c.) *end* of each year, and; d.) conclusion of the 3-year implementation of the grant.

If an LEA does not achieve its designated goals, the SEA renewal determination process will consider:

a) The amount of fidelity of implementation achieved as measured by the CBAM Model (for both central office and school staff);

b) The amount of improvement demonstrated by benchmark data;

c) The growth of instruction for all students as exhibited through data meeting minutes, student work, classroom assessments and end-of-course tests;

d) The amount of improvement as measured by leading indicators; and

e) A recommendation of the District Grant Improvement Coach. Based on the analysis of this combined data, the SEA will determine SIG renewal.

(3) 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.

The SEA's process for reviewing goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools will be much as described above. There will be local monthly reviews conducted by the LEA and school administration to provide the opportunity to assess school progress toward LEA goal attainment. The C-BAM Model will be used by the SEA in conjunction with quarterly CIP reviews to assess fidelity of implementation. Tier III schools found to be having implementation difficulties will be offered extended support through the LEA and district grant coach.

(4) 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 the LEA is approved to serve.

The SEA will place a District Grant Coach in each LEA that has committed to implementing a total school reform model. The District Grant Coach will be responsible for building LEA capacity and assisting with school level implementation of the reform model. The LEA will be required in conjunction with the District Grant Coach to monitor weekly in every school approved for a total school reform. Each review will be followed by a debriefing with the District Grant Coach. The LEA will identify areas of "Glows" and areas of "Grows". If a school is having difficulty with implementation, the LEA will be taught how to deal with lack of implementation through planning actions to be taken with the District Grant Coach. The District Grant Coach will report on implementation monthly to the SEA at School Support Team PD sessions. Coaching advice will be given to the District Grant Coach by School Improvement Leaders. If difficulties continue, one of the School Improvement leaders will visit to assess the situation and develop a plan with the District Grant Coach will be approved through the SDE.

(5) 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.

Schools will be prioritized for funding by using the following criteria:

a.) Tier ranking, including student achievement and graduation rate data

b.) Rubric application score

c.) Video interview score to ascertain Central Office leadership capability, commitment, and capacity

d.) Assessment of the amount of federal , state and local funding currently available to the LEA

(6) Describe the criteria, if any that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

Priority will be assessed according to the following:

a) School longitudinal data

b) Video interview score to ascertain Central Office leadership capability, commitment, and capacity

c) Other funding, resources, and programs already in place

d) Other successful implementations of academic and/or behavioral interventions

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

The SEA does not intend to take over any Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools.

(8) 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, 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.[2]

The SEA has developed a transformation model designed to allow LEAs to meet their specific needs. The decision to participate in the state model remains the decision of the LEA. Services for the state model will include outside educational entities as well as some state services. There are two required components to the model which every LEA must select. The first is the Response to Instruction (RtI) framework. It is the intent of the SEA that the RtI framework serve as the umbrella for the other programs in the model. The second is the hiring of a District Grant Coach. These exemplary educators trained by the SEA in school improvement processes will work directly with LEA personnel to build data and instructional capacity to share specifically with Tier I and Tier II schools and with Tier III schools as available.

[2] 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:

_X_ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.

_X_ 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 that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.

_X_ Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.

_X_ Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the State receives FY 2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the State).

_N/A_ Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Departments differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.

_X_ Monitor each LEA's implementation of the interventions supported with school improvement funds.

___ To the extent 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.
Blank because Alabama does not have charter school legislation.

_X_ 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 the 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.

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

F. SEA RESERVATION: An 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 the State-level funds it has received from its School Improvement Grant.

The State of Alabama plans to use the reserved five percent of the SIG funds for the following purposes:

- To hire an educational grant specialist to assist with the management of SIG funds , LEA technical assistance and SEA monitoring processes
- To contract with TRE consulting to train SEA in capturing data according to the CBAM fidelity model
-
- To hire 10 district grant coaches to build capacity within LEAs and schools utilizing the State SIG model

- To fund State Support Team members travel expenses related to providing LEA technical assistance
- To fund a part-time administrative assistant to support SIG administration

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: An SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

_X_ **The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application. (January 15, 2010 and January 27, 2010)**

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

_X_ **The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including;**

- **Regional In-service Center Directors**
- **Southern Poverty Law Center**
- **SERVE (Greensboro, NC)**
- **Southeast Education Development Lab (SEDL)**

H. WAIVERS: The final requirements invite an SEA to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must list in its application those requirements for which it is seeking a waiver.

The State of Alabama requests a waiver of the requirements it has listed 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, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

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

_X_ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a school-wide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

_X_ Waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of Persistently Lowest-achieving schools to permit Alabama to Include in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are lowest-achieving in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA Act that have not made 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 assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics combines.

_X_ Waive inclusion of 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 who were enrolled in the school for a full academic year as that term is defined in Alabama's Accountability Workbook is less than 40.

The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

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

The State assures that, prior to submitting this request in 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 this request 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 this waiver request 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.

The State assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, 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, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.

SEA APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION FOR LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES SCORING RUBRIC

Section	Exceptional (7-9)	Adequate (4-6)	Inadequate (1-3)	PTS. Assigned
School Improvement Grants (SIG) 1003(g) LEA Application Cover Page	Required Signatures are Included		Required Signatures are not Included and application returned to LEA for correction.	
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. Please identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school and the intervention model that will be used in each school with a School Improvement Grant.	The tiers for all schools listed are identified and an intervention is specified for all Tier I and Tier II schools consistent with the final grant requirements		Tiers and/or Interventions are not specified consistent with the final grant requirements	
B-1 Descriptive Information: Commitment				
(a) *For each Tier I and Tier II school, please identify the needs and the selected intervention for each school. Needs should be identified using the Continuous Improvement Grant (SIG) Needs Assessment Form. (See Appendix A)*	a) The demographics of the district are addressed and thoroughly explained. b) The district's AYP status is provided along with a thorough description of the data by subgroup where the district did not meet state and federal AYP benchmarks. c) The schools for which funding is being requested are identified and the schools are prioritized according to needs of each school and the school's capacity to implement the	a) The demographics of the district are addressed and adequately explained. b) The district's AYP status is provided along with an adequate description of the data by subgroup where the district did not meet state and federal AYP benchmarks. c) The schools for which funding is being requested are identified and the schools are prioritized according to needs of each school and the school's capacity to implement the	a) The demographics of the district are addressed and inadequately explained. b) The district's AYP status is provided along with an inadequate description of the data by subgroup where the district did not meet state and federal AYP benchmarks. c) The schools for which funding is being requested are identified and the schools are prioritized according to needs of each school and the school's capacity to implement the	

	selected models, intervention and/or school improvement activities and move out of improvement status. d) There is exceptional evidence provided of district effort to identify root causes and commitment to assist the schools) to fully implement the proposal to address the causes. e) The administering, implementing, and monitoring of the 1003(G) grant is thoroughly described in a plan that: specifies all district and other resources targeted for school improvement i.e., local school improvement funds/initiatives, equity projects, remediation, etc.) that will supplement these grant funds.	selected models, intervention and/or school improvement activities and move out of improvement status. d) There is adequate evidence provided of district effort to identify root causes and commitment to assist the schools) to fully implement the proposal to address the causes. e) The administering, implementing, and monitoring of the 1003(G) grant is adequately described in a plan that: specifies all district and other resources targeted for school improvement i.e., local school improvement funds/initiatives, equity projects, remediation, etc.) that will supplement these grant funds.	selected models, intervention and/or school improvement activities and move out of improvement status. d) There is inadequate evidence provided of district effort to identify root causes and commitment to assist the schools) to fully implement the proposal to address the causes. e) The administering, implementing, and monitoring of the 1003(G) grant is inadequately described in a plan that: specifies all district and other resources targeted for school improvement i.e., local school improvement funds/initiatives, equity projects, remediation, etc.) that will supplement these grant funds.	
(b) *Please indicate the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in this application to implement fully and effectively the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.*	There is exceptional evidence provided of district commitment to assist the school to fully implement the proposal. The administering, implementing, and monitoring the 1003(G) grant is described in a plan that: a) Thoroughly specifies district support and technical assistance that will be available to the school. b) Identifies all district staff responsible for providing support and technical assistance	There is adequate evidence provided of district commitment to assist the school to fully implement the proposal. The administering, implementing, and monitoring the 1003(G) grant is described in a plan that: a) Adequately specifies district support and technical assistance that will be available to the school. b) Identifies all district staff responsible for providing support and technical assistance	There is thorough evidence provided of district commitment to assist the school to fully implement the proposal. The administering, implementing, and monitoring the 1003(G) grant is described in a plan that: a) Inadequately specifies district support and technical assistance that will be available to the school. b) Identifies all district staff responsible for providing support and technical assistance	

	c) Lists staff by job titles, as individuals, or as groups as appropriate (e.g. Language Arts Supervisor, Math Coach, Federal Programs Director, Supervisor of Instruction etc.). d) Thoroughly describes and explains the coordination of 1003(g) grant funds and activities with all other school improvement efforts in the district.	c) Lists staff by job titles, as individuals, or as groups as appropriate (e.g. Language Arts Supervisor, Math Coach, Federal Programs Director, Supervisor of Instruction etc.). d) Adequately describes and explains the coordination of 1003(g) grant funds and activities with all other school improvement efforts in the district.	c) Lists staff by job titles, as individuals, or as groups as appropriate (e.g. Language Arts Supervisor, Math Coach, Federal Programs Director, Supervisor of Instruction etc.). d) Inadequately describes and explains the coordination of 1003(g) grant funds and activities with all other school improvement efforts in the district.	
B-2 Descriptive Information: Lack of Capacity to Serve				
*If the LEA is **NOT** applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.*	a) There is exceptional evidence of the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process to assess the lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process to assess the lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process to assess the lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school does not meet the identified needs.	
B-3 Descriptive Information: Action Steps				

(a) *Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. (May be an SDE recommended model.)*	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive plan designed to meet the needs identified and to implement, with fidelity, the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA plan for its design to meet the needs identified and to implement, with fidelity, of the selected model.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed or inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities and does not meet the needs identified.	
(b) *Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.* ***(If the Transformation (State Model) intervention has been selected for all TIER I and TIER II schools, this page is omitted.)***	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider does not meet the identified needs.	

(c) *Align other resources with interventions.*	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities does not meet the identified needs.	
(d) *Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.* ***(e.g. schedules, calendars, number of PD days provided)***	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and inadequately explained.	

	c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities does not meet the identified needs.	
(e) *Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.*	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends does not meet the identified needs.	
B-4 Descriptive Information: Timeline				
Planning ***(a)*** *The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to* ***plan*** *and implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in Part A of the application:*	a) The plan includes a thoroughly detailed timeline that provides: • All dates for professional development/training sessions. • All dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) The timeline thoroughly	a) The plan includes an adequately detailed timeline that provides: • Most dates for professional development/training sessions. • Most dates for sharing information with stakeholders.	a) The plan includes an inadequately detailed timeline that provides: • Some or none of the dates for professional development/training sessions. • Some or none of the dates for sharing information with stakeholders.	

	presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	b) The timeline adequately presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	b) The timeline somewhat presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	
Year 1 ***(b)*** *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 identified in Part A of the application:*	a) The plan includes a thoroughly detailed timeline that provides: • All dates for professional development/training sessions. • All dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • All dates for progress monitoring activities. • All dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • All dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for the year two application is thoroughly explained. The timeline clearly presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	a) The plan includes an adequately detailed timeline that provides: • Most dates for professional development/training sessions. • Most dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Most dates for progress monitoring activities. • Most dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Most dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for year two applications is adequately explained. The timeline adequately presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	a) The plan includes a detailed timeline that provides: • Some or none of the dates for professional development/training sessions. • Some or none of the dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Some or none of the dates for progress monitoring activities. • Some or none of the dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Some or none of the dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for year two applications is inadequately explained. The timeline somewhat presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	

Year 2 ***(c)*** *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 identified in Part A of the application:*	a) The plan includes a thoroughly detailed timeline that provides: • All dates for professional development/training sessions. • All dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • All dates for progress monitoring activities. • All dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • All dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for the year three application is thoroughly explained. The timeline clearly presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	a) The plan includes an adequately detailed timeline that provides: • Most dates for professional development/training sessions. • Most dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Most dates for progress monitoring activities. • Most dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Most dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for year three applications is adequately explained. The timeline adequately presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	a) The plan includes an inadequately detailed timeline that provides: • Some or none of the dates for professional development/training sessions. • Some or none of the dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Some or none of the dates for progress monitoring activities. • Some or none of the dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Some or none of the dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for year three applications is somewhat explained or not explained at all. The timeline somewhat presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	

Year 3 ***(d)*** *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 identified in Part A of the application:*	a) The plan includes a thoroughly detailed timeline that provides: • All dates for professional development/training sessions. • All dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • All dates for progress monitoring activities. • All dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • All dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for future improvement efforts is thoroughly explained.	a) The plan includes an adequately detailed timeline that provides: • Most dates for professional development/training sessions. • Most dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Most dates for progress monitoring activities. • Most dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Most dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for future improvement efforts is adequately explained.	a) The plan includes a detailed timeline that provides: • Some or none of the dates for professional development/training sessions. • Some or none of the dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Some or none of the dates for progress monitoring activities. • Some or none of the dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Some or none of the dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for future improvement efforts is somewhat explained or not explained at all.	
B-5 Descriptive Information: Annual Goals and Leading Indicators				
(a) *The LEA must describe its 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 Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.*	There is a thorough description of the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics, including measurable and rigorous targets to monitor the progress of Tier I and Tier II schools.	There is an adequate description of the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics, including measurable and rigorous targets to monitor the progress of Tier I and Tier II schools.	There is an inadequate description or no description of the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics including measurable and rigorous targets to monitor the progress of Tier I and Tier II schools.	

(b) *Leading Indicators: LEA Academic Informative Data* *The LEA must include metrics that constitute the leading indicators for the SIG programs:*	*LEA Academic Informative Data* table is thoroughly complete for each school	*LEA Academic Informative Data* table is adequately complete for each school	*LEA Academic Informative Data* table is somewhat or not complete for each school.	
(c) *Leading Indicators: LEA State Assessment Participation Rates*	*LEA State Assessment Participation Rates* table is thoroughly complete for each school.	*LEA State Assessment Participation Rates* table is adequately complete for each school.	*LEA State Assessment Participation Rates* table is somewhat or not complete for each school.	
B-6 Descriptive Information: Tier III Action Steps				
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.	The LEA has provided a thorough plan outlining the specific services or activities to be implemented in each Tier III school is provided.	The LEA has provided an adequate plan outlining the specific services or activities to be implemented in each Tier III school is provided.	The LEA has provided an inadequate or no plan outlining the specific services or activities to be implemented in each Tier III school is provided.	
B-7 Descriptive Information: LEA Goals				
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. *LIST SEPARATELY BY SCHOOL.*	The LEA has provided a thorough description of goals it has established in order to hold accountable its Tier three schools that receive school improvement funds.	The LEA has provided an adequate description of goals it has established in order to hold accountable its Tier three schools that receive school improvement funds.	The LEA has provided an inadequate description or no description of goals it has established in order to hold accountable its Tier three schools that receive school improvement funds.	
B-8 Descriptive Information: Stakeholders				
As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools: *LIST SEPARATELY BY*	The LEA has thoroughly described a collaborative planning process that includes staff, parents, students, and local community/business partners in the development of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvements activities.	The LEA has adequately described a collaborative planning process that includes staff, parents, students, and local community/business partners in the development of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvements activities.	The LEA has inadequately described a collaborative planning process that includes staff, parents, students, and local community/business partners in the development of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvements activities.	

SCHOOL.	a) Thoroughly-defined data are provided that support a commitment of school staff, parents, and students to fully implement this project is provided. b) Community/business partners are thoroughly described along with their roles and commitment to the school in supporting the implementation of proposed improvement strategies. c) Community/business partners are listed. A signed letter from each partner, written on the partner's letterhead is included that thoroughly describes the partner's commitment to supporting the grant. d) A collaborative partnership is thoroughly explained between the district and the school to support the 1003(G) proposal. e) A process of communication to keep all stakeholders informed of the progress of the 1003(G) project is thoroughly explained. f) A process for soliciting input from parents and students on the progress of the 1003(G) grant is thoroughly explained.	a) Adequately-defined data are provided that support a commitment of school staff, parents, and students to fully implement this project is provided. b) Community/business partners are adequately described along with their roles and commitment to the school in supporting the implementation of proposed improvement strategies. c) Community/business partners are listed. A signed letter from each partner, written on the partner's letterhead is included that adequately describes the partner's commitment to supporting the grant. d) A collaborative partnership is adequately explained between the district and the school to support the 1003(G) proposal. e) A process of communication to keep all stakeholders informed of the progress of the 1003(G) project is adequately explained. f) A process for soliciting input from parents and students on the progress of the 1003(G) grant is adequately explained.	a) Inadequately-defined data are provided that support a commitment of school staff, parents, and students to fully implement this project is provided. b) Community/business partners are inadequately described or not described along with their roles and commitment to the school in supporting the implementation of proposed improvement strategies. c) Community/business partners are listed. A signed letter from each partner, written on the partner's letterhead is included that somewhat describes the partner's commitment to supporting the grant. d) A collaborative partnership is inadequately explained, or not at all explained, between the district and the school to support the 1003(G) proposal. e) A process of communication to keep all stakeholders informed of the progress of the 1003(G) project is inadequately explained or not at all explained. f) A process for soliciting input from parents and students on the progress of the 1003(G) grant is inadequately explained or not at all explained.	

Local Education Agency Name :_ _____

Reviewer Name :_____ Date :_____

Section	*Points Possible*	*Points Assigned*
A	9	_____
B-1-A	9	_____
B-1-B	9	_____
B-3-A	9	_____
B-3-C	9	_____
B-3-D	9	_____
B-3-E	9	_____
B-4-A	9	_____
B-4-B	9	_____
B-4-C	9	_____
B-4-D	9	_____
B-5-A	9	_____
B-5-B	9	_____
B-5-C	9	_____
B-6	9	_____
B-7	9	_____

Total Points_____

Total Points / Possible Points = _____% of Points Earned

APPENDIX B
1003(G) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT LEA FY 2010 BUDGET
YEAR ONE

Func	Prog	Obj		Description of Expenditures				Budget $
		010		Regular Teacher Salary	***Original Application:***	☐ **YES**	☐ **NO**	
		011		Resource Teacher Salary	***Amended Application:***	☐ **YES**	☐ **NO**	
		083		Consulting Teacher Salary	***Amendment Number:***			
		122		Social Worker	***Effective date:***			
		180		Substitutes	***Please describe below:***			
		191		Supplements	Please submit a budget, between $50,000 - $2,000,000, of which funds requested are of sufficient size and aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of selected interventions and school improvement activities			
		192		Stipends				
		210		Health Insurance				
		220		Retirement				
		230		Social Security				
		240		Medicare				
		250		Unemployment Compensation				
		312		Purchased Services-Staff Ed. Services				
		319		Purchased Services-Other Prof. Ed. Services				
9120		319		Purchased Services-Parenting Specialist				
		382		In-State Travel				
		383		Out-of-State Travel				
		411		Student Classroom Supplies				
		491		Instructional Equipment				
		494		Audio/Video				
		495		Computer Hardware				
		496		Library /Media				
		499		Other Equipment				
		623		Registration Fees				
				TOTAL EXPENDITURES				0

1003(G) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT LEA FY 2010 BUDGET
YEAR TWO

Func	Prog	Obj		Description of Expenditures				Budget $
		010		Regular Teacher Salary	***Original Application:***	☐ **YES**	☐ **NO**	
		011		Resource Teacher Salary	***Amended Application:***	☐ **YES**	☐ **NO**	
		083		Consulting Teacher Salary	***Amendment Number:***			
		122		Social Worker	***Effective date:***			
		180		Substitutes	***Please describe below:***			
		191		Supplements	Please submit a budget, between $50,000 - $2,000,000, of which funds requested are of sufficient size and aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of selected interventions and school improvement activities			
		192		Stipends				
		210		Health Insurance				
		220		Retirement				
		230		Social Security				
		240		Medicare				
		250		Unemployment Compensation				
		312		Purchased Services-Staff Ed. Services				
		319		Purchased Services-Other Prof. Ed. Services				
9120		319		Purchased Services-Parenting Specialist				
		382		In-State Travel				
		383		Out-of-State Travel				
		411		Student Classroom Supplies				
		491		Instructional Equipment				
		494		Audio/Video				
		495		Computer Hardware				
		496		Library /Media				
		499		Other Equipment				
		623		Registration Fees				
				TOTAL EXPENDITURES				0

1003(G) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT LEA FY 2010 BUDGET
YEAR THREE

Func	Prog	Obj		Description of Expenditures				Budget $
		010		Regular Teacher Salary	***Original Application:***	☐ **YES**	☐ **NO**	
		011		Resource Teacher Salary	***Amended Application:***	☐ **YES**	☐ **NO**	
		083		Consulting Teacher Salary	***Amendment Number:***			
		122		Social Worker	***Effective date:***			
		180		Substitutes	***Please describe below:***			
		191		Supplements	Please submit a budget, between $50,000 - $2,000,000, of which funds requested are of sufficient size and aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of selected interventions and school improvement activities			
		192		Stipends				
		210		Health Insurance				
		220		Retirement				
		230		Social Security				
		240		Medicare				
		250		Unemployment Compensation				
		312		Purchased Services-Staff Ed. Services				
		319		Purchased Services-Other Prof. Ed. Services				
9120		319		Purchased Services-Parenting Specialist				
		382		In-State Travel				
		383		Out-of-State Travel				
		411		Student Classroom Supplies				
		491		Instructional Equipment				
		494		Audio/Video				
		495		Computer Hardware				
		496		Library /Media				
		499		Other Equipment				
		623		Registration Fees				
				TOTAL EXPENDITURES				0

APPENDIX C
Alabama Transformation Model
Support Menu

Required Components
Name of Program: Response to Instruction (RtI)
Brief Description: RtI refers to an instructional framework that promotes a well-integrated system connecting general, gifted, supplemental, and special education services. RtI will provide high-quality, standards-based instruction, and interventions that are matched to students' academic and behavioral needs.
Expected Outcomes: ▪ High-quality, research-based instruction by highly-qualified staff. ▪ Data-based decision-making tools for screening and progress monitoring. ▪ Differentiated Instructional strategies. ▪ Framework for improving achievement for struggling learners using a multi-tiered model approach.
Contact: Christine Spear, cspear@alsde.edu, 334.242.9743
Name of Program: District Grant Coach
Brief Description: District Grant Coaches are highly experienced educators or administrators who are under contract with the SDE to provide support to LEAs focusing on turning around challenging schools. District Grant Coaches work under the direction of a School Improvement Leader. They will provide daily on-site support to the LEA School Improvement Specialist (or other district school improvement designee). Examples of support components include: analyzing and using data, implementing and monitoring continuous improvement processes, maximizing district leadership teams, and promoting collaborative relationships relevant to established goals.
Expected Outcomes: ▪ Coordinated services designed to support and organize work in schools on a district level ▪ Improved decision-making using achievement data ▪ Improved LEA Leadership Team structure and performance ▪ Changed culture for sustenance of goals beyond life of grant
Contact: Ann Allison, aallison@alsde.edu, 334.242.8199
Name of Program: Content-Based Analysis Model (C-BAM)
Brief Description: The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) is an evaluation tool that measures, describes and explains the change teachers, and school leaders experience while trying to implement or lead transformational changes in a school. Three powerful evaluation instruments, Stages of Concern, Levels of Use, and Innovation Configurations, are used to monitor the implementation of change. CBAM is predicated upon the fact that in order to be effective, change will occur over several years and should be monitored. Innovations presented through professional

development, coaching, and/or mentoring can be monitored through the stages of concerns of the teachers and school leaders. Teachers involved in implementing the innovation move through 7 discrete levels of concerns so that, when properly used, can determine problems that need to be addressed early in the process. The Levels of Use instrument serves as a "dip stick" to monitor the level of implementation. The third instrument, Innovation Configuration is used to measure the impact and integration into the educational environment.

Expected Outcomes:

- Evaluation process that LEAs can use across all future innovations
- Availability of formative evaluation results so that innovations can be adjusted by LEA participants as needed for success
- Overall Transformation Model component evaluation results based upon Key Success Indicators
- Online Tools for quick assessments and data sets
- Professional Learning experiences for teachers and schools leaders to assess and adapt their own practices to achieve desired results
- Timely data presented in a user-friendly way that enables corrections and improvements throughout the implementation period and beyond

Contact: Shannon Parks, sparks@alsde.edu, 334.242.9594

Elective Components

Name of Program: Advanced Placement (AP)Expansion

Brief Description: The Advanced Placement Program purpose is to increase participation in the College Board's Advanced Placement Program, and to foster the increase in number of qualifying scores on AP exams. The main advantage of taking an AP course is better preparation for college. It has been shown that students master in depth content at the college level more easily after completing AP courses in high school. Students also acquire sophisticated academic skills and increased self-confidence in preparation for college.

Expected Outcomes:

- Increased participation in AP classes
- Increased AP class offerings for Math and English
- Increased number of qualifying scores on the AP exam

Contact: Phyllis Rase, prase@alsde.edu, 334.242.9743

Name of Program: Alabama Positive Behavior Supports (PBS)

Brief Description: PBS is a national research-based model for reducing discipline referrals, reducing the number of students suspended and/pr expelled, and improving student achievement. PBS uses a behaviorally-based systems approach to enhance the capacity of schools, families and communities to design effective environments that improve the link between research validated practices and the environments in which teaching and learning occur.

Expected Outcomes:

- Reduced Discipline referrals
- Reduced suspensions and expulsions
- Increased consistency/morale among staff
- Support and infrastructure to improve relationships between home, school and community stakeholders
- Proactive, predictable, positive learning environments
- Supported, successful interventions for students

Contact: Donna Kirkendoll, dkirkendoll@alsde.edu, 334.242.8114

Name of Program: Alabama Math, Science, & Technology Initiative (AMSTI)

Name of Program: Alabama Reading Initiative – Plan for Adolescent Literacy (ARI-PAL)

Brief Description: The Alabama Reading Initiative Plan for Adolescent Literacy (ARI-PAL) is based on five essential elements: collaborative leadership, assessment, accelerated intervention, professional development and strategic teaching. Collaborative leadership focuses on the duties of instructional leaders, leadership teams, and the implementation of continuous improvement plans. Assessment involves data-driven decision making using multiple sources of formative and summative data and progress monitoring to guide instruction. Accelerated intervention includes flexible scheduling, targeted skills instruction and varied grouping patterns within both the content and intervention settings. Professional development fosters ongoing, job-embedded learning via collaborative learning communities, coaching, and shared teaching experiences with continuous support. These four elements work together to support the instructional component of ARI-PAL which is strategic teaching, a daily instructional framework designed to incorporate purposeful planning, explicit instruction, and multiple strategies that result in increased student engagement. This element ensures that sound instructional practices are in place across the curriculum in order to positively impact student achievement. After initial leadership and instructional training, ARI-PAL school faculties receive intensive weekly support for these five essential elements. The support from state and regional staff works toward building capacity to sustain the comprehensive school reform efforts.

Expected Outcomes:

- Increased achievement across the curriculum
- Data analysis capabilities
- Support systems necessary for true school reform
- Increased active student engagement and daily assessment of learning

- Sound instructional practices that build school capacity

Contact: Reeda Betts, rbetts@alsde.edu, Carol Belcher, cbelcher@alsde.edu, or Denise Perkins, dperkins@alsde.edu 334.353.1389

Name of Program: Alabama Teach21 Program

Brief Description: Teach21 is a research-based, successful program designed to fully engage students in learning using 21st Century learning tools. Key components include: project-based learning with reading and math as the primary content focus; 21st Century Tools for research and concept acquisition, presentation of concepts, communication among and between teachers, learners, and their parents; deep engagement in relevant learning; technology integration and leadership professional development for teachers and school leaders. The Teach21 Program encompasses the transformational model outcomes for students, teachers, parents, and school leaders, thereby rendering each school capable of building and sustaining growth and progress through 21st Century learning catapults.

Expected Outcomes:

- Improved student achievement in reading and math
- Engagement in Learning
- Increased Efficacy for Students and Teachers
- Decreased at-risk factors (attendance, discipline referrals, suspensions/expulsions, drop-outs, home-school links)
- 21st Century Technology Tools
- Students (and teachers) prepared for 21st C. work

Contact: Shannon Parks, sparks@alsde.edu, 334.242.9594
Keith George, kgeorge@alsde.edu 334.242.9594

Name of Program: The Arts in Every Classroom Project

Brief Description: The goal of Arts in Every Classroom (AEC) is to raise student achievement for at-risk students by actively supporting and positively engaging students through integrated arts programming and strengthening arts instruction.

Expected Outcomes:
Outcomes:

- Increased achievement across the curriculum.
- Development of a community of practice to accelerate learning.
- Increased student engagement in learning.
- Embedded teacher professional development training to reinforce and expand arts knowledge base.

Contact: Martha Lockett, mlockett@alsde.edu, 334.242.9594

Name of Program: Curriculum Alignment Project
Brief Description: The purpose of the Curriculum Alignment Project is to align the Alabama Course of Study Standards, including the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics replete with instructional materials. These standards will be organized into topics using a scope and sequence pacing guide. In order to accomplish this task, local committees will be formed to write these documents with state assistance through Webinar sessions after Curriculum Coordinators and selected staff members (additional curriculum coordinator/lead teacher/principal) have received training. Budgetary items will include travel to a work session for Curriculum Coordinators and selected staff members, substitute teachers, and will also fund materials and supplies, and printing. Sample products will be made available to committees.
Expected Outcomes: ▪ Increased achievement by planning and teaching Common Core standards areas. ▪ Developed lesson plans and instructional strategies for each Course of Study standard. ▪ Completed, LEA-custom scope and sequence pacing guides. ▪ State of the Art Training in curriculum alignment.
Contact: Steve McAlily, stevemc@alsde.edu, 334.242.9743
Name of Program: Instructional Guides
Brief Description: The Curriculum Guide project will include the development of lesson plans/instructional strategies for each standard in the Alabama Courses of Study, including the Common Core Standards, for English Language Arts and Mathematics. Committees will be developed to write these documents. Budgetary items will include travel and per diem for each committee member, substitute teachers, materials and supplies, and printing.
Expected Outcomes: ▪ Increased achievement in Common Core standards in Math and Language Arts areas. ▪ Developed lesson plans and instructional strategies for each Course of Study standard.
Contact: Ginger Montgomery, gmontgomery@alsde.edu, 334.242.8059
Name of Program: Distance Learning
Brief Description: ACCESS Distance Learning is a comprehensive program designed to provide rigorous, high quality web-based and Interactive Videoconferencing (VCI) courses aligned with Alabama Standards. This program will expand this model to grades 7 and 8 as well as adding a new component targeting reading in grades 7 -12. This model will provide

opportunities for students, no matter their location, to increase scores in identified curricula using 21st Century tools and equipment. This individualized instruction, based on acquired data from research based software, will be designed by a highly qualified, Alabama Certified teacher and monitored by a trained facilitator. This model will include a certified, highly-qualified teacher and a data analyst funded by ACCESS Distance Learning. Training at one of the ACCESS Regional Support Centers for the school facilitator, counselor, principals, reading coach, etc . will also be funded by ACCESS Distance Learning

Expected Outcomes:

- Improved student achievement in reading
- Improved student engagement
- Improved graduation rate and/or decreased drop-out rate
- High-quality, research-based instruction by highly-qualified staff
- Data-based decision-making tools and strategies for individualized instruction

Contact: Earlene Patton, epatton@alsde.edu, 334.343.9594

Name of Program: Graduation Coach Program

Brief Description: Twelve part-time graduation coach team leaders will be employed by the Alabama Department of Education, Prevention and Support Services Section for selected Title 1 middle and high schools currently identified as being in school improvement. As the state strives to increase the number of high school students who graduate on time, this initiative will serve as an early intervention to coordinate academic and behavioral (attendance and discipline) services for selected Title 1 middle and high schools.

Expected Outcomes:

- Increased capacity to mediate and resolve at-risk factors (student and teacher truancy, behavior, drop-out rate
- Increased community collaborations regarding factors that affect at-risk determinants and how to ameliorate these factors
- Increased student engagement
- Establishment of statewide best practices network

Contact: Kay Warfield, kaw@alsde.edu, 334.242.8165

Name of Program: Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)

Brief Description: As a critical SREB initiative, High Schools That Work (HSTW) is the nation's largest school improvement program for high school leaders and teachers. Components include motivation to achieve rigorous academic content, and high standards. Efforts are customized to meet specific needs of middle and high schools. Another SREB Program, Technology Centers That Work (TCTW), prepares students for postsecondary studies and employment in high-demand, high-wage, high-

skill fields. LEAs benefit by using a shared-time technology center to support postsecondary and job development skills. Through SREB's middle grades initiative, schools are able to implement strategies that address the crucial middle grades and key transition into high school. *Making Middle Grades Work (MMGW)* helps districts and schools look at what they expect, what they teach and how they teach young adolescents to prepare for success in further education, raise student achievement, and help students graduate career and college ready.
Expected Outcomes: ▪ Increased motivation ▪ Increased relevance of curriculum to the student's work/school goals ▪ Mastery of rigorous content
Contact: Ann Allison (HSTW), aallison@alsde.edu, 334.242.8199; Dawn Morrison (TCTW), dmorrison@alsde.edu, 334.242.9115, Sara Wright, swright@alsde.edu, 334.242-8059
Name of Program: Instructional Review Process
Brief Description: The purpose of the Instructional Review Process is to assist LEAs in creating and sustaining continual school improvement. The Instructional Review team will gather evidence through observations, interviews, and document reviews to provide data to the schools for instructional decision-making.
Expected Outcomes: ▪ Feedback that serves as a basis for instructional and programmatic decision-making ▪ Improved programmatic decision-making
Contact: Carolyn Townsend, ctownsend@alsde.edu, 334.242.9743
Name of Program: Language!
Brief Description: Language! is a comprehensive Literacy Curriculum designed for struggling readers, writers, speakers and spellers in 3rd grade – 12th grade who are scoring below the 60th percentile. Language! provides explicit systematic research-based instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics, word recognition and spelling, vocabulary and morphology, grammar and usage, and reading and writing comprehension. Language! provides multiple entry points to place students into the curriculum according to their skill level and reading ability. The curriculum consists of six levels, with six units of instruction (10 lessons per unit).
Expected Outcomes: ▪ Assessment system to place students into the appropriate curriculum level thereby increasing success in language and reading ▪ Online data management systems for progress monitoring
Contact: Julie Lowery, jlowery@alsde.edu, 334.242.8114

Name of Program: Leadership & Evaluation
Brief Description: The Leadership and Evaluation unit will provide a transformational principal electronic self-assessment to determine strengths and weaknesses that will inform the development of training and support. Other components include: a 3-day orientation session to provide training for new principals; booster meetings for networking and support; leadership online modules designed by SREB; new principal mentorship support.
Expected Outcomes: ▪ Improved academic achievement through transformational leadership ▪ Improved support systems through networking, mentorships, and online learning for school leaders ▪ Systemic Change mechanisms that render results through leadership development
Contact: John Bell, jbell@alsde.edu, 334.242-9962
Name of Program: Makes Sense Strategies (MSS)
Brief Description: Makes Sense Strategies program is a research-based program designed to increase grade k-12 student outcomes in core academic standards for reading comprehension; process writing, English, science and math. MSS is a collection of an array of powerful techniques and tools for differentiating curriculum; planning and implementing instruction, and assessing student learning. Students learn new strategies and thinking skills when teachers employ the MSS strategies. This approach brings more focus and direction to how children should be taught.
Expected Outcomes: ▪ Increased outcomes in core academics, including reading and math ▪ Powerful resources for differentiating instruction ▪ New Assessment tools ▪ Improved higher order thinking Skills
Contact: Theresa Farmer, tfarmer@alsde.edu, 334.242.8114
Brief Description: The Alabama Math, Science, and Technology Intitiative (AMSTI) is focused on improving math and science education. AMSTI provides students with well-trained teachers and the equipment, materials, and resources, needed for hands-on, activity-based math and science education. Teachers and administrators receive 120 contact hours of grade and subject specific professional development. This training helps deepen teacher content knowledge, provides teachers with hand-on activities, and equips them with researched based pedagogical strategies to teach the Alabama Course of Study standards. Teachers receive all of the equipment and materials needed to provide high quality, inquiry-based, hands-on instruction with their students. In-classroom mentoring is provided by AMSTI specialists so teachers become confident in performing the activities with their students and in improving their instructional skills so they move to higher levels on the EDUCATE Alabama

continuum. A learning community approach is used to ensure effective implementation and continuous improvement.
Expected Outcomes: ▪ Increased student achievement in science and math ▪ Data analysis capabilities ▪ Classroom mentoring strategies ▪ Skills using science and math equipment ▪ Reading strategies ▪ Writing strategies ▪ Deepening teacher content knowledge in math and science ▪ Use of formative and summative assessment to improve instruction
Contact: Cathy Jones,cjones01@alsde.edu; 334.353.9151

APPENDIX D

LEA Capacity/Commitment Interview Rubric		
1. The LEA demonstrates a commitment to the continued utilization of data, from multiple sources (attendance, PRIDE, discipline, ARMT, AHSGE, surveys, progress reports, report cards, etc.) to identify and address areas of concern.		
Exceptional (7-9 points)	**Adequate (4-6 points)**	**Inadequate (1-3 points)**
The LEA provides evidence that it has been fully trained and committed to support this area of the grant. a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive plan designed to meet the needs identified and to implement, with fidelity, the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities. d) Supporting the school(s) served in the form of support team representative(s) working in the school(s) at least one full day per week for the first year of the grant and regularly evaluating and adjusting services as needed in subsequent years,	The LEA provides evidence that it has been fully trained and committed to support this area of the grant. a) There is adequate evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA plan for its design to meet the needs identified and to implement, with fidelity, of the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities. d) Supporting the school(s) served. LEA presence in the school(s) is less than 1 full day per week for the first year with no concrete plan for adjustments in subsequent years, e) Scheduling of data meetings to identify school/teacher/student weaknesses and adjust	The LEA provides little or no evidence that it has the capacity or commitment to support this area of the grant. a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed or inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities and does not meet the needs identified.

e) Scheduling regular (at least biweekly) data meetings to identify school/teacher/student weaknesses and to adjust plans for supports to address those weaknesses, f) Communicating with selected provider(s) to plan Professional Development and support based on assessed needs (at least biweekly), g) Maintaining accurate documentation of meetings and communications, h) Following and/or revising schedules, goals, and timeline as needed, and i) Submitting all data/forms to the SDE and/or USDE in accordance to timeline.	plans for supports to address those weaknesses does not occur on at least a biweekly basis, f) Communicating with selected provider(s) to plan Professional Development and support based on assessed needs does not occur on at least a biweekly basis, g) Maintaining accurate documentation of meetings and communications, h) Following and/or revising schedules and goals takes place, but infrequently, and i) Submitting all data/forms to the SDE and/or USDE in accordance to timeline.	

LEA Capacity/Comment Rubric		
2. The LEA demonstrates the capacity and commitment to recruit, screen, and monitor the quality of supports provided by selected service provider(s).		
Exceptional (7-9 points)	**Adequate (4-6 points)**	**Inadequate (1-3 points)**
The LEA provides evidence that it has been fully trained and committed to support this area of the grant. a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified. d) Communicating regularly (at least biweekly) with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs, e) Utilizing multiple sources of data to evaluate the effectiveness of the supports provided (at least biweekly) and reporting the results to the SDE. f) Maintaining records of the quality and frequency of supports provided by the selected service provider(s),	The LEA provides evidence that it has been fully trained and committed to support this area of the grant. a) There is adequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified. d) Communicating (less than biweekly) with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs, e) Utilizing multiple sources of data to evaluate the effectiveness of the supports provided (less than biweekly) and reporting the results to the SDE. f) Maintaining records of the quality and frequency of supports provided by the selected service provider(s),	The LEA provides little or no evidence that it has the capacity or commitment to support this area of the grant. a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider does not meet the identified needs.

g) Maintaining a presence (one day per week in the first year) in the school to monitor the interactions of the school administration, faculty, and staff with the selected service provider(s) to ensure the full implementation of supports, and h) Recording and reporting progress to school, LEA, SDE, and USDE.	g) Maintaining a presence in the school to monitor the interactions of the school administration, faculty, and staff with the selected service provider(s) to ensure the full implementation of supports, and h) Recording and reporting progress to school, LEA, SDE, and USDE.	

LEA Capacity/Commitment Rubric		
3. The LEA demonstrates the capacity and commitment to align other resources with the interventions and modify practices or policies, if necessary, to implement the interventions fully and effectively.		
Exceptional (7-9 points)	**Adequate (4-6 points)**	**Inadequate (1-3 points)**
The LEA provides evidence that it has been fully trained and committed to support this area of the grant. a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for	The LEA provides evidence that it has been fully trained and committed to support this area of the grant. a) There is adequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process	The LEA provides little or no evidence that it has the capacity or commitment to support this area of the grant. a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final

aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified. d) Reviewing current practices and policies and making modifications, if necessary, to implement the interventions fully and effectively. e) Aligning all resources with the goals and timeline of the grant (e.g., fiscal, personnel, time allotments/scheduling, curriculum, instruction, technology resources/equipment). f) Conducting regularly scheduled reviews of the resource alignment to ensure all areas are operating fully and effectively to meet the intended outcomes or making adjustments as necessary. g) Maintaining a presence (minimum of one day per week the first year) in the school to monitor the implementation of the interventions by school administration, faculty, and staff as well as interactions with the selected service provider(s) to ensure the full implementation of supports, and h) Reviewing data, recording and reporting progress to school, LEA, SDE, and USDE.	for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified. d) Reviewing some of the current practices and policies and making modifications, if necessary, to implement the interventions. e) Aligning some of the resources with the goals and timeline of the grant (e.g., fiscal, personnel, time allotments/scheduling, curriculum, instruction, technology resources/equipment). f) Conducting occasional reviews of the resource alignment to ensure all areas are operating fully and effectively to meet the intended outcomes or making adjustments as necessary. g) Maintaining a presence in the school to monitor the implementation of the interventions by school administration, faculty, and staff as well as interactions with the selected service provider(s) to ensure the full implementation of supports, and h) Reviewing data, recording and reporting progress to school, LEA, SDE, and USDE.	requirements and the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities does not meet the identified needs.

LEA Capacity/Commitment Rubric		
4. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.		
Exceptional (7-9 points)	**Adequate (4-6 points)**	**Inadequate (1-3 points)**
The LEA provides evidence that it has been fully trained and committed to support this area of the grant. a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified. d) Embedding all educational program(s) (interventions) in an extensive strategic longer-term plan to sustain gains in student achievement. e) Aligning all resources with the school's mission and goals.	The LEA provides evidence that it has been fully trained and committed to support this area of the grant. a) There is adequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified. d) Embedding educational program(s) (interventions) in a strategic longer-term plan to sustain gains in student achievement. e) Aligning most resources with the school's mission and goals. f) Demonstrating a commitment to the	The LEA provides little or no evidence that it has the capacity or commitment to support this area of the grant. a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities does not meet the identified needs.

f) Demonstrating a commitment to the continuous development of teacher knowledge and skills to incorporate changes into their instruction as evidenced by an extensive action plan. g) Growing both the fiscal and human capital within the LEA for implementation and sustainability of all educational programs. h) Establishing and implementing an accountability structure that provides effective oversight of the educational program(s), financial management, and operations of the school.	continuous development of teacher knowledge and skills to incorporate changes into their instruction as evidenced by an action plan. g) Growing the fiscal and/or human capital within the LEA for implementation and sustainability of most educational programs. h) Establishing and implementing an accountability structure that provides some level of oversight of the educational program(s), financial management, and operations of the school.	

LEA Capacity/Commitment Rubric		
5. The LEA demonstrates the capacity and commitment to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.		
Exceptional (7-9 points)	**Adequate (4-6 points)**	**Inadequate (1-3 points)**
The LEA provides evidence that it has been fully trained and committed to support this area of the grant. a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and	The LEA provides evidence that it has been fully trained and committed to support this area of the grant. a) There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and	The LEA provides little or no evidence that it has the capacity or commitment to support this area of the grant. a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are

thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the needs identified.	adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the needs identified.	addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends does not meet the identified needs.

APPENDIX E-1

TRE CONSULTING
Technology, Research, & Educational Consulting, LLC
1919 Oxmoor Road, Suite 241
Birmingham, AL 35209-3502

Feburary 5, 2010

Mrs. Ann Allison
Educational Administrator
ALSDE Federal Programs Section
Instruction and Support Team/1003(g) Grant Manager
5348 Gordon Persons Building
50 North Ripley St.
Montgomery, AL 36130

Ms. Allison:

My experience as a statewide evaluator has led me to research a number of evaluation tools that are most appropriate to gauge the success of innovations in education. A tool that I have become most familiar with is the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) that measures the actual degree and success of implementations as they are being undertaken in a school.

CBAM is a research-based evaluation tool that has been used since the late 1970's to determine change in teacher behavior in the classroom resulting from professional development or mentoring. The reason this tool is impressive is that it measures those changes in teacher practices based upon interventions, including but not limited to
professional development undertakings. We all know that in order to be effective, the intervention(s) must transfer from training or mentoring to a change in teacher behavior. The following is a very brief synopsis of keystone research related to the use of the C-BAM model to evaluate educational reform efforts. I have also included online links to add more information and examples of this varied model's rich and varied applications.

CBAM Overview
The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) was developed by Hall, Wallace, and Dossett in the early 1970's. It was designed to measure, describe and explain the change teachers experience while trying to implement new curriculum or instructional strategies. Three powerful evaluation instruments, Stages of Concern, Levels of Use, and Innovation Configurations, are used to monitor the implementation of change.

Hall, Wallace and Dossett's concept of this model is that for an innovation to be effective, change will occur over several years and should be monitored. Innovations presented through professional development or coaching can be monitored through the stages of concerns of the teachers. Teachers involved in implementing the innovation move through 7 discrete levels of concerns (Awareness through refocusing – see link #2).

If at any point during the process, the participants move back toward the beginning, the innovation will

fail. Thus the Stages of Concern, when properly used, can determine problems early in the process. The Levels of Use instrument serves as a "dip stick" to monitor the level of implementation. The third instrument, Innovation Configuration is used to measure the impact and integration into the educational environment.

1.http://www.nationalacademies.org/rise/backg4a.htm
2.http://www.mentoring-association.org/membersonly/CBAM.html#Using
3.http://ide.ed.psu.edu/change/hall.htm
4.http://www.jstor.org/pss/1180105
5.http://www.ucalgary.ca/iejll/vaughan

I hope this helps. We have developed a cost structure to use this model--cost is mostly associated with the evaluator services and support, not the instrument itself. We look forward to our continued partnership with Alabama. Please do not hesitate to contact one of the TRE Consultants below should you have further questions.

Sincerely,

Stephanie A. Baird, Ph.D.
Education Researcher & Evaluator
Birmingham Office
205.586.9102

Christopher B. Ash
CEO, TRE Consulting, LLC
Huntsville Office
256.682.3904

APPENDIX E-2

Traditions of Change Research

What Types of Concerns Must People Resolve as They Experience Change?

Contact Us

Site Map

Home Page

Join AECT

The focus on the intended adopter is presented in the *Concerns-Based Adoption Model,* or CBAM, originally proposed by Hall, Wallace, and Dossett (1973). Scholars writing from this perspective proceed from the assumption that teachers, as the relatively autonomous practitioners of education at the level "where it really happens" are the key adopters of concern. This model has several unique strengths--including having dimensions which are each paired with a valid and reliable instrument for diagnosing current status (Hall, 1978, p. 2). It has also benefited from a large number of contributors, who have generally continued their CBAM research even after leaving the core group (*e.g.,* Loucks, 1983; Rutherford, 1986). Coupled with new researchers and practitioners adopting the CBAM perspective, these characteristics have yielded an exceptionally rich knowledge base with particularly strong empirical support.

Practitioners will find CBAM an exceptionally powerful tool for diagnosing their implementation effort's progress by tracking the progression of adopters' concerns, and their behaviors related to innovation use. This perspective can also be useful as the effort is launched, to assess whether prior exposure from *other* sources (like the media, or colleagues at other schools) has caused portions of the population to advance into subsequent stages of concern or levels of use. One of the key lessons of CBAM research is that because adopter concerns evolve over time to focus on different issues, the most effective interventions will vary accordingly. For example, if most adopters are experiencing intense *personal* concerns, a campaign aimed at highlighting the innovation's impact on *student learning* is unlikely to have much effect. A final useful feature of this framework is the Innovation Configuration (IC) Component Checklist, which allows the practitioner to communicate what effective innovation use in its intended setting (*e.g.,* the classroom) actually *looks like,* and even to specify what (if any) adaptations can be made to reduce strangeness or complexity without rendering the innovation ineffective.

Also see:

- What are the major perspectives from which change is most often studied?
- Examples: the intended adopter

Last Modified: 15 January 2000
© AECT Council on Systemic Change
1800 North Stonelake Drive, Suite 2
Bloomington, IN 47404 CHANGE@aect.org

APPENDIX F

School Improvement Grant LEA Application Checklist

(To Be Used by LEA to assure all required components are completed)

School Name: _____ **School System:** _____

Date Received: _____ **Initialed By:** _____

Application Cover Page

____ Required signatures

A. Schools to be Served

____ Selection of identified schools

____ Identification of intervention model

B1. Descriptive Information: Commitment

____ Identification of needs (SIG Needs Assessment Form)

____ Identification of selected intervention

____ Evidence of capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources/related support to identified schools

B2. Descriptive Information: Lack of Capacity to Serve

____ Attached explanation of lack of capacity to serve each Tier I school

B3. Descriptive Information: Action Steps

(a)

____ Identification of model and model requirements

____ Comprehensive plan included detailing design/implementation of interventions

(b)

____ Selection of external provider (include contract)
NOTE: Maybe omitted if state model is chosen

(c)

____ Alignment of other resources with interventions

(d)

____ Inclusion of description of modified practices and policies (if necessary)

____ Modification results

(e)

____ Summary of sustainability of reform when funding period ends

B4. Descriptive Information: Timeline

(a)

____ Detailed timeline for planning and implementation of interventions

(b)

____ Detailed steps for implementation in Tier I and Tier II schools (year-1)

(c)

____ Detailed steps for implementation in Tier I and Tier II schools (year-2)

(d)

____ Detailed steps for implementation in Tier I and Tier II schools (year-3)

B5. Descriptive Information: Annual Goals and Leading Indicators

(a)

____ Description of annual goals for student achievement on state assessments in the areas of reading, language arts, and mathematics

____ Measureable and rigorous targets to monitor Tier 1 & Tier II schools' progress

(b)

____ Inclusion of LEA Academic Informative Data Table

(c)

____ Inclusion of LEA Stat Assessment Participation Rate Table

B6. Descriptive Information: Tier III Action Steps

NOTE: Complete only if application includes Tier III schools

____ Identification of specific services and activities to be implemented in Tier III schools

B7. Descriptive Information: Stakeholders

____ Description of collaborative planning process utilized in the development of the proposal

____ Evidence of consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG models

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION
FOR LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES
LEA APPLICATION

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

FY 2010

DRAFT

Mai

Alabama Department of Education
Federal Programs
5348 Gordon Persons Building
P.O. Box 302101
Montgomery, Alabama 36130-2101

For technical assistance, contact Ann Allison at:
Telephone: (334) 242-8213
Fax: (334) 242-0496
E-mail: aallison@alsde.edu

School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) LEA Application Cover	Local Education Agency (LEA) Name:
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant:	
Name:	Signature:
Position and Office:	Email Address:
Telephone:	Fax:

Assurances

The LEA must assure that it will:

- ❑ Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements.
- ❑ Establish annual goals for student achievement on the state's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with School Improvement funds and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive School Improvement funds.
- ❑ Include, if it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, 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.
- ❑ Report to the SEA the school-level data required under Section III of the final requirements.

LEA Chief School Financial Officer	Signature	Date

LEA Superintendent	Signature	Date

Joseph B. Morton		
State Superintendent of Education	Signature	Date

DRAFT

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.

Please identify each TIER I, TIER II, and TIER III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the intervention model that will be used in Tier I and Tier II schools. An LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50% of those schools. If choosing the from the Support Menu.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	TIER			INTERVENTION MODEL (TIER I AND II ONLY)				School Improvement Activity (TIER III only)
		I	II	III	Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation	

(Continue if necessary)

SCHOOL NAME	***NCES ID#***	***TIER***			***INTERVENTION MODEL (TIER I AND II ONLY)***				***School Improvement Activity (TIER III only)***
		I	***II***	***III***	***Turnaround***	***Restart***	***Closure***	***Transformation***	

B-1. COMMITMENT AND CAPACITY

The LEA must demonstrate the commitment to serve each Tier I and Tier II school by completing the following information:

The ALSDE will evaluate the capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school by requiring the LEA to document a process that shall include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Assessing the extent to which the LEA can recruit qualified new staff to effectively implement educational reform interventions;

(b) Assessing the commitment of the LEA, school board, school staff, and stakeholders to support the implementation of educational reform in the district;

(c) Assessing the alignment of the school improvement process to identified school needs to ensure effective short-term and long-term implementation of the selected intervention model or school improvement activities;

(d) Assessing the alignment of federal, state, and local resources to identified school needs to ensure short-term and long-term support of the selected intervention model or school improvement activities;

(e) Assessing the capacity of time and personnel to ensure the initial fundamentals of the intervention are implemented effectively and efficiently (C-BAM).

(f) Assessing the availability of all other necessary resources unique to each intervention model or school improvement activity to ensure timely transition of implementation protocol.

In a detailed explanation, not to exceed 3 pages, please indicate the capacity and commitment to use School Improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in this application to implement fully and effectively the required activities of the school intervention model selected.

B-2. LACK OF CAPACITY TO SERVE

If the LEA is NOT applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

The ALSDE will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school by requiring the LEA to document a process that shall include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Assessing the extent to which the LEA can recruit qualified new staff to effectively implement educational reform interventions;

(b) Assessing the alignment of the school improvement process to identified school needs to ensure effective short-term and long-term implementation of the selected intervention model or school improvement activities;

(c) Assessing the alignment of federal, state, and local resources to identified school needs to ensure short-term and long-term support of the selected intervention model or school improvement activities;

(d) Assessing the capacity of time and personnel to ensure the initial fundamentals of the intervention are implemented effectively and efficiently (C-BAM).

(e) Assessing the availability of all other necessary resources unique to each intervention model or school improvement activity to ensure timely transition of implementation protocol.

If the LEA is NOT applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school in a detailed explanation not to exceed 3 pages.

C-1. DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING INTERVENTIONS

The LEA must describe actions it has taken or will take to design and implement interventions consistent with the School Improvement Grant final requirements. (May be based on the SDE Transformation Model)

The ALSDE will assess the LEA's commitment to design and implement an appropriate model, intervention, and/school improvement activities by requiring the LEA to document a process that may include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Assessing the completed SIG School Needs Assessment to identify the greatest needs;

(b) Assessing the LEA and school's capacity (staff, resources, etc.) to implement specific interventions and school improvement activities;

(c) Assessing the alignment of the LEA and school improvement processes for supporting the designed interventions;

(d) Assessing other resources that will support the design and implementation efforts of selected interventions;

(e) Assessing the engagement of stakeholders (staff, parents, community, etc.) to provide input into the design and implementation process;

(f) Assessing the effectiveness of state support team representative(s) for the grant period and regularly evaluating and adjusting services as needed;

(g) Assessing the scheduling of regular (at least biweekly) data meetings to identify school/teacher/student weaknesses and to adjust plans for supports to address those weaknesses;

(h) Assessing the communication with selected provider(s) to plan Professional Development and support based on assessed needs (at least biweekly);

(i) Maintaining accurate documentation of meetings and communications;

(j) Following and/or revising schedules, goals, and timeline as needed;

(k) Submitting all data/forms to the SDE and/or USDE in accordance to timeline; and

(l) Requiring the LEA that chooses one of the four models for an individual school to provide <u>all</u> necessary information regarding model requirements.

In a detailed explanation, not to exceed 4 pages, please describe the actions the LEA has taken or will take to design and implement the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities.

C-2. SELECTION OF PROVIDERS

The LEA must describe actions it has taken or will take to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

The ALSDE will assess the LEA's commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers by requiring the LEA to document a process for assessing external provider quality which may include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Identifying external providers based on each school's SIG needs and justification of the selection of a model, intervention, and/or school improvement activities;

(b) Interviewing and analyzing external providers to determine evidence-based effectiveness, experience, expertise, and documentation to assure quality and efficiency of each external provider based on each schools identified SIG needs;

(c) Selecting an external provider based upon the provider's commitment of timely and effective implementation and the ability to meet school needs;

(d) Aligning the selection with existing efficiency and capacity of LEA and school resources, specifically time and personnel;

(e) Assessing the regular (at least biweekly) communication with the selected service provider(s) to ensure that supports are taking place and are adjusted according to the school's identified needs,

(f) Assessing the utilization of multiple sources of data to evaluate the effectiveness of the supports provided (at least biweekly) and reporting the results to the SDE.

(g) Assessing the monitoring of records for quality and frequency of supports provided by the selected service provider(s),

(h) Assessing the in-school presence (at least one day a week) to monitor the interactions of the school administration, faculty, and staff with the selected service provider(s) to ensure the full implementation of supports; and

(i) Assessing the recording and reporting of progress to school, LEA, SDE, and USDE.

(j) Requiring Tier III schools that are not implementing a total school reform model to prioritize interventions and or school improvement activities by importance based on needs.

(k) Requiring the LEA that chooses one of the four models for an individual school to provide <u>all</u> necessary information regarding model requirements.

Although the Support Menu interventions have been thoroughly assessed for quality through a rigorous process by the ALSDE, and have been utilized and shown to be effective in selected schools and districts in the State, intervention and school improvement activity providers will be held to the same standards and criteria as external providers.

In a detailed explanation, not to exceed 2 pages, please describe the actions the LEA has taken or will take to recruit, screen and select external providers to assure their quality.

C-3. ALIGNMENT OF RESOURCES

The LEA must describe actions it has taken or will take to align other resources with interventions.

The ALSDE will assess the LEA's commitment to align other resources with the interventions by requiring the LEA to document a process which may include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Identifying resources currently being utilized in an academic support capacity;

(b) Identifying additional and/or potential resources that may be utilized in an academic support capacity;

(c) Assessing the alignment of other federal, state, and local resources based on evidence-based effectiveness and impact with the design of interventions;

(d) Assessing the alignment of other federal, state, and local resources with the goals and timeline of the grant (e.g., fiscal, personnel, time allotments/scheduling, curriculum, instruction, technology resources/equipment);

(e) Conducting regularly scheduled reviews of the resource alignment to ensure all areas are operating fully and effectively to meet the intended outcomes or making adjustments as necessary;

(f) Redirecting resources that are not being used to support the school improvement process; and

(g) Assessing the presence (minimum of one day per week the first year) in the school to monitor the implementation of the interventions by school administration, faculty, and staff as well as interactions with the selected service provider(s) to ensure the full implementation of supports.

In a detailed explanation, not to exceed 2 pages, please describe the actions the LEA has taken or will take to align other resources with the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities. Further, illustrate alignment of resources using the Alignment of Resources Matrix.

C-4. MODIFICATION OF PRACTICES AND POLICIES

The LEA must describe actions it has taken or will take to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

The ALSDE will assess the LEA's commitment to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively by requiring the LEA to document a process which may include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Identifying ALSDE and/or LEA challenges that may slow or halt the school improvement implementation process;

(b) Assessing, designing, and implementing a policy modification protocol that includes input that may include state and local education agency administrators, board members, and personnel; and

(c) Developing an ongoing process to assess areas that may be considered for policy and process modification that include, but will not be limited to: (i) school administrator and staff hiring practices; (ii) school administrator and staff transfer procedures; (iii) teacher-performance rewards; and (iv) altering the traditional school day and/or calendar to include additional instructional and planning time.

In a detailed explanation, not to exceed 2 pages, please describe the actions the LEA has taken or will take to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities fully and effectively.

C-5. SUSTAINABILITY OF REFORMS

The LEA must describe actions it has taken or will take to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

The ALSDE will assess the LEA's commitment to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends by requiring the LEA to document a process that may include, but will not be limited to:

(a) Developing school improvement planning processes that support sustainability of education reform protocol;

(b) Developing processes to assure effective training of school leadership staff to ensure the understanding and efficient implementation of interventions into operating flexibility of the school;

(c) Developing processes to assure effective training of school staff to ensure the understanding and efficient implementation of interventions into the classroom curriculum and activities;

(d) Identifying alternative funding sources to sustain operational protocol that may require financial support;

(e) Identifying meaningful professional development for school leadership and staff that support short-term and long-term initiatives of educational improvement;

(f) Demonstrating a commitment to the continuous development of teacher knowledge and skills to incorporate changes into their instruction as evidenced by an extensive action plan;

(g) Developing an evaluation system that measures short-term and long-term, multi-level implementation of interventions, as well as the measurement of effectiveness of supporting initiatives and policy;

(h) Development of a process to embed interventions and school improvement activities in an extensive strategic long-term plan to sustain gains in student achievement;

(i) Developing an evaluation system to monitor strategic checkpoints and end of the year results and outcomes to inform and assist practitioners with problem-solving and decision-making that supports short-term and long-term educational fidelity;

(j) Developing a process to sustain alignment of resources with the school's mission, goals, and needs;

(k) Planning a growth model for both the fiscal and human capital within the LEA for implementation and sustainability of interventions and school improvement activities;

(l) Establishing and implementing accountability processes that provide effective oversight of the interventions, school improvement activities, financial management, and operations of the school.

In a detailed explanation, not to exceed 2 pages, please describe the actions the LEA has taken or will take to sustain reforms after the funding period ends. Further illustrate sustainability efforts using the Sustainability Matrix.

D. IDENTIFICATION OF STAKEHOLDERS

As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its TIER I, TIER II and Tier III schools:

Please list each stakeholder/organization and its role regarding the application and implementation of the selected model, intervention, and/or school improvement activities.

E. WAIVERS

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

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

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

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.

- ❑ Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline

- ❑ 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.

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.

LEA Chief School Financial Officer	**Signature**	**Date**

LEA Superintendent	**Signature**	**Date**

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION
FOR LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES
SCHOOL APPLICATION

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

FY 2010

DRAFT

Mai

Alabama Department of Education
Federal Programs
5348 Gordon Persons Building
P.O. Box 302101
Montgomery, Alabama 36130-2101

For technical assistance, contact Ann Allison at:
Telephone: (334) 242-8213
Fax: (334) 242-0496
E-mail: aallison@alsde.edu

School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g) **School Application Cover**	**Local Education Agency (LEA) Name:**
School Contact Information:	
School Name:	**NCES ID:**
School Address:	**Email Address:**
Telephone:	**Fax:**

A. IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

The LEA must list the needs of each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school by completing the following information:

For each TIER I, TIER II, and TIER III school, please identify the needs and the selected intervention for each school. Needs should be identified using the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) Needs Assessment Form (see Appendix A) and any other needs assessments that may be available and appropriate.

B. ALIGNMENT OF RESOURCES MATRIX FOR SCHOOLS

Please provide a summary of how each fund source, local, state, and federal, supports the selected model, intervention, and/or school improvement activities.

Program/Personnel/Item	Funding Source Expenditure Description	Amount ($)

C. SUSTAINABILITY MATRIX FOR SCHOOLS

Please provide a summary of sustainability below. In the left column, list the activity or intervention that will be sustained. In the right column, list the plan of sustainability for the appropriate intervention or activity.

Interventions and Activities	Plan for Sustainability

D-P. PLANNING TIMELINE

The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to plan and implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in Part A of the application.

Please describe the monthly actions steps the LEA will take to plan and ensure full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.

February	
March	
April	
May	
June	
July	

D-1. YEAR ONE TIMELINE

The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school identified in Part A of the application.

Please describe the monthly actions steps the LEA will take to plan and ensure full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.

August	
September	
October	
November	
December	
January	
February	
March	
April	
May	
June	
July	

D-2. YEAR TWO TIMELINE

The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school identified in Part A of the application.

Please describe the monthly actions steps the LEA will take to plan and ensure full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.

August	
September	
October	
November	
December	
January	
February	
March	
April	
May	
June	
July	

D-3. YEAR THREE TIMELINE

The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school identified in Part A of the application.

Please describe the monthly actions steps the LEA will take to plan and ensure full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.

August	
September	
October	
November	
December	
January	
March	
April	
May	
June	
July	

E-1. LEA ANNUAL GOALS

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 Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that receive School Improvement funds.

List one reading/language arts goal and one mathematics goal for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school separately. Schools serving students in grade 12 must also include a goal related to graduation. Goals must be provided for each of the three years of the School Improvement Grant. LEAs should prepare goals with each individual school.

FY 2009-10 Baseline Data	Annual Goals		
	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13
Example: 55% of all students scored proficient on the States reading assessment	*Increase the percentage of all students scoring proficient to 60% on the State's reading assessment*	*Increase the percentage of all students proficient to 70% on the State's reading assessment*	*Increase the percentage of all students proficient to 80% on the State's reading assessment*
Example: 50% of all students scored proficient on the ARMT mathematics assessment	*Decrease the percentage of students scoring non-proficient by 10% on the ARMT mathematics assessment*	*Decrease the percentage of students scoring non-proficient by 15% on the ARMT mathematics assessment*	*Decrease the percentage of students scoring non-proficient by 20% on the ARMT mathematics assessment*
Example: 75% of all students in grade 12 graduated	*Increase the number of students in grade 12 graduating to 80%*	*Increase the number of students in grade 12 graduating to 85%*	*Increase the number of students in grade 12 graduating to 90%*

E-2. LEADING INDICATORS: LEA INFORMATIVE DATA

The LEA must list metrics that constitute the leading indicators for the SIG programs.

Please indicate the informative data for 2008-09 and 2009-10.

Informative Data Category	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Number of minutes within the school year:					
Graduation rate:					
Dropout rate:					
Student attendance rate:					
Truancy rate:					
Discipline incidents:					
Teacher attendance rate:					

Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes:

2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	

Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system:

E-3. LEADING INDICATORS: LEA STATE ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION RATES

The LEA must list metrics that constitute the leading indicators for the SIG programs.

Please indicate the participation rates for each assessment for the appropriate subgroup and grade level for 2008-09 and 2009-10.

Year		Grade		State Assessment									
Student Subgroups				ARMT Reading	ARMT Math	SAT-10 Reading	SAT-10 Lang.	SAT-10 Math	AHSGE Reading	AHSGE Lang.	AHSGE Math	AAA Reading	AAA Math
All Students													
Special Education													
American Indian/Alaskan Native													
Black													
Hispanic													
White													
Limited-English Proficient													
Free/Reduced Price Meals													

Year		Grade		State Assessment									
Student Subgroups				ARMT Reading	ARMT Math	SAT-10 Reading	SAT-10 Lang.	SAT-10 Math	AHSGE Reading	AHSGE Lang.	AHSGE Math	AAA Reading	AAA Math
All Students													
Special Education													
American Indian/Alaskan Native													
Black													
Hispanic													
White													
Limited-English Proficient													
Free/Reduced Price Meals													

E-3. LEADING INDICATORS: LEA STATE ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION RATES

(Continued from previous page)

Please indicate the participation rates for each assessment for the appropriate subgroup and grade level for 2008-09 and 2009-10.

Year		Grade		State Assessment									
Student Subgroups				ARMT Reading	ARMT Math	SAT-10 Reading	SAT-10 Lang.	SAT-10 Math	AHSGE Reading	AHSGE Lang.	AHSGE Math	AAA Reading	AAA Math
All Students													
Special Education													
American Indian/Alaskan Native													
Black													
Hispanic													
White													
Limited-English Proficient													
Free/Reduced Price Meals													

Year		Grade		State Assessment									
Student Subgroups				ARMT Reading	ARMT Math	SAT-10 Reading	SAT-10 Lang.	SAT-10 Math	AHSGE Reading	AHSGE Lang.	AHSGE Math	AAA Reading	AAA Math
All Students													
Special Education													
American Indian/Alaskan Native													
Black													
Hispanic													
White													
Limited-English Proficient													
Free/Reduced Price Meals													

F. SIG 1003(g) BUDGET

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 intervention, and/or school improvement activities in each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school it commits to serve*
- *Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention model(s) in the LEA's Tier I, Tier II, Tier III schools*

The ALSDE will further review all LEA budgets to assure that they have sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively by:

(a) Requiring the LEA to submit a budget, between $50,000 - $2,000,000, of which funds requested are of sufficient size and aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of selected interventions and school improvement activities;

(b) Requiring the LEA to provide appropriate documentation regarding the alignment of federal, state, and local resources to ensure short-term and long-term support of the selected interventions or school improvement activities;

(c) Requiring the LEA to provide appropriate documentation, from the intervention provider on appropriate letter head, in the form of a detailed cost-analysis of the selected intervention of annual salaries, services and materials;

(d) Requiring a high level of transparency from the LEA regarding accounting procedures and processes through the use of Alabama's electronic grant application process (eGAP) which includes both budget planning and funding information. The Federal Programs Director is responsible for final approval of all federal budgets. All budget revisions will be done on eGAP. Documents posted on eGAP are available for public viewing.

F-1. YEAR ONE, FY 2010 SIG BUDGET

Func	Prog	Obj		Description of Expenditures				Budget $
		010		Regular Teacher Salary	***Original Application:***	☐ YES	☐ NO	
		011		Resource Teacher Salary	***Amended Application:***	☐ YES	☐ NO	
		083		Consulting Teacher Salary	***Amendment Number:***			
		122		Social Worker	***Effective date:***			
		180		Substitutes	***Please describe below:***			
		191		Supplements	Please submit a budget, between $50,000 - $2,000,000, of which funds requested are of sufficient size and aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of selected interventions and school improvement activities			
		192		Stipends				
		210		Health Insurance				
		220		Retirement				
		230		Social Security				
		240		Medicare				
		250		Unemployment Compensation				
		312		Purchased Services-Staff Ed. Services				
		319		Purchased Services-Other Prof. Ed. Services				
9120		319		Purchased Services-Parenting Specialist				
		382		In-State Travel				
		383		Out-of-State Travel				
		411		Student Classroom Supplies				
		491		Instructional Equipment				
		494		Audio/Video				
		495		Computer Hardware				
		496		Library /Media				
		499		Other Equipment				
		623		Registration Fees				
				TOTAL EXPENDITURES				0

F-2. YEAR TWO, FY 2011 SIG BUDGET

Func	Prog	Obj		Description of Expenditures				Budget $
		010		Regular Teacher Salary	***Original Application:***	☐ YES	☐ NO	
		011		Resource Teacher Salary	***Amended Application:***	☐ YES	☐ NO	
		083		Consulting Teacher Salary	***Amendment Number:***			
		122		Social Worker	***Effective date:***			
		180		Substitutes	***Please describe below:***			
		191		Supplements	Please submit a budget, between $50,000 - $2,000,000, of which funds requested are of sufficient size and aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of selected interventions and school improvement activities			
		192		Stipends				
		210		Health Insurance				
		220		Retirement				
		230		Social Security				
		240		Medicare				
		250		Unemployment Compensation				
		312		Purchased Services-Staff Ed. Services				
		319		Purchased Services-Other Prof. Ed. Services				
9120		319		Purchased Services-Parenting Specialist				
		382		In-State Travel				
		383		Out-of-State Travel				
		411		Student Classroom Supplies				
		491		Instructional Equipment				
		494		Audio/Video				
		495		Computer Hardware				
		496		Library /Media				
		499		Other Equipment				
		623		Registration Fees				
				TOTAL EXPENDITURES				0

F-3. YEAR THREE, FY 2012 SIG BUDGET

Func	Prog	Obj		Description of Expenditures				Budget $
		010		Regular Teacher Salary	***Original Application:***	☐ YES	☐ NO	
		011		Resource Teacher Salary	***Amended Application:***	☐ YES	☐ NO	
		083		Consulting Teacher Salary	***Amendment Number:***			
		122		Social Worker	***Effective date:***			
		180		Substitutes	***Please describe below:***			
		191		Supplements	Please submit a budget, between $50,000 - $2,000,000, of which funds requested are of sufficient size and aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of selected interventions and school improvement activities			
		192		Stipends				
		210		Health Insurance				
		220		Retirement				
		230		Social Security				
		240		Medicare				
		250		Unemployment Compensation				
		312		Purchased Services-Staff Ed. Services				
		319		Purchased Services-Other Prof. Ed. Services				
9120		319		Purchased Services-Parenting Specialist				
		382		In-State Travel				
		383		Out-of-State Travel				
		411		Student Classroom Supplies				
		491		Instructional Equipment				
		494		Audio/Video				
		495		Computer Hardware				
		496		Library /Media				
		499		Other Equipment				
		623		Registration Fees				
				TOTAL EXPENDITURES				0

DRAFT

1003(g) School Improvement Grant Appendices
To Support the LEA Application

APPENDIX A
1003(g) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT NEEDS ASSESSMENT

PART I - Indicate data sources used during planning by identifying strengths and weaknesses or program gaps. If the LEA and/or school did not review a particular data source, please write N/A. LEA improvement goals should address program gaps (weaknesses) as they relate to student achievement.. Close attention should be given to the proficiency index. Please include all disaggregated subgroups including those with less than forty students.

(Duplicate and complete Appendix A for each TIER I and TIER II school)

SCHOOL DATA

Briefly describe the process the LEA contact and school leadership team used to conduct the needs assessment (analysis of all data)	
Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT): Describe how staffing decisions ensure that highly qualified, well-trained teachers provide instruction and how their assignments most effectively address identified academic needs	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
School Administrator and Special Services Evaluation	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
Educate Alabama – Teacher Evaluation	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
School Technology Plan	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
Career and Technical Education Program Improvement Plan	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
Other Education Plans (e.g. Alabama Alternate Assessment)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**

DRAFT

SCHOOL ASSESSMENT DATA

Alabama High School Graduation Examination (AHSGE)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test (ARMT)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
Alabama Science Assessment	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
Stanford 10	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**

DRAFT

SCHOOL ASSESSMENT DATA

Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
Alabama Direct Assessment of Writing (ADAW)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
ACCESS for English Language Learners (ELLs)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
Additional Assessments (e.g. Alabama Alternate Assessment)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
Local Assessments (e.g. LEA, school. and grade-level assessments, program specific assessments)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**

DRAFT

SCHOOL CULTURE-RELATED DATA

School Demographic Information related to student discipline (e.g. total office referrals, long- and short-term suspensions, expulsions, alternative school placements, School Incidence Report (SIR) data)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
School Demographic Information related to drop-out information and graduation rate data	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
School Demographic Information related to teacher attendance, teacher turnover, or challenges associated with a high percent of new and/or inexperienced faculty	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
School Demographic Information related to student attendance, patterns of student tardiness, early checkouts, late enrollments, high number of transfers, and/or transiency including migratory moves (if applicable)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
School Perception Information related to parent perceptions and parent needs including information about literacy and education levels	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**

DRAFT

SCHOOL CULTURE-RELATED DATA

School Perception Information related to student PRIDE data	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
School Process Information related to an analysis of existing curricula focused on helping English Language Learners (ELLs) work toward attaining proficiency in annual measurable academic objectives (AMAOs)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
School Process Information related to an analysis of existing personnel focused on helping English Language Learners (ELLs) work toward attaining proficiency in annual measurable academic objectives (AMAOs)	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
School Process Information uncovered by an analysis of curriculum alignment, instructional materials, instructional strategies, reform strategies, and/or extended learning opportunities	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**
Other school culture-related data	
Strengths:	**Weaknesses:**

DRAFT

GOAL TO ADDRESS ACADEMIC NEEDS

PART II - All components to support improving academic achievement, including school culture considerations, should be related to the weaknesses identified in the data summary.

Continuous Improvement Goal (Should address identified weaknesses and gaps in achievement)
Data results on which goal(s) is (are) based

Target Grade-Levels:	**Target Student Subgroups**
Target AHSGE Areas: ☐ Reading ☐ Mathematics ☐ Science ☐ Social Studies ☐ Language	**Target Content Areas:** ☐ Reading ☐ Mathematics ☐ Science ☐ Other
Additional Academic Indicators	

COURSE OF STUDY	REFORM STRATEGIES	BENCHMARKS	INTERVENTIONS	RESOURCES
Which course of study standards, ahsge standards/objectives, eligible content, or wida standards are linked to each strategy?	WHAT RESEARCH-BASED STRATEGIES/ACTION WILL BE USED TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE?	HOW WILL PROGRESS FOR EACH ACTION STEP BE MEASURED?	HOW WILL THE SCHOOL PROVIDE TIMELY ASSISTANCE IF STRATEGIES DO NOT CHANGE PERFORMANCE?	WHAT RESOURCES AND SPECIFIC EXPENDITURES WILL BE NEEEDED FOR SUCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION?
	STRATEGY: ACTION STEP:			
	STRATEGY: ACTION STEP:			

DRAFT

GOAL TO ADDRESS ANNUAL MEASURABLE ACHIEVEMENT OBJECTIVES AND ENGLISH PROFICIENCY NEEDS

PART III - Refer to the ELL Data Compilation as part of the needs assessment in forming goals. If any ELL student did not make AMAOs complete this page.

English Proficiency Goal (Should address identified weaknesses and gaps):
Data results on which goal(s) is (are) based:

Target Grade-Levels:
Target ELP Language Domain(s):
☐ **Reading** ☐ **Writing** ☐ **Listening** ☐ **Speaking** ☐ **Comprehension** ☐ **Other**
Additional Academic Indicators

COURSE OF STUDY	REFORM STRATEGIES	BENCHMARKS	INTERVENTIONS	RESOURCES
WHICH COURSE OF STUDY STANDARDS, AHSGE STANDARDS/OBJECTIVES, ELIGIBLE CONTENT, OR WIDA STANDARDS ARE LINKED TO EACH STRATEGY?	WHAT RESEARCH-BASED STRATEGIES/ACTION WILL BE USED TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE?	HOW WILL PROGRESS FOR EACH ACTION STEP BE MEASURED?	HOW WILL THE SCHOOL PROVIDE TIMELY ASSISTANCE IF STRATEGIES DO NOT CHANGE PERFORMANCE?	WHAT RESOURCES AND SPECIFIC EXPENDITURES WILL BE NEEEDED FOR SUCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION?
	STRATEGY:			
	ACTION STEP:			
	STRATEGY:			
	ACTION STEP:			

STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS SCHOOL SAFETY, CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT, DISCIPLINE, AND BUILDING SUPPORTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

PART IV - Strategies developed to address improving school safety, classroom management/discipline, and building supportive learning environments should be related to the weaknesses or program gaps identified in the data summary (e.g., parental/community involvement, teacher collaboration, student/teacher motivation). The LEA and school must develop a timeline for multiple reviews of continuous improvement efforts.

COURSE OF STUDY	REFORM STRATEGIES	BENCHMARKS	INTERVENTIONS	RESOURCES
WHICH COURSE OF STUDY STANDARDS, AHSGE STANDARDS/OBJECTIVES, ELIGIBLE CONTENT, OR WIDA STANDARDS ARE LINKED TO EACH STRATEGY?	**WHAT RESEARCH-BASED STRATEGIES/ACTION WILL BE USED TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE?**	**HOW WILL PROGRESS FOR EACH ACTION STEP BE MEASURED?**	**HOW WILL THE SCHOOL PROVIDE TIMELY ASSISTANCE IF STRATEGIES DO NOT CHANGE PERFORMANCE?**	**WHAT RESOURCES AND SPECIFIC EXPENDITURES WILL BE NEEEDED FOR SUCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION?**
	STRATEGY:			
	ACTION STEP:			
	STRATEGY:			
	ACTION STEP:			
	STRATEGY:			
	ACTION STEP:			

APPENDIX B

Scoring Rubric for School Improvement Grant Application for Local Education Agencies

LEA Application Criteria

Section	*Exceptional (7-9)*	*Adequate (4-6)*	*Inadequate (1-3)*	*PTS. Assigned*
School Improvement Grants (SIG) 1003(g) LEA Application Cover Page	Required signatures are included.		Required signatures are not included.	
A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED (LEA APP)				
An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant. Please identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school and the intervention model that will be used in each school with a School Improvement Grant.	The tiers for all schools listed are identified and an intervention is specified for all Tier I and Tier II schools consistent with the final grant requirements		Tiers and/or Interventions are not specified consistent with the final grant requirements	
B-1 COMMITMENT AND CAPACITY				
Please indicate the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in this application to implement fully and effectively the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.	There is exceptional evidence provided of district commitment to assist the school to fully implement the proposal. The administering, implementing, and monitoring the 1003(G) grant is described in a plan that: a) Thoroughly specifies district support and technical assistance that will be available to the school. b) Identifies all district staff responsible for providing support and technical assistance c) Lists staff by job titles, as individuals, or as groups as	There is adequate evidence provided of district commitment to assist the school to fully implement the proposal. The administering, implementing, and monitoring the 1003(G) grant is described in a plan that: a) Adequately specifies district support and technical assistance that will be available to the school. b) Identifies all district staff responsible for providing support and technical assistance c) Lists staff by job titles, as individuals, or as groups as	There is thorough evidence provided of district commitment to assist the school to fully implement the proposal. The administering, implementing, and monitoring the 1003(G) grant is described in a plan that: a) Inadequately specifies district support and technical assistance that will be available to the school. b) Identifies all district staff responsible for providing support and technical assistance c) Lists staff by job titles, as individuals, or as groups as	

	appropriate (e.g. Language Arts Supervisor, Math Coach, Federal Programs Director, Supervisor of Instruction etc.). d) Thoroughly describes and explains the coordination of 1003(g) grant funds and activities with all other school improvement efforts in the district.	appropriate (e.g. Language Arts Supervisor, Math Coach, Federal Programs Director, Supervisor of Instruction etc.). d) Adequately describes and explains the coordination of 1003(g) grant funds and activities with all other school improvement efforts in the district.	appropriate (e.g. Language Arts Supervisor, Math Coach, Federal Programs Director, Supervisor of Instruction etc.). d) Inadequately describes and explains the coordination of 1003(g) grant funds and activities with all other school improvement efforts in the district.	
B-2 LACK OF CAPACITY TO SERVE				
*If the LEA is **NOT** applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.*	a) There is exceptional evidence of the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process to assess the lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process to assess the lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the LEA's lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process to assess the lack of capacity to serve each Tier I and Tier II school does not meet the identified needs.	
C-1 DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING INTERVENTIONS				

Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. (May be an SDE recommended model.)	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive plan designed to meet the needs identified and to implement, with fidelity, the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA plan for its design to meet the needs identified and to implement, with fidelity, of the selected model.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities are addressed or inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements for designing and implementing the selected model, interventions, and school improvement activities and does not meet the needs identified.	
C-2 SELECTION OF PROVIDERS				
Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality. ***(If the Transformation (State Model) intervention has been selected for all TIER I and TIER II schools, this page is omitted.)***	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for recruiting, screening and selecting an external provider are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for recruiting, screening, and selecting an external provider does not	

			meet the identified needs.	
C-3 ALIGNMENT OF RESOURCES				
Align other resources with interventions.	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities does not meet the identified needs.	
C-4 MODIFICATION OF PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES				
Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. ***(e.g. schedules, calendars, number of PD days provided)***	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school	

	improvement activities are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	improvement activities are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities to meet the needs identified.	improvement activities are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for modifying practices and policies to enable full and effective implementation of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities does not meet the identified needs.	
C-5 SUSTAINABILITY OF REFORMS				
Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends does not meet the identified needs.	
D. IDENTIFICATION OF STAKEHOLDERS				

As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its TIER I, TIER II and Tier III schools.	a) There is exceptional evidence of a process for identifying stakeholders b) All of the decisive factors regarding the process for identifying stakeholders are addressed and thoroughly explained. c) The LEA includes a comprehensive process for identifying stakeholders to meet the needs identified.	a) There is adequate evidence of a process for identifying stakeholders. b) Most of the decisive factors regarding the process for identifying stakeholders are addressed and adequately explained. c) Minor changes are needed to the LEA process for identifying stakeholders to meet the needs identified.	a) There is inadequate evidence of a process for identifying stakeholders. b) Some or none of the decisive factors regarding the process for identifying stakeholders are addressed and inadequately explained. c) The plan is not consistent with the final requirements and the process for identifying stakeholders does not meet the identified needs.	
E. 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.	Required signatures are included.		Required signatures are not included.	

APPENDIX C

Scoring Rubric for School Improvement Grant Application for Local Education Agencies

School Application Criteria

Section	*Exceptional (7-9)*	*Adequate (4-6)*	*Inadequate (1-3)*	*PTS. Assigned*
School Improvement Grants (SIG) 1003(g) LEA Application Cover Page	School information is complete.		School information is not complete	
A. IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOL NEEDS				
For each Tier I and Tier II school, please identify the needs and the selected intervention for each school. Needs should be identified using the Continuous Improvement Grant (SIG) Needs Assessment Form. (See Appendix A)	a) The demographics of the district are addressed and thoroughly explained. b) The district's AYP status is provided along with a thorough description of the data by subgroup where the district did not meet state and federal AYP benchmarks. c) The schools for which funding is being requested are identified and the schools are prioritized according to needs of each school and the school's capacity to implement the selected models, intervention and/or school improvement activities and move out of improvement status. d) There is exceptional evidence provided of district effort to identify root causes and commitment to assist the schools) to fully implement the proposal to address the causes.	a) The demographics of the district are addressed and adequately explained. b) The district's AYP status is provided along with an adequate description of the data by subgroup where the district did not meet state and federal AYP benchmarks. c) The schools for which funding is being requested are identified and the schools are prioritized according to needs of each school and the school's capacity to implement the selected models, intervention and/or school improvement activities and move out of improvement status. d) There is adequate evidence provided of district effort to identify root causes and commitment to assist the schools) to fully implement the proposal to address the causes.	a) The demographics of the district are addressed and inadequately explained. b) The district's AYP status is provided along with an inadequate description of the data by subgroup where the district did not meet state and federal AYP benchmarks. c) The schools for which funding is being requested are identified and the schools are prioritized according to needs of each school and the school's capacity to implement the selected models, intervention and/or school improvement activities and move out of improvement status. d) There is inadequate evidence provided of district effort to identify root causes and commitment to assist the schools) to fully implement the proposal to address the causes.	

	e) The administering, implementing, and monitoring of the 1003(G) grant is thoroughly described in a plan that: specifies all district and other resources targeted for school improvement i.e., local school improvement funds/initiatives, equity projects, remediation, etc.) that will supplement these grant funds.	e) The administering, implementing, and monitoring of the 1003(G) grant is adequately described in a plan that: specifies all district and other resources targeted for school improvement i.e., local school improvement funds/initiatives, equity projects, remediation, etc.) that will supplement these grant funds.	e) The administering, implementing, and monitoring of the 1003(G) grant is inadequately described in a plan that: specifies all district and other resources targeted for school improvement i.e., local school improvement funds/initiatives, equity projects, remediation, etc.) that will supplement these grant funds.	
B. ALIGNMENT OF RESOURCES FOR SCHOOLS				
Align other resources with interventions.	There is exceptional evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.	There is adequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.	There is inadequate evidence of a process for aligning resources with the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.	
C. SUSTAINABILITY MATRIX FOR SCHOOLS				
Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.	d) There is exceptional evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.	d) There is adequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.	d) There is inadequate evidence of a process for sustaining reforms after the funding period ends.	
D-P. PLANNING TIMELINE				

Planning *The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to* ***plan*** *and implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in Part A of the application:*	a) The plan includes a thoroughly detailed timeline that provides: • All dates for professional development/training sessions. • All dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) The timeline thoroughly presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	a) The plan includes an adequately detailed timeline that provides: • Most dates for professional development/training sessions. • Most dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) The timeline adequately presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	a) The plan includes an inadequately detailed timeline that provides: • Some or none of the dates for professional development/training sessions. • Some or none of the dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) The timeline somewhat presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	
D-1. YEAR ONE TIMELINE				

Year 1 *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 identified in Part A of the application:*	a) The plan includes a thoroughly detailed timeline that provides: • All dates for professional development/training sessions. • All dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • All dates for progress monitoring activities. • All dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • All dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for the year two application is thoroughly explained. The timeline clearly presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	a) The plan includes an adequately detailed timeline that provides: • Most dates for professional development/training sessions. • Most dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Most dates for progress monitoring activities. • Most dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Most dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for year two applications is adequately explained. The timeline adequately presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	a) The plan includes a detailed timeline that provides: • Some or none of the dates for professional development/training sessions. • Some or none of the dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Some or none of the dates for progress monitoring activities. • Some or none of the dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Some or none of the dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for year two applications is inadequately explained. The timeline somewhat presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	
D-2. YEAR TWO TIMELINE				
Year 2 *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 identified*	a) The plan includes a thoroughly detailed timeline that provides: • All dates for professional development/training sessions.	a) The plan includes an adequately detailed timeline that provides: • Most dates for professional development/training sessions.	a) The plan includes an inadequately detailed timeline that provides: • Some or none of the dates for professional development/training	

in Part A of the application:	• All dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • All dates for progress monitoring activities. • All dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • All dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for the year three application is thoroughly explained. The timeline clearly presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	• Most dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Most dates for progress monitoring activities. • Most dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Most dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for year three applications is adequately explained. The timeline adequately presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	sessions. • Some or none of the dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Some or none of the dates for progress monitoring activities. • Some or none of the dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Some or none of the dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for year three applications is somewhat explained or not explained at all. The timeline somewhat presents a cohesive approach to school improvement that leverages funds to provide the greatest service to students.	
D-3. YEAR THREE TIMELINE				

Year 3 *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 identified in Part A of the application:*	a) The plan includes a thoroughly detailed timeline that provides: • All dates for professional development/training sessions. • All dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • All dates for progress monitoring activities. • All dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • All dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for future improvement efforts is thoroughly explained.	a) The plan includes an adequately detailed timeline that provides: • Most dates for professional development/training sessions. • Most dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Most dates for progress monitoring activities. • Most dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Most dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for future improvement efforts is adequately explained.	a) The plan includes a detailed timeline that provides: • Some or none of the dates for professional development/training sessions. • Some or none of the dates for the implementation of all strategies/activities. • Some or none of the dates for progress monitoring activities. • Some or none of the dates for end of the year assessments/data sessions. • Some or none of the dates for sharing information with stakeholders. b) Planning of how assessment results will be used for future improvement efforts is somewhat explained or not explained at all.	
E-1. ANNUAL GOALS				
The LEA must describe its 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 Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.	There is a thorough description of the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics, including measurable and rigorous targets to monitor the progress of Tier I and Tier II schools.	There is an adequate description of the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics, including measurable and rigorous targets to monitor the progress of Tier I and Tier II schools.	There is an inadequate description or no description of the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics including measurable and rigorous targets to monitor the progress of Tier I and Tier II schools.	

E-2. LEADING INDICATORS: LEA INFORMATIVE DATA				
Leading Indicators: LEA Academic Informative Data *The LEA must include metrics that constitute the leading indicators for the SIG programs:*	*LEA Academic Informative Data* table is thoroughly complete for each school	*LEA Academic Informative Data* table is adequately complete for each school	*LEA Academic Informative Data* table is somewhat or not complete for each school.	
E-2. LEADING INDICATORS: LEA STATE ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION RATES				
(c) *Leading Indicators: LEA State Assessment Participation Rates*	*LEA State Assessment Participation Rates* table is thoroughly complete for each school.	*LEA State Assessment Participation Rates* table is adequately complete for each school.	*LEA State Assessment Participation Rates* table is somewhat or not complete for each school.	
F. SIG 1003(g) BUDGET				
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.	(a) The LEA budget is between $50,000 - $2,000,000, of which funds requested are of sufficient size and are thoroughly aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities; (b) There is exceptional documentation from the intervention provider on appropriate letter head, detailing cost-analysis regarding the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.	a) The LEA budget is between $50,000 - $2,000,000, of which funds requested are of sufficient size and are adequately aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities; b) There is adequate documentation from the intervention provider on appropriate letter head, detailing cost-analysis regarding the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.	a) The LEA budget is not between $50,000 - $2,000,000, and funds requested are inadequately aligned with needs of the school to support the implementation of the selected model, interventions and/or school improvement activities; b) There is inadequate documentation from the intervention provider regarding the cost-analysis of the selected model, interventions, and/or school improvement activities.	

APPENDIX D

1003(G) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT LEA APPLICATION CHECKLIST

(To Be Used by LEA to assure all required components are completed)

School Name: _____ **School System:** _____

Date Received: _____ **Initialed By:** _____

DRAFT

LEA APPLICATION COMPONENTS	
LEA APPLICATION COVER	
☐	Required signatures
A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED	
☐	Selection of identified schools
☐	Identification of intervention model
B-1. COMMITMENT AND CAPACITY	
☐	Identification of needs (SIG Needs Assessment Form)
☐	Identification of selected intervention
☐	Evidence of capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources/related support to identified schools
B-2. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: LACK OF CAPACITY TO SERVE	

☐	Attached explanation of lack of capacity to serve each Tier I school
C-1. DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING INTERVENTIONS	
☐	Identification of model and model requirements
☐	Comprehensive plan included detailing design/implementation of interventions
C-2. SELECTION OF PROVIDERS	
☐	**Selection of external provider (include contract)** ***(NOTE: Maybe omitted if state model is chosen)***
C-3. ALIGNMENT RESOURCES	
☐	Alignment of other resources with interventions
C-4. MODIFICATION OF PRACTICES AND POLICIES	
☐	Inclusion of description of modified practices and policies (if necessary)
☐	Modification results
C-5. SUSTAINABILITY OF REFORMS	
☐	Summary of sustainability of reform when funding period ends
D. STAKEHOLDERS	
☐	Description of collaborative planning process utilized in the development of the proposal
E. WAIVERS	

☐	Waiver box checked for each applicable waiver request
☐	Evidence of consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of SIG models
SCHOOL APPLICATION	
SCHOOL APPLICATION COVER	
☐	Completed information
A. IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOL NEEDS	
☐	
B. ALIGNMENT OF RESOURCES MATRIX FOR SCHOOLS	
☐	Identification of specific services and activities to be implemented in Tier III schools
C. SUSTAINABILITY MATRIX FOR SCHOOLS	
☐	Identification of specific services and activities to be implemented in Tier III schools
D-P through D-3. PLANNING AND YEARLY TIMELINES	
☐	Detailed timeline for planning and implementation of interventions (D-P)
☐	Detailed timeline for year one implementation in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools (D-1)
☐	Detailed timeline for year one implementation in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools (D-2)
☐	Detailed steps for implementation in Tier I and Tier II schools (D-3)
E-1. LEA ANNUAL GOALS	

☐	Description of annual goals for student achievement on state assessments in the areas of reading, language arts, and mathematics
☐	Measureable and rigorous targets to monitor Tier 1 & Tier II schools' progress
E-2. LEA INFORMATIVE DATA	
☐	Inclusion of LEA Academic Informative Data Table
E-3. LEA STATE ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION RATES	
☐	Inclusion of LEA Stat Assessment Participation Rate Table
F. APPLICATION BUDGET	
☐	All expenditures for all schools for YEAR ONE are provided
☐	Fully developed varrative describes anticipated use of funds for years two and three