

**APPLICATION COVER SHEET**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS**

<p>Legal Name of Applicant:</p> <p><b>Arizona Department of Education</b></p>		<p>Applicant's Mailing Address:</p> <p>1535 W. Jefferson St. Phoenix, AZ 85007</p>
---	---	--

State Contact for the School Improvement Grant

Name: Angela Denning

Position and Office: Deputy Associate Superintendent of School Improvement and Intervention; School Effectiveness Division

Contact's Mailing Address:

1535 W. Jefferson St., Bin #10  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Telephone: 602.364.2281

Fax: 602.364.2334

Email address: [Angela.Denning@azed.gov](mailto:Angela.Denning@azed.gov)

<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Tom Horne</p>	<p>Telephone: 602.542.5460</p>
---	------------------------------------

<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p>X </p>	<p>Date: 2/16/10 <b>Revised 3/17/2010</b></p>
--	---

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

**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.

Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA’s definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition.

<u>LEA NAME, NCES ID #</u>						
SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE <sup>1</sup>

- See attached Excel Spreadsheet (Appendix A) for List of Arizona’s Tier I, Tier II & Tier III Schools

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.

**Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools**

**Tier I.** Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is:

1. Among the lowest-achieving 5 percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring

**OR**

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

2. Is a high school that has not had a graduation rate of 60 percent or greater in any of the past three years.

**Tier II.** Any high school that is eligible for but did not receive Title I funds that is (High schools are defined as schools serving grades 9-12):

1. Among the lowest-achieving 5 percent of high schools

**OR**

2. Has not had a graduation rate of 60 percent or greater in any of the past three years.

High schools are defined as schools serving grades 9-12.

Academic achievement is measured by performance on Arizona's standards-based test, the AIMS.

Graduation rates are measured using a four-year, adjusted cohort graduation rate. Cohort years 2006, 2007, and 2008 were used in the determination.

**Determining the lowest-achieving 5 percent.** Arizona ranked schools using the Single Percentage Method defined in federal guidance using current year test results (p5). This ranked schools by the percentage of students scoring proficient on the AIMS. Arizona also ranked schools by lack of progress. Lack of progress was measured as the average annual change in the percentage of students scoring Arizona Department of Education March 2010 proficient on AIMS over the past three years. A school's final ranking was determined by averaging the two ranks, giving each rank equal weight, using the following formula:

$$\text{Final Rank} = \frac{\text{Rank Percent Proficient} + \text{Rank Lack of Progress}}{2}$$

**Exceptions:** Schools identified as credit recovery were not included on the list. To be identified as credit recovery, a school had to have met the state Board's definition of an alternative school, and to have identified itself through its publicly posted mission statement on its school report card as a credit recovery school.

**Link to "PLA" Definition on Arizona Department of Education's Website:**

<http://www.ade.az.gov/azlearns/aypdeterminations.asp>

## Alignment of SIG Requirements between SEA and LEA Applications

See Appendix B for LEA Application

Section of SEA Application that addresses requirements of LEA		Section of LEA Application Item is Addressed	Evaluation Tool
<i>SEA Section</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>LEA Section</i>	
B. Part 1.1	Needs Analysis of Tier I and Tier II Schools	A (Analysis) and C (Root Causes)	Rubric A, C & D
B. Part 1.2	LEA demonstrates capacity to use funds <b>(NOTE: The questions on the LEA Application do not have a 1-to-1 correlation with the rubric-the SII Team will address the items in the rubric by reviewing information contained in the LEA's responses to all items in B.1)</b>	B.1a and B.1b	Rubric B.1a
B. Part 1.3	LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement selected model	F	Rubric F
B. Part 2 (1-4)	Actions LEAs will most likely take after receiving a School Improvement Grant	B.1b	Rubric B.1b & E
B. Part 2 (5)	Sustaining reforms	G	Rubric G

See Appendix C for complete Evaluation Tool

<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.</b>		
AREA	Total Points Possible	Minimum Points Needed for Approval
<b>A – Analysis of School Needs</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>B.1a – Analysis of LEA Capacity</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>B.1b – Analysis of LEA Commitment</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>C – Root Causes</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>D – School's to Be Served</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>E – LEA's Accountability</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>F – Budget</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>G – Sustainability</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

**LEA applications must meet the minimum points for each area for approval. In addition, applications must score in the Fully Addressed or Partially Addressed indicators to be approved. Applications that meet the minimum points but receive a rubric score in Not Addressed, specifically in LEA Capacity, will not be approved.**

**Rubric points to be assigned for each component of the LEA application during the review process:**

**Fully Addressed**  
 5 – All items addressed  
 4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed

**Partially Addressed**

3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness

2 – Missing a number of components

**Not Addressed**

1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue

0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan

**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/or Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.**

*Evaluation Criteria*

*The SEA will review the LEA’s responses to questions in Sections A, C and D of the LEA application to determine the degree and level the LEA analyzed the needs of their schools and selected the best intervention for these schools using the following Rubrics:*

- Rubric A – *LEA’s Analysis of School Needs* - addresses A.1-A.3 of the LEA Application
  - Minimum Rubric Score for consideration is 27 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.
- Rubric C – *Root Causes* - addresses C.1-C.4 of the LEA Application
  - Minimum Rubric Score for consideration is 36 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.
- Rubric D – *Schools to Be Served* – addresses D.1-D.3 of the LEA Application
  - Minimum Rubric Score for consideration is 12 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.

**Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:**

**5 – All items addressed**

**4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed**

**3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness**

**2 – Missing a number of components**

**1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue**

**0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan**

**(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.**

*Evaluation Criteria*

*The SEA will review the LEA’s responses to the capacity matrix indicators to determine the LEA*

*capacity to implement one of the four intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools using the following Rubrics:*

- Rubric B.1 – *Evaluation of LEA Capacity* - addresses B.1a of the LEA Application
  - Minimum score for consideration is 76 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.
  - The matrix responses on the LEA Application do not have a 1-to-1 correlation with the rubric-the SI Team will address the items in the rubric by reviewing information contained in the LEA’s responses to all items in B.1

**Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:**

**5 – All items addressed**

**4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed**

**3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness**

**2 – Missing a number of components**

**1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue**

**0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan**

- (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).**

#### *Evaluation Criteria*

*The SEA will review the LEA’s budget proposal, section F of the LEA application, to determine the level and degree that the LEA budget sufficiently funds the necessary components to implement the chosen intervention model and support the continued improvement efforts in specified schools using the following Rubrics:*

- Rubric F – *Analysis of Budget* – addresses Section F of the LEA Application
  - Minimum score for consideration is 18 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.

**Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:**

**5 – All items addressed**

**4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed**

**3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness**

**2 – Missing a number of components**

**1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue**

**0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan**

#### **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:**

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.**

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

**(3) Align other resources with the interventions.**

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

***Evaluation Criteria***

***The SEA will review the LEA's responses to determine the level and degree of LEA commitment to implement one of the four intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools using the following Rubrics:***

- **Rubric B.2 – *LEA Commitment*** - addresses B.1b of the LEA Application
  - Minimum score for consideration is 32 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.
- **Rubric E – *LEA's Accountability*** – addresses E.1-E.4 of the LEA Application
  - Minimum score for consideration is 32 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.

**Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:**

**5 – All items addressed**

**4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed**

**3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness**

**2 – Missing a number of components**

**1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue**

**0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan**

**(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.**

***Evaluation Criteria***

***The SEA will review LEA's Sustainability Plan, section G, to determine quality and viability of the long range plan to sustain continue improvement efforts after the funding period ends using the following Rubrics***

- **Rubric G – *Sustainability Plans*** – addresses Section G of the LEA Application
  - Minimum score for consideration is 10 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.

**Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:**

**5 – All items addressed**

**4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed**

**3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness**

**2 – Missing a number of components**

**1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue**

**0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan**

**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.**

**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.**

LEA capacity will be determined through the analysis of responses to the capacity matrix using the Scoring Rubrics. LEAs demonstration of capacity will be assessed in the five areas for the Arizona Standards and Rubric for District and School Improvement; LEA and School Leadership, Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development, Assessment, Culture, Climate, and Communication and Resource Management. The LEA's rubric score in Capacity and Commitment will determine whether an LEA demonstrates the capacity to implement the School Improvement Grant in their Tier I or Tier II school(s). LEAs responses must achieve a rubric score of at least 54 for Capacity and 32 for Commitment to be considered having the capacity to implement. The rubric scores represent the LEAs work and efforts to demonstrate their capacity to fully and completely implement an intervention model and support the continuous improvement work in Tier III schools

To determine the validity of an LEA's claim that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I and Tier II school(s), the Arizona Department of Education will utilize the following actions:

1. Review the LEA Application. Specifically LEA responses to the individual indicators in the capacity matrix, synthesizing the strengths and weakness. Review the LEA responses demonstrating commitment, synthesizing the actions that have already taken place and those that are planned. Review the Standards and Rubrics for School/District Improvement Self Assessment to identify foundational indicators that are in the approaches or falls far below category.
2. Reference the evaluation tool completed for Part B – *B.1a-Analysis of LEA's Capacity*
3. Meet with the LEA Team together and individually to gather information on the perception of capacity
4. Arizona Department of Education's School Improvement and Intervention team will conduct on-site visits of Tier I and/or Tier II schools in that LEA

If the Arizona Department of Education agrees that the LEA does not have the capacity at this time, the ADE will work with the LEA team, incorporating findings from above and will develop an Action Plan for building their capacity. The capacity issue will be reviewed when the 2010 SIG Grant becomes available.

If the Arizona Department of Education disagrees with the LEA determination that it lacks capacity, the

ADE will:

1. Convene a meeting with the LEA Team and provide evidence that the LEA has capacity and determine then if it is a “commitment” issue
2. Outline the LEA capacity identified in the evidence. Create an action plan for the LEA to implement the chosen intervention model in Tier I and/or Tier II school(s).
3. Provide technical assistance to address the issues that are most interfering with the LEA’s moving forward with the grant application
4. Provide information on additional resources and external providers that would support the LEA
5. In addition, the Arizona Department of Education may convene a community forum to seek input from stakeholders

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

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

Approval of LEA’s applications for their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools will be accomplished in three steps: (The first two weeks after the application period ends will be focused on the Tier I and Tier II schools. After completing the review and approval of Tier I and Tier II, School Improvement and Intervention (SII) staff will review the applications for Tier III.). The School Improvement and Intervention (SII) Review teams will consist of three ADE Educational Program Specialists. Members of the review team will initially score independently, and then convene in small groups to collectively reach consensus on scores.

- a) **Step One:** upon receiving an LEA’s Application, the SII Review Teams will apply the scoring rubric detailed in Appendix D. The rubric offers quality insight into the criteria that will be used to assess the applications. Review team members will review each application and provide a score for each section based on the rubrics A through G. If the application does not reach the minimum number of points required to move to Step 2, an Education Program Specialist will contact the district and assist with modifying the weaker areas. If the application achieves the necessary points, that LEA will move to Step Two.
- b) **Step Two:** using the online Arizona LEA Tracker (ALEAT) tool, the LEA creates a detailed action plan that includes goals, action steps, tasks, timeline, person responsible and budget allocation using the application components. Their completed action plan will be reviewed for alignment with their goals and actions outlined in the application.
  - The LEAs will use the ADE’s online *Tracker* system, ALEAT to submit their plan for implementing the selected Improvement Model. ALEAT is an online tool to monitor the implementation and evaluate the effectiveness of a district and/or school Improvement

Plan. ALEAT allows ADE to post support materials to provide guidance and assistance to LEAs to organize the information for planning, monitoring, and reporting. Once the plan is entered and approved, school, district and SEA staff can view the plan, and monitor progress of activities as well as report progress and outcomes. Currently, ADE is using *ALEAT* for LEA monitoring of federal and state programs and improvement planning. The SIG Goals and plans for individual schools will be incorporated into this same system, thus maintaining a consistent system for planning, monitoring implementation and reporting.

If there are discrepancies between Action Plan on ALEAT and the SIG Application, the LEA will be contacted by their Education Program Specialist. If there is alignment the LEA's application will be considered approved and complete. Award Letters will be sent to LEAs.

- c) **Step Three:** once the LEA receives the grant Award Letter, the LEA places the detailed budget sheet on to the ADE's Grant Management System. Once the budget information is placed on to the Grants Management System, it will be reviewed for alignment with the ALEAT budget and the action plan.

Any grant proposal that does not meet the minimum threshold, as determined through each review process, will be returned to the LEA with specific suggestions for improvement. At each step in the process, staff of the School Improvement Section will be available to support LEA Teams as they work through the application process through on-site visits, informational sessions and conference calls.

***Revised TIMELINE***

<b><i>Action</i></b>	<b><i>Date</i></b>	<b><i>Purpose/Rationale</i></b>
Conference calls to all superintendents of LEAs with schools in Tier I and Tier II	February 3-4, 2010	To inform them of the school or schools in Tier I and/or Tier II status prior to the information going public and to let them know of the Feb. 11 meeting
Initial overview Workshop with Leadership Teams from all LEAs with a Tier I and/or Tier II school	February 11, 2010	To set the stage for the upcoming grant application and identify steps needed to be taken prior to application release
Provide a 2-day Data Summit for LEAs with Tier I and/or Tier II schools (inviting Tier III LEAs as space permits)	March 22-23, 2010	ADE will facilitate a process that LEA teams can use to complete and in depth analysis of their current level of performance
Release SIG LEA Application*	March 29, 2010	This is the expected timeframe for approval of the SEA Application
SIG LEA Applications Due*	May 14, 2010	ADE wants to provide enough time for teams to address the items in the application, leaving time for approval and accessing funds in early

		summer
ADE SII Unit Review of LEA Tier I and Tier II Applications*	May 14 – May 28, 2010	Small teams will review and evaluate each Tier I and Tier II application
Tier I and Tier II LEAs will have access to funds*	June, 2010	LEAs will complete budget sheet on Grants Management
ADE SII Unit Review Tier III Applications*	May 17 – June 11, 2010	Small teams will review and evaluate each Tier III Application
Tier III LEAs will have access to funds*	July 1, 2010	LEAs will complete budget sheet on Grants Management
LEAs and Schools implement chosen intervention model(s) and improvement plans	2010-2011 school year	

\*Actual date dependent on SEA Application approval at the Federal Level

**(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.**

The Arizona Department of Education’s School Improvement Section will employ a two-part process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for each of its Tier I and/or Tier II schools. The first part will be focused on those items that can be monitored and reviewed throughout the year (a,b) and the second part will be looking at change from year to year (c,d). The combination of this data will be reviewed to address renewal (e,f).

The Arizona Department of Education will review, on a quarterly basis, the LEA’s goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools using progress monitoring tools outlined by the LEA in its application. LEA will submit a quarterly report detailing the progress towards goals and implementation progress. Site visits will be conducted by School Improvement Education Program Specialists using an implementation checklist based on the Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement.

- a) The Arizona Department of Education will monitor goals, timelines and implementation of activities and strategies reported by the LEA on its Implementation Plan for Tier I and Tier II schools using ALEAT and site visits on a monthly basis.

The ALEAT Plan includes descriptions of the Goals and Strategies, detailed Action Steps (start and end dates, person(s) responsible, specified budget allocations and expenditures), and related Tasks with due dates and assignments. The ADE will review and approve these plans online, and make

comments back to the LEA about each item in the plan. Comments appear within the plan at the point of origin, and may also be emailed from *ALEAT* to the persons responsible for that section of the Plan. ADE will provide templates and guidance documents to the LEAs, attached within their online Plan, and may view documents uploaded by the LEAs. As the LEA implements their plan, they record their progress in *ALEAT* by providing status updates of Tasks and Action Steps, recording actual expenditures in their budgets, and uploading documentation related to activities and events to the file cabinet. The Plan Overview page shows the Status of each Goal, Strategy, and Action Step, including when it was last updated and by whom. Action Steps may be "tagged" with one or more designation set by ADE (e.g. SIG, PD, ELL, Parent) and the Plan View may be filtered by a Tag, and/or by a Funding Source, and/or by the Status of Action Steps (Not Begun, In Progress, Completed). The filters provide a view of just those selected features in the Plan, so Reviewer(s) may quickly assess all of the SIG-related Action Steps and see the progress that has been made on each one. An Implementation report is also available, which presents a chart view of each Action Step, its current Status, and the history of Progress updates with related comments. Certain documentation can be uploaded to a particular Strategy or Action Step, showing the implementation process and the impact on student achievement.

- b) The Arizona Department of Education will review the LEAs annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools by evaluating essential data to include, but not limited to, student achievement and leading indicators (Baseline data on the following indicators will be collected as part of the LEA's initial SIG Application Process:
- Teacher attendance rate
  - Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g. AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes (High School)
  - Number of minutes within the school year
  - Average scale scores on AIMS (Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards) assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade for the "all students" group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup
  - AYP status
  - Which AYP targets the school met and missed
  - School improvement status
  - Percentage of students that perform at the "meets" or "exceeds" level on the AIMS reading and math portions
  - Student participation rate on AIMS
  - Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency
  - Graduation rate (High School)
  - Dropout rate (High School)
  - Student attendance rate
  - College enrollment rates (High School)
  - Discipline incidents
  - Truants
  - Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system
- c) Every school and district in improvement needs to complete the corresponding *Arizona's Standards and Rubrics for District/School Improvement* self assessment and the results for each district with a Tier I and/or Tier II school, plus a self assessment for each of the Tier I and Tier II schools will be reviewed to identify progress made.
- d) The Arizona Department of Education will determine whether or not 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 goals and making progress on the achievement and leading indicators (identified above) in

addition to the review of the self assessment using the *Standards and Rubrics for District/School Improvement*. If substantial progress has not been made, the SEA will meet with the LEA team to review the data, progress reported on the Implementation Plan as documented in ALEAT, progress on the leading indicators (identified above) and other relative data that would aid the SEA in identifying specifically in which areas significant progress was not made in order to assist the LEA in prioritizing critical areas for improvement.

- e) The LEA must revise their School Improvement Grant and Implementation Plan to meet these priorities and resubmit their application to the SEA. The School Improvement Grant and Implementation Plan will be reviewed by the SEA to determine viability and LEA capacity to implement the revised plans. If the revised application is approved, the SEA will renew the LEA's School Improvement Grant.

**(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 Arizona Department of Education's School Improvement and Intervention Section will employ a two-part process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for each of its Tier III schools. The first part will be focused on those items that can be monitored and reviewed throughout the year (a,b) and the second part will be looking at change from year to year (c,d). The combination of this data will be reviewed to address renewal (e,f).

- a) The Arizona Department of Education will review the LEA's goals for student achievement for its Tier III schools using progress monitoring tools outlined by the LEA in its application. The SEA will monitor goals, timelines and implementation of activities and strategies reported by the LEA on its Implementation Plan for Tier III schools on ALEAT on a quarterly basis. The ALEAT Plan includes descriptions of the Goals and Strategies, detailed Action Steps (start and end dates, person(s) responsible, specified budget allocations and expenditures), and related Tasks with due dates and assignments. The ADE will review and approve these plans online, and make comments back to the LEA about each item in the plan. Comments appear within the plan at the point of origin, and may also be emailed from ALEAT to the persons responsible for that section of the Plan. ADE will provide templates and guidance documents to the LEAs, attached within their online Plan, and may view documents uploaded by the LEAs. As the LEA implements their plan, they record their progress in ALEAT by providing status updates of Tasks and Action Steps, recording actual expenditures in their budgets, and uploading documentation related to activities and events to the file cabinet. The Plan Overview page shows the Status of each Goal, Strategy, and Action Step, including when it was last updated and by whom. Action Steps may be "tagged" with one or more designation set by ADE (e.g. SIG, PD, ELL, Parent) and the Plan View may be filtered by a Tag, and/or by a Funding Source, and/or by the Status of Action Steps (Not Begun, In Progress, Completed). The filters provide a view of just those selected features in the Plan, so Reviewer(s) may quickly assess all of the SIG-related Action Steps and see the progress that has been made on each one. An Implementation report is also available, which presents a chart view of each Action Step, its current Status, and the history of Progress updates with related comments. Certain documentation can be uploaded to a particular Strategy or Action Step, showing the implementation process and the impact on student achievement.

- b) The Arizona Department of Education will review the LEAs annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools by evaluating essential data to include, but not limited to, student achievement and leading indicators (Baseline data on the following indicators will be collected as part of the LEA’s initial SIG Application Process:
- Teacher attendance rate
  - Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g. AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes (High School)
  - Number of minutes within the school year
  - Average scale scores on AIMS (Arizona’s Instrument to Measure Standards) assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup
  - AYP status
  - Which AYP targets the school met and missed
  - School improvement status
  - Percentage of students that perform at the “meets” or “exceeds” level on the AIMS reading and math portions
  - Student participation rate on AIMS
  - Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency
  - Graduation rate (High School)
  - Dropout rate (High School)
  - Student attendance rate
  - College enrollment rates (High School)
  - Discipline incidents
  - Truants
  - Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA’s teacher evaluation system
- c) Every school and district in improvement needs to complete the corresponding *Arizona’s Standards and Rubrics for District/School Improvement* self assessment and the results for each district with a Tier I and/or Tier II school, plus a self assessment for each of the Tier I and Tier II schools will be reviewed to identify progress made.
- d) The Arizona Department of Education will determine whether or not to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting goals and making progress on the achievement and leading indicators (identified above) in addition to the review of the self assessment using the *Standards and Rubrics for District/School Improvement*. If substantial progress has not been made, the SEA will meet with the LEA team to review the data, progress reported on the Implementation Plan as documented in ALEAT, and other relevant data that would aid ADE in identifying specifically in which areas significant progress was not made in order to assist the LEA in prioritizing critical areas for improvement.
- e) The LEA must revise their School Improvement Grant and Implementation Plan to meet these priorities and resubmit their application to the SEA. The School Improvement Grant and Implementation Plan will be reviewed by the SEA to determine viability and LEA capacity to implement the revised plans. If the revised application is approved, the SEA will renew the LEA’s School Improvement Grant.

**(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 Arizona Department of Education will employ a variety of methods of continuous monitoring and annual review when monitoring the 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.

- a) This monitoring will include, but is not limited to, the following:  
**ALEAT (LEA Tracker)** will assist the Arizona Department of Education in monitoring the implementation progress for each Tier I and Tier II schools in accordance with the intervention model selected by the LEA. ADE will monitor the LEA's plan implementation using *ALEAT*, providing “real-time” information on implementation (status updates, comments, documentation provided) as well as review the SIG schools' plans and the LEA's interactions within the school plans (e.g. comments, LEA-provided documents, monitoring reports in the LEA plans.) The implementation of the school intervention model will be evident in both the LEA plan implementation and in their interaction with the progress of the school plans. In addition to the LEA plans, *ALEAT* provides individual school Improvement Plans, accessible from their LEA Overview page. The school plans are structured like the LEA plans, and schools may “pull in” specific goals from the LEA plan, then edit them to reflect school-level implementation. The User Permission structure of *ALEAT* permits School users to view their LEA's Plan and other school plans within their LEA. They may only edit their own school plan. The LEA users may view and add comments to their schools' plans, and edit their LEA plan. State Administrators may view, edit, and add comments to all plans in *ALEAT*. The LEA and the ADE will monitor the school's progress in implementing their plan just as the ADE monitors the LEA's plan. The LEA may request specific documentation or evidence be attached to the school plan elements, such as formative assessment data, or evaluations of professional development. The school may upload the documents one time, yet provide them to anyone at the LEA who needs to see them, and attach them to multiple points within the plan, as appropriate. The LEA will report on implementation according to approved timelines, strategies and activities included in the plan and documentation of progress made or outcomes. The LEA will update status reports quarterly.
- The Arizona Department of Education will provide weekly monitoring and review of plans, including use of funds, in *ALEAT* to ensure timelines are met and that adequate documentation is made by the LEA demonstrating implementation and sufficient progress. ADE will provide the LEA with ongoing feedback and guidance on documentation and implementation through weekly phone calls and/or emails. Webinars and online conferencing will be scheduled as needed.
- b) In addition, the Arizona Department of Education will employ other methods to efficiently monitor an 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 following of which are embedded in the monitoring process, but are not limited to:
- Onsite visits and observations conducted monthly and documented by School Improvement Program Specialists
  - Review of assessment and achievement data (progress monitoring data described in LEA plan) on a quarterly basis
  - Face-to-Face regional meetings of Tier I and Tier II LEA teams, facilitated by School Improvement staff, to have LEA staff share successes and roadblocks with a broader audience

building lateral capacity

- Quarterly reports on plan implementation completed by LEA
- End-of-Year Report submitted by LEA
- Annual review of leading indicators (as defined in Section 3 of the final guidance)

c) The SEA may request certain documentation from the LEA or employ more intensive support or monitoring (e.g. more frequent on-site monitoring, fiscal monitoring, etc.) as deemed necessary by the School Improvement Section staff.

**(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.**

Arizona Department of Education will prioritize funding of School Improvement Grants in the following manner:

- a) First, applications received from LEAs with schools in Tier I and Tier II will be reviewed through use of rubrics in the Evaluation of LEA Applications.
- b) LEAs with Tier I and Tier II Applications will be prioritized by:
  - applications that have a plan for all Tier I and II schools in the LEA
  - the total combined score of the 8 rubrics used in the evaluation process
  - the score for capacity and commitment to fully implement the chosen model (a strong focus on building district capacity to support all schools)
  - the score for budget – that sufficient funds were requested to fully implement the chosen model
- c) Once all applications for Tier I and Tier II have been addressed, applications from LEAs with schools in Tier III will be reviewed. Priority will be given to LEAs with Tier III schools that choose to fully implement one of two priority intervention models (Turnaround Model, Transformation Model).
- d) Once all applications for LEAs with a Tier III school(s) that have chosen to fully implement one of the priority intervention models (Turnaround Model, Transformation Model) have been approved, remaining applications from LEAs with Tier III schools that have not chosen to fully implement one of the priority intervention models will be reviewed. The SEA will determine the funding allocations depending on the schools identified priority needs and the LEA's capacity to meet those needs.

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

- a) First, as part of the application process, the LEA will prioritize their Tier III schools and provide their rationale for this order. The rationale needs to be data-driven.
- b) Arizona Department of Education will compare the LEAs prioritized list of Tier III schools against the same criteria the SEA used in identifying Tier I and II schools and the ranking list developed by our research department (percent of students below proficient on AIMS, number of years in improvement and for high school the percentage of students who graduate in four years.)
- c) LEAs with a Tier III school(s) that have chosen to fully implement one of the priority intervention models (Turnaround Model, Transformation Model)
- d) Additionally, the SEA will consider past performance of an individual Tier III school's progress in implementing their ASIP (Arizona School Improvement Plan) to determine if there has been significant change and whether or not the school has the capacity for continued improvement.

**(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.**

Due to local control, the state does not have plans to take over operation of a school, at this time. If an LEA requests a takeover, the Arizona Department of Education would contract with an EMO or a CMO to implement one of the models.

**(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.**

Arizona Department of Education does not intend to provide services directly to any schools in absence of a takeover.

The provisions in items 7 and 8 are not applicable to Arizona at this time. State law does not currently allow a direct takeover of a district school. However, it does allow for significant interventions to be imposed upon low performing schools. These consequences apply to a school if it earns a "Failing to Meet Academic Standards" label. This can occur when a school receives an "Underperforming" label for three consecutive years in the state's accountability system known as AZ LEARNS. The main performance measures are: pass rate and growth rate on the state's assessment instrument, reclassification rate of ELL students and graduation and drop-out rates (for high schools only).

A "Failing" school may be required to remove school administrators, select new curricula, hire additional personnel, and the like. Progress on these requirements will be monitored by the Intervention unit for a minimum of three years. Arizona law also allows the State Board of Education to select an outside agency to take control of a Failing school. This provision has not yet been imposed on any school within the state. All of the above flows from Arizona Revised Statute § 15-241.

The SEA is exploring the possibilities of extending this type of intervention to schools identified as persistently lowest achieving under ESEA.

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

By submitting this application, the Arizona Department of Education assures that it will do the following:

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

- ✓ 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.
- ✓ Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 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).

Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements. Not applicable, as the state is not participating in this pilot project.

- ✓ 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.
- ✓ 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.
- ✓ 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.**

Arizona Department of Education and specifically the School Improvement Section within the School Effectiveness Division has engaged in a review of our current practices with regard to supporting schools and districts in order to enhance the services we are providing. The SEA completed the State System of Support Evaluation process with the Southwest Comprehensive Center and the Center for Innovation and Improvement. Arizona had two separate groups serving schools and districts in improvement. One group focused on AZLEARNS accountability system and the other group focused on the NCLB/ESEA accountability system. Significant steps have been taken over the past year to coordinate these efforts.

Arizona has formalized processes in place for addressing the underperformance of schools identified through the AZLEARNS system. These have been established in Arizona Statute 15-241. These processes include coaches, Solutions Team visits, development of School Improvement Plans and District Plans, Turnaround Coaches, Turnaround Principals, and Comprehensive Site visits with extensive planning. The Solutions Team and Comprehensive Site visits require teams of people to travel to the school and spend 1-2 days on-site collecting data, meeting with staff, reviewing documents to determine the current conditions in the school. This involves looking at the overall systems that are in place what needs to be done to improve those systems so students can learn.

Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, Arizona provided coaches to schools in Year 1 of School Improvement under NCLB/ESEA. Arizona will continue to expand the technical assistance that it provides to its schools and districts in NCLB/ESEA improvement to include Solutions Team visits and Comprehensive Site visits as currently provided under AZLEARNS.

Beginning July 1, 2010 the School Improvement and Intervention Section will be reorganized to offer high quality service in a more effective and efficient manner. All Education Program Specialist will work with the schools in their region regardless of which accountability system brought them into school improvement status. This will require professional development for staff to insure a clear understanding of both systems. There will be an increase in the number of on-site visits to those schools and districts on the Tier I and Tier II lists. At least one additional Education Program Specialist will be hired to better support the number of schools in improvement. Webinars and other technology will be used to support ongoing communication and training in order to facilitate a high level of interaction with the schools and districts and to be able to provide them “just in time” training opportunities.

Additional support will be provided through regional meetings and a statewide school improvement conference held in conjunction with our annual Title I conference. Increased professional development opportunities will be provided to the School Improvement staff to continue to build the capacity of the state’s system of support.

**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.**

- ✓ The School Improvement and Intervention section of the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.
  1. School Improvement and Intervention (SII) team sent the first draft of the LEA application out by email to all COP members for their feedback. Members were encouraged to provide feedback.
  2. On January 29, SII Unit held an audio conference with COP members to update them on the process and solicit additional information.
  3. On February 5<sup>th</sup>, Angela Denning, Deputy Associate Superintendent, made a presentation and

provided the latest application draft at COP's monthly meeting. Members worked in small groups to provide additional feedback.

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

✓ The School Improvement and Intervention section of the Arizona Department of Education has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including:

- Parent Information Resource Center (PIRC),
- ADE's Title I Department,
- ADE's Research and Evaluation staff,
- ADE's High School Renewal staff,
- Various Race to the Top Committee members,
- Arizona RTI
- Southwest Comprehensive Center @ WestEd

**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.**

**ARIZONA** requests a waiver of the requirements it has listed below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in Arizona 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 of Arizona 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.

- ✓ 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.
- ✓ 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.

The State of Arizona 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 of Arizona 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 of Arizona 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 of Arizona 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.

LEA NCES#	District Name	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate
400234	Academy of Arizona	Academy of Arizona - Main	2024	X			
0400276	Academy with Community Pa	Academy with Community Partners	01841			X	
0400450	Agua Fria Union High School	Agua Fria High School	00001			X	
0400480	Aguila Elementary District	Aguila Elementary School	00002			X	
0400520	Ajo Unified District	Ajo High School	00003			X	
0400404	Akimel O'Otham Pee Posh Ch	Akimel O'Otham Pee Posh (3rd &	01993			X	
0400600	Alhambra Elementary District	Andalucia Middle School	00302			X	
0400600	Alhambra Elementary District	R E Simpson School	00015			X	
404770	Altar Valley Elementary Distri	Altar Valley Middle School	01005			X	
0404770	Altar Valley Elementary Distri	Robles Elementary School	02400			X	
0400353	American Charter Schools Fou	Peoria Accelerated High School	01896			X	
0400618	American Charter Schools Fou	South Pointe High School	03095			X	
0400355	American Charter Schools Fou	West Phoenix High School	01734			X	
0400680	Amphitheater Unified District	Amphitheater High School	00032			X	
0400680	Amphitheater Unified District	Amphitheater Middle School	00020			X	
0400680	Amphitheater Unified District	Helen Keeling Elementary School	00026			X	
0400790	Apache Junction Unified Distr	Four Peaks Elementary School	00041			X	
0400057	Arizona Call-a-Teen Youth Res	Arizona Call-a-Teen Center for Excel	00784			X	
0400910	Ash Fork Joint Unified District	Ash Fork Elementary School	00047			X	
0400960	Avondale Elementary District	Lattie Coor	00051			X	
0401050	Balsz Elementary District	Balsz School	00054			X	
0401050	Balsz Elementary District	Brunson-Lee Elementary School	03142			X	
0401050	Balsz Elementary District	David Crockett School	00055			X	
0400636	Blueprint Education	Hope High School	03108			X	
0401380	Buckeye Elementary District	Buckeye Primary	02491			X	
0401500	Bullhead City School District	Bullhead City Jr High School	00085			X	
0401600	Camp Verde Unified District	Camp Verde Elementary School	00086			X	
0400219	Career Success Schools	Career Success High School - Copper	03137			X	
0400219	Career Success Schools	Career Success High School - Main Ca	02011			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Cartwright School	00089			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Charles W. Harris School	00091			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Desert Sands Middle School	00092			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Estrella Middle School	00093			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Frank Borman Middle School	00094			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	G. Frank Davidson	01709			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Heatherbrae School	00096			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Marc T. Atkinson Middle School	02005			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Peralta School	00102			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Starlight Park School	00104			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Sunset School	00105			X	
0401680	Cartwright Elementary Distric	Tomahawk School	01055			X	
0401740	Casa Grande Union High Scho	Casa Grande Union High School	00113			X	

LEA NCES#	District Name	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate
0401740	Casa Grande Union High Scho	Desert Winds High School	01629			X	
0401810	Cedar Unified District	White Cone High School	02544	X			
0400016	Center for Academic Success,	Center for Academic Success, The #1	00476			X	
0400016	Center for Academic Success,	Center for Academic Success, The #2	00481			X	
0400253	Cesar Chavez Learning Comm	Aztlan Academy	02208			X	
0400253	Cesar Chavez Learning Comm	Cesar Chavez Middle School	01867			X	
0401870	Chandler Unified District	Erie Elementary School	00127			X	
0401870	Chandler Unified District	Galveston Elementary School	00128			X	
0401940	Chinle Unified District	Canyon De Chelly Elementary School	00136			X	
0401940	Chinle Unified District	Chinle Elementary School	00135			X	
0401940	Chinle Unified District	Chinle High School	00127			X	
0401940	Chinle Unified District	Chinle Junior High School	00138			X	
0402110	Clifton Unified District	Laugharn Elementary School	00151	X			
0402320	Coolidge Unified District	Coolidge High School	00158			X	
0402320	Coolidge Unified District	HoHoKam Elementary School	01534			X	
0402320	Coolidge Unified District	West Elementary School	00164			X	
0400114	CPLC Community Schools dba	Calli Ollin High School	01616	X			
0400114	CPLC Community Schools dba	Hiaki High School	02554	X			X
0400114	CPLC Community Schools dba	Toltecali High School	02331	X			X
0402400	Crane Elementary District	Centennial Middle School	01976			X	
0402400	Crane Elementary District	Crane Middle School	00014			X	
0402430	Creighton Elementary District	Creighton Elementary School	00174			X	
0402430	Creighton Elementary District	Excelencia School	01999			X	
0402430	Creighton Elementary District	Gateway School	01704			X	
0402430	Creighton Elementary District	Larry C Kennedy School	00176			X	
0402430	Creighton Elementary District	Papago School	00179			X	
0402430	Creighton Elementary District	William T Machan Elementary School	00181			X	
0407750	Deer Valley Unified District	Deer Valley Middle School	00676			X	
0402530	Douglas Unified District	Paul H Huber Jr High School	00185			X	
0402530	Douglas Unified District	Ray Borane Middle School	00194			X	
0402690	Dysart Unified District	El Mirage School	00199			X	
0402690	Dysart Unified District	Surprise Elementary School	00201			X	
0402690	Dysart Unified District	Thompson Ranch Elementary	02402			X	
0402690	Dysart Unified District	Valley Vista High School	02684			X	
0400142	E.Q. Scholars, Inc.	Scholars Academy, The	01807			X	
0400412	E-cademie, A Charter School	E-cademie	02410			X	
0400078	EDGE School Inc. The	Edge High School - Himmel Park	01006			X	
0402760	Elfrida Elementary District	Elfrida Elementary School	00204			X	
0402790	Eloy Elementary District	Eloy Intermediate School	01060			X	
0400133	Employ-Ability Unlimited, Inc.	Desert Pointe Academy	01888			X	
0400421	Esperanza Community Collegi	Esperanza Community Collegial Acader	02523			X	
0400052	Espiritu Community Developr	Esperanza Montessori Academy	02451			X	

LEA NCES#	District Name	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate
0400235	Excalibur Charter School Inc	Avalon Elementary	03157			X	
0402860	Flagstaff Unified District	Coconino High School	00212			X	
0402860	Flagstaff Unified District	Flagstaff Middle School	00216			X	
0402860	Flagstaff Unified District	Leupp Public School	00219			X	
0402860	Flagstaff Unified District	Mount Elden Middle School	00214			X	
0402860	Flagstaff Unified District	W F Killip Elementary School	00217			X	
0400144	Florence Crittenton Services	Crittenton Youth Academy	01717	X			X
0403010	Flowing Wells Unified District	Flowing Wells Junior High School	00232			X	
0403060	Fowler Elementary District	Fowler Elementary School	00240			X	
0403060	Fowler Elementary District	Western Valley Middle School	03085			X	
0400102	Friendly House, Inc.	Friendly House Academia Del Pueblo E	01582			X	
0403200	Ft Thomas Unified District	Fort Thomas Elementary School	00248			X	
0403240	Gadsden Elementary District	Arizona Desert Elementary	01806			X	
0403240	Gadsden Elementary District	Cesar Chavez Elementary	03066			X	
0403240	Gadsden Elementary District	Desert View Elementary	03116			X	
0403240	Gadsden Elementary District	Gadsden Elementary School	00250	X			
0403240	Gadsden Elementary District	Rio Colorado Elementary School	01213			X	
0403240	Gadsden Elementary District	San Luis Middle School	01101			X	
0403240	Gadsden Elementary District	Southwest Jr. High School	02388			X	
0403290	Ganado Unified School District	Ganado High School	00252			X	
0403290	Ganado Unified School District	Ganado Intermediate School	00253			X	
0403290	Ganado Unified School District	Ganado Middle School	00254			X	
0400124	Genesis Academy	Genesis Academy	01589			X	
0403310	Gila Bend Unified District	Gila Bend High School	00256			X	
0400419	Gila County Regional School District	Globe Education Center	02473			X	
0403420	Glendale Elementary District	Challenger Middle School	01402			X	
0403420	Glendale Elementary District	Desert Spirit	02281			X	
0403420	Glendale Elementary District	Don Mensendick School	00270			X	
0403420	Glendale Elementary District	Glendale Landmark Middle School	00269			X	
0403420	Glendale Elementary District	Isaac E Imes School	00267			X	
0403420	Glendale Elementary District	Melvin E Sine School	00268			X	
0400146	Global Education Foundation	Tucson Academy of Leadership &	01780			X	
0403500	Globe Unified District	High Desert Middle School	02422			X	
0400445	Imagine Charter Elementary	Imagine Elementary at Camelback	02676	X			
0403950	Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified	Baboquivari High School	00310	X			X
0403950	Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified	Baboquivari Middle School	00311			X	
0403950	Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified	Indian Oasis Primary School	00312			X	
0400312	Ira H. Hayes Memorial Applied	Ira H. Hayes High School	02216	X			X
0403960	Isaac Elementary District	Alta E Butler School	00314			X	
0403960	Isaac Elementary District	Carl T. Smith Middle School	02382			X	
0403960	Isaac Elementary District	Esperanza Elementary School	01542			X	
0403960	Isaac Elementary District	Isaac Middle School	00315			X	

LEA NCES#	District Name	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate
0403960	Isaac Elementary District	J B Sutton Elementary School	00318			X	
0403960	Isaac Elementary District	Joseph Zito Elementary School	00319			X	
0403960	Isaac Elementary District	Morris K. Udall Escuela de Bellas Ar	01876			X	
0403960	Isaac Elementary District	Moya Elementary	02282			X	
0403960	Isaac Elementary District	P T Coe Elementary School	00317			X	
0403960	Isaac Elementary District	Pueblo Del Sol Middle School	00650			X	
0400332	James Sandoval Preparatory H	James Sandoval Preparatory High Scho	02165		X		X
0404060	Kayenta Unified District	Kayenta Intermediate School	01160			X	
0404060	Kayenta Unified District	Kayenta Middle School	01161			X	
0404060	Kayenta Unified District	Monument Valley High School	00324			X	
0400295	Kingman Unified School Distri	Kingman High School	00881			X	
0400295	Kingman Unified School Distri	Mt Tipton Elementary School	00149	X			X
0404230	Kyrene Elementary District	Kyrene Middle School	00334			X	
0404290	Laveen Elementary District	Cheatham Elementary School	02398			X	
0404290	Laveen Elementary District	Maurice C. Cash Elementary School	00342			X	
0400423	Legacy Education Group	East Valley High School	02525		X		
0400298	Legacy Schools	Legacy Elementary School	02143			X	
0404410	Littlefield Unified District	Beaver Dam Elementary	01302			X	
0404440	Littleton Elementary District	Country Place Elementary	02497			X	
0404440	Littleton Elementary District	Quentin Elementary School	02435			X	
0404720	Maricopa Unified School Distri	Maricopa Elementary	00371			X	
0404720	Maricopa Unified School Distri	Maricopa High School	00372			X	
0404720	Maricopa Unified School Distri	Maricopa Wells Middle School	01468			X	
0404860	Mcnary Elementary District	Mcnary Elementary School	00376			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Brimhall Junior High School	00108			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Carson Junior High School	00380			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Emerson Elementary School	00384			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Fremont Junior High School	00387			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Kino Junior High School	00396			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Longfellow Elementary School	00400			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Lowell Elementary School	00401			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Mesa Junior High School	00405			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Powell Junior High School	00410			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	S H A R P	01076			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Smith Junior High School	02110			X	
0404970	Mesa Unified District	Taylor Junior High School	01234			X	
0400280	Mohave Accelerated Learning	Mohave Accelerated Learning Center	02186			X	
0400379	Flagstaff Unified School Distri	Mountain English Spanish Academy of	02316	X			
0405400	Murphy Elementary District	Alfred F Garcia School	00445			X	
0405400	Murphy Elementary District	Arthur M Hamilton School	00446			X	
0405400	Murphy Elementary District	Jack L Kuban Elementary School	01309			X	
0405400	Murphy Elementary District	William R Sullivan Elementary School	00447			X	

LEA NCES#	District Name	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate
0400611	New Samaritan High School	New Samaritan High School	03120			X	
0405530	Nogales Unified District	Nogales High School	00455			X	
0405530	Nogales Unified District	Pierson Vocational High School	01552			X	
0400077	Northern Arizona Academy fo	Northern AZ Academy for Career Dev.	00918			X	
0400077	Northern Arizona Academy fo	Northern AZ Academy for Career Dev.	00943			X	
0400284	Omega Alpha Academy	Omega Alpha Academy School	02095			X	
0400101	OMEGA SCHOOLS d.b.a. Ome	Oasis High School	01885			X	
0400101	OMEGA SCHOOLS d.b.a. Ome	Omega Academy	01580			X	
0400101	OMEGA SCHOOLS d.b.a. Ome	S. Sturgeon Middle School	03090			X	
0400101	OMEGA SCHOOLS d.b.a. Ome	La Puerta High School	03091	X			
0405670	Osborn Elementary District	Montecito Community School	01703			X	
0405670	Osborn Elementary District	Osborn Middle School	00461			X	
0405820	Page Unified District	Desert View Elementary School	01078			X	
0405820	Page Unified District	Page Middle School	00468			X	
0405930	Paradise Valley Unified Distric	Greenway Middle School	00130			X	
0405930	Paradise Valley Unified Distric	Palomino Intermediate School	03104			X	
0405930	Paradise Valley Unified Distric	Palomino Primary School	00487			X	
0405930	Paradise Valley Unified Distric	Vista Verde Middle School	01218			X	
0400364	PAS Charter, Inc., dba Intelli-S	Intelli-School - Metro Center	00804			X	
0400344	Pathways KM Charter Schools	Rimrock Public High School	01990		X		
0406120	Peach Springs Unified District	Peach Springs School	00502	X			
0406150	Pearce Elementary District	Pearce Elementary School	00503			X	
0406210	Pendergast Elementary Distric	Pendergast Elementary School	00506			X	
0400109	Phoenix Advantage Charter Sc	Phoenix Advantage Charter School	01592			X	
0406300	Phoenix Elementary District	Mary Mcleod Bethune School	00518			X	
0406300	Phoenix Elementary District	Silvestre S Herrera School	00531			X	
0400153	Phoenix School of Academic E	Learning Institute, The	01902			X	
0406330	Phoenix Union High School Di	Alhambra High School	00538			X	
0406330	Phoenix Union High School Di	Camelback High School	00540			X	
0406330	Phoenix Union High School Di	Carl Hayden High School	00541			X	
0406330	Phoenix Union High School Di	Central High School	00542			X	
0406330	Phoenix Union High School Di	Cesar Chavez High School	01882			X	
0406330	Phoenix Union High School Di	Maryvale High School	00549			X	
0406330	Phoenix Union High School Di	North High School	01244			X	
0406330	Phoenix Union High School Di	South Mountain High School	00552			X	
0406330	Phoenix Union High School Di	Trevor Browne High School	00554			X	
0400201	Pima County Board of Superv	Pima Vocational High School	02069			X	
0400367	Pima Prevention Partnership	Pima Partnership School, The	02303	X			X
0400023	Pinon Unified District	Pinon Elementary School	01352			X	
0400023	Pinon Unified District	Pinon Middle School	01355			X	
0400083	PPEP & Affiliates	PPEP TEC - Celestino Fernandez Learn	01011			X	
0400083	PPEP & Affiliates	PPEP TEC - Cesar Chavez Learning Cen	01016			X	

LEA NCES#	District Name	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate
0400288	Premier Charter High School	Premier Charter High School	02176	X			X
0400081	Presidio School	Presidio High School	01010			X	
0406780	Quartzsite Elementary District	Ehrenberg Elementary School	00573			X	
0406870	Red Mesa Unified District	Red Mesa Elementary School	00141			X	
0406870	Red Mesa Unified District	Red Mesa High School	00142			X	
0406870	Red Mesa Unified District	Red Mesa Junior High School	00206			X	
0406870	Red Mesa Unified District	Round Rock Elementary School	00143			X	
0407020	Riverside Elementary District	Kings Ridge School	02487			X	
0407080	Roosevelt Elementary District	Bernard Black Elementary School	02498			X	
0407080	Roosevelt Elementary District	C O Greenfield School	00587			X	
0407080	Roosevelt Elementary District	Cesar E Chavez Community School	00605			X	
0407080	Roosevelt Elementary District	Ed & Verma Pastor Elementary School	01879			X	
0407080	Roosevelt Elementary District	Ignacio Conchos School	01143			X	
0407080	Roosevelt Elementary District	John R Davis School	01144			X	
0407080	Roosevelt Elementary District	Rose Linda School	00607			X	
0407080	Roosevelt Elementary District	T G Barr School	00582			X	
0407080	Roosevelt Elementary District	V H Lassen Elementary School	00593			X	
0407080	Roosevelt Elementary District	Valley View School	01100			X	
0407200	Sacaton Elementary District	Sacaton Elementary	00621			X	
0407200	Sacaton Elementary District	Sacaton Middle School	01176			X	
0407170	Saddle Mountain Unified School District	Ruth Fisher Elementary School	00620			X	
0406960	San Carlos Unified District	San Carlos High School	01502			X	
0406960	San Carlos Unified District	San Carlos Intermediate	01656	X			
0406960	San Carlos Unified District	San Carlos Junior High School	00526	X			
0406740	Sanders Unified District	Sanders Elementary School	00572			X	
0406740	Sanders Unified District	Sanders Middle School	01043			X	
0406740	Sanders Unified District	Valley High School	01142	X			
0407520	Santa Cruz Valley Unified District	San Cayetano Elementary School	00637			X	
0407530	Santa Cruz Valley Union High School District	Santa Cruz Valley Union High School	00638			X	
0400363	SC Jensen Corporation, Inc. dba	Intelli-School	02300			X	
0407570	Scottsdale Unified District	Supai Middle School	00661			X	
0407630	Seligman Unified District	Seligman High School	00668		X		
0400154	Shonto Governing Board of Education	Shonto Preparatory Technology High School	01770	X			X
0407890	Somerton Elementary District	Somerton Middle School	00698			X	
0407890	Somerton Elementary District	Tierra Del Sol Elementary School	01566			X	
0400259	Southgate Academy, Inc.	Southgate Academy	02080			X	
0408130	Stanfield Elementary District	Stanfield Elementary School	00705			X	
0408170	Sunnyside Unified District	Apollo Middle School	00706			X	
0408170	Sunnyside Unified District	Chaparral Middle School	01148			X	
0408170	Sunnyside Unified District	Los Amigos Elementary School	01386			X	
0408170	Sunnyside Unified District	Sierra Middle School	01149			X	
0400387	Tempe Accelerated Public Charter School	Tempe Accelerated High School	01735			X	

LEA NCES#	District Name	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate
0408310	Tempe School District	Connolly Middle School	00768			X	
0408310	Tempe School District	Fees Middle School	01107			X	
0408310	Tempe School District	Gililand Middle School	00775			X	
0408310	Tempe School District	Mckemy Middle School	00779			X	
0400062	Tertulia: A Learning Communi	Tertulia Pre-College Community Inter	01598			X	
0400062	Tertulia: A Learning Communi	Tertulia Pre-College Community Prima	00811			X	
0408490	Tolleson Elementary District	Arizona Desert Elementary School	01705			X	
0408490	Tolleson Elementary District	Porfirio H. Gonzales Elementary Scho	01477			X	
0408520	Tolleson Union High School D	Copper Canyon High School	02416			X	
0408520	Tolleson Union High School D	La Joya Community High School	02339			X	
0408680	Tuba City Unified District	Eagles Nest Intermediate School	00813			X	
0408680	Tuba City Unified District	Tuba City High School	00812			X	
0408680	Tuba City Unified District	Tuba City Junior High School	00814			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Cavett Elementary School	01267			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Hohokam Middle School	01480			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Howenstine High School	01450		X		
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Lynn Urquides	00861			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Maxwell Middle School	00867			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Myers-Ganoung Elementary School	00871			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Naylor Middle School	00872			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Project More High School	01508		X		
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Richey Elementary School	00877			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Robison Elementary School	00880			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Safford Engineering/Technology Magn	00886			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Teenage Parent Program - TAPP	01509			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Valencia Middle School	00972			X	
0408800	Tucson Unified District	Wakefield Middle School	00901			X	
0408820	Union Elementary District	Hurley Ranch Elementary	02496			X	
0400207	Vechij Himdag Alternative Sch	Vechij Himdag MashchamakuD	02215			X	
0409060	Washington Elementary Scho	Cholla Middle School	00921			X	
0409060	Washington Elementary Scho	Maryland Elementary School	00930			X	
0409060	Washington Elementary Scho	Mountain View Elementary School	00932			X	
0409060	Washington Elementary Scho	Palo Verde Middle School	00935			X	
0409060	Washington Elementary Scho	Shaw Butte School	00941			X	
0409060	Washington Elementary Scho	Sunnyslope Elementary School	00944			X	
0409090	Wellton Elementary District	Wellton Elementary School	00948			X	
0409160	Whiteriver Unified District	Alchesay High School	00005	X			
0409160	Whiteriver Unified District	Canyon Day Junior High School	00952	X			
0409160	Whiteriver Unified District	Seven Mile School	02190	X			
0409160	Whiteriver Unified District	Whiteriver Elementary	00951			X	
0409250	Willcox Unified District	Willcox Middle School	00958			X	
0409430	Window Rock Unified District	Dine Bi'Olta (Immersion School)	02447			X	

LEA NCES#	District Name	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate
0409430	Window Rock Unified District	Tse'Hootsooi Elementary School	02764			X	
0409430	Window Rock Unified District	Tsehootsooi Middle School	00968			X	
0409460	Winslow Unified District	Winslow High School	00975			X	
0400277	Youngtown Public Charter Sch	Youngtown Public Charter School	02167			X	
0409600	Yuma Elementary District	Fourth Avenue Junior High School	00985			X	
0409600	Yuma Elementary District	George Washington Carver Elementary	00983			X	
0409600	Yuma Elementary District	Pecan Grove Elementary School	00993			X	
0400095	Yuma Private Industry Council	Educational Opportunity Center	01114			X	
0409630	Yuma Union High School Distr	Cibola High School	01388			X	
0409630	Yuma Union High School Distr	Kofa High School	00996			X	
0409630	Yuma Union High School Distr	Yuma High School	00997			X	

# Arizona Department of Education

## School Improvement Grant 1003(g) LEA Application for Tier I, Tier II and Tier III

### LEA APPLICATION COVER PAGE

<b>LEA Name:</b>	<b>NCES ID#</b>	<b>CTDS#</b>	<b>Entity ID</b>
<b>Superintendent:</b>	<b>Email:</b>		
<b>Federal Programs Director:</b>	<b>Email:</b>		
<b>LEA Contact Information</b>			
<b>Mailing Address:</b>			
<b>Telephone number:</b>			
<b>Fax:</b>			

**Superintendent Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Federal Program Director Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

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

# Arizona Department of Education

## School Improvement Grant LEA Application for Tier I, Tier II and Tier III

**DIRECTIONS:** There are 3 STEPS to this application process:

- **Step 1:** LEA teams work to complete this application form. This part consists of Sections A through J. (*Approval from SI Team required to move to Step 2*)
- **Step 2 – Complete Section K – complete detailed action plan for implementation of plan components for the 2010-2011 school year on ALEAT. (*This section needs to be approved before moving to Step 3*)**
- **Step 3 – Complete Section L – detailed budget information needs to be completed on ADE’s Grants Management System**

### IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS

School Name	NCES ID#	CTDS#	Entity ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III

The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant.

## A. LEA'S ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL'S NEEDS

With data and information available to you, analyze the needs of each of your Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools. The goal is for your LEA's Leadership team to carefully analyze and interpret all data in order to accurately and completely assess the needs of your Tier I and/or Tier II schools. The knowledge gained during this investigative and analytical phase will be the basis for your decision as to which of the four intervention models should be implemented in your schools. The guiding questions to consider as the LEA Leadership analyzes and interprets data are: **Where are we now?; and How did we get to this place?**

### Where are we now?

#### A.1. Who are we? (as an LEA, school, staff, and community)

- Provide a brief description of the LEA and each school to be served using School Improvement Grant funds. Explain how the LEA and school(s) are organized; describe the characteristics of the student population, the teaching and administrative staff; and discuss the level of community involvement and parent engagement.

#### A.2 How do we do operate and do business at the LEA and school levels?

- Based on the description in A.1, provide a brief description of the climate, culture, values and beliefs that are part of the LEA and schools.

#### A.3 How are our students doing?

- Provide detailed summary of the student data for each Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III school. Include data documents or reports as attachments.

**\*\*The following is baseline data that needs to be included with your LEA Application.**

<b>School Improvement Grant</b>			
<b>BASELINE DATA (To be submitted with SIG LEA Application)</b>			
An SEA must report these metrics for the school year prior to implementing the intervention, if the data are available, to serve as a baseline, and for each year thereafter for which the SEA allocates school improvement funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. With respect to a school that is closed, the SEA need report only the identity of the school and the intervention taken-- <u>i.e.</u> , school closure.			
<b>SCHOOL DATA</b>	<b>BASELINE</b>		
	<b>2007-2008 Optional</b>	<b>2008-2009 (Must Complete</b>	<b>2009-2010 Optional</b>
Which intervention the school used (i.e., turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation )			
AYP status			
Which AYP targets the school met and missed			
School improvement status			
Number of minutes within the school year			
<b>STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA</b>			
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics ( <u>e.g.</u> , Basic, Proficient, Advanced), by grade and by student subgroup			
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup			
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup			
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency			
Graduation rate			
Dropout rate			
Student attendance rate			

Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes			
College enrollment rates			
<b>STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE</b>			
Discipline incidents			
Truants			
<b>TALENT</b>			
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system			
Teacher attendance rate			



**B. DESCRIPTION OF LEA'S CAPACITY**

**B1.a How effective are our processes?**

- LEA demonstrates 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 required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

<b>Behavior for successful restructuring of persistently low achieving schools</b>	<b>What are the strengths? What is in place?</b>	<b>What are the weaknesses? What needs to be put in place?</b>	<b>What changes will be made to address the weaknesses and improve on the strengths?</b>
<b>Standard 1: Leadership Systems</b>			
Administrators are chosen for getting results, influencing others and willingness to change			
District has a comprehensive plan for recruiting and retaining highly effective teachers and leaders.			
There is a process to evaluate principals' abilities to demonstrate behavioral competencies of instructional leadership			
The LEA aligns personnel evaluations to effective instructional performance.			

<p>The LEA has a process and procedures in place to exempt schools from district policies that restrict innovation; i.e. staffing, budgeting, and scheduling.</p>			
<p>District has a plan to monitor implementation of the intervention model or school improvement plan. This would include processes to be used, timelines, benchmarks, consequences, etc.</p>			
<p><b>Standard 2: Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development</b></p>			
<p>The LEA has core curriculum that is evaluated and revised annually. Programs &amp; practices are evaluated and discarded in a timely manner if they do not show measurable learning results</p>			
<p>The LEA has a professional development plan that allows for PD during the work day and specifically addresses and targets school improvement needs</p>			
<p>The LEA has negotiated the necessary changes in collective bargaining agreements to provide the LEA/principals with greater control over hiring, placement, and retention of</p>			

staff.			
The LEA has a strong teacher evaluation process in place that provides for removing ineffective teachers that aren't committed to the turnaround process.			
The LEA has a systematic process for measuring quality instruction and student engagement including walkthrough procedures			
The LEA has a systematic process enabling teachers to collaborate during the work day to use data to improve instruction.			
<b>Standard 3: Assessment System</b>			
The LEA has a comprehensive data warehouse system that allows for the collection of student data down to individual student performance			
The measurement of student learning is used to better support systemic, programmatic and instructional decisions, and is part of the core work of the district and schools.			
Clear LEA/school goals are set based on what students need to know, think, and do for personal, economic, and civic success for the 21st century.			

The LEA has a system in place to train and support teachers in using data to drive instruction.			
<b>Standard 4: Culture, Climate, and Communication</b>			
District staff, school board members, and association members work together to make the dramatic changes the restructured school(s) need for improving student learning			
The LEA sets school improvement as a priority and adheres to the implementation and monitoring of the school's goals, including consistently monitoring improvement timelines for student achievement			
The LEA has a valued culture of high expectations for student achievement including established vision, mission, and goals			
All staff members are held accountable for increased student achievement.			
The LEA is committed to involving community/parents in the restructuring process including communicating current reality, new vision, buy in, and silencing of naysayers.			

<b>Standard 5: Resource Management</b>			
The LEA has prioritized the reallocation of resources to schools in improvement including personnel, funding, programming, etc.			
LEA leverages funds in order to design a viable sustainability plan for future years.			
The LEA Consolidated Plan includes strategies/action steps aligned to school improvement needs (Sustainability)			

**B1.b Describe the actions the LEA has taken or will take to address the following:**

	<b>Actions LEA has taken:</b>	<b>Actions LEA will take: Include a general timeline</b>
<b>Design and implement interventions aligned with the requirements of the selected model;</b>		
<b>Describe the process the LEA will use to screen and select quality external providers;</b>		
<b>Alignment of other resources;</b>		
<b>Policies and Practices LEA will modify to enable its schools to implement the selected intervention(s) fully and effectively</b>		

## C. ROOT CAUSES

### How did we get to this place?

After the data, including information on capacity, has been analyzed the LEA must determine the root causes from the results. Based on the analyzed information, examine possible reasons for current level of performance. This requires the LEA to move from problem identification to problem solving.

#### C.1 Provide the conclusions the LEA has reached, that is based on the analyzed data from the previous section.

- Include the data used for analysis, the observations, findings, identified root causes, and conclusions reached by the team.

--

#### C.2 Identify the strengths, needs and barriers of the LEA and schools.

<i>Student Strengths</i>	<i>System Strengths</i>	<i>Student Needs</i>	<i>System Needs</i>	<i>School Barriers</i>	<i>District Barriers</i>

#### C.3 Provide an outline of the steps the district will take to address the needs and barriers of the school, as well as, the district's needs and barriers in supporting this school.

--

#### C.4 Identify the intervention model that is chosen for each Tier I and/or Tier II school. Provide a brief justification - including how student achievement will be improved by this model.

--

**D. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED**

**D.1 Identify each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA *commits to serve* and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school. (The model is identified after the team analyzes the data, identifies the schools’ needs and examines LEA capacity to serve the school.)**

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	INTERVENTION MODEL CHOSEN			
				turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

**D.2 Prioritize, by need, the district’s TIER III schools:**

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	AYP Designation	Area of Need(s) Based on 2009 AIMS Assessment

**D.3 If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I and/or Tier II school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each school:**

**E. LEA'S ACCOUNTABILITY**

**E.1 Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading, math and or graduation rate that have been established in order to monitor the Tier I and Tier II schools. Using the Analysis of Data completed in A.3., complete the following for each Tier I and/or Tier II school being served:**

Goal Area	Goals	Baseline
Reading		
Math		
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)		

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading			
Math			
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)			

**E.2 Using the prioritized list developed in D.2, provide a detailed description of the support that the LEA will provide for each Tier III school. Include the interventions provided by level of need.**

School	Level of Need			Describe LEA Support (Internal and/or External) Funded and non-Funded support	Timeline
	Highest	Medium	Lowest		


**E.3 Describe the annual goals the LEA has established in order to hold accountable your Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.**

Goal Area	Goals	Baseline	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person Responsible
			Process	Timeline	
Reading/Language Arts					
Math					
Graduation Rate					

**E.4 Describe the LEA’s technical assistance plan for schools that do not achieve the progress that is expected.**

## F. BUDGET

**F. Using the Budget Excel spreadsheet, provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to –**

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

An LEA’s budget must cover the period of availability (3 years), including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

**\*\*Attach LEA budget as an appendix.**

**G. SUSTAINABILITY**

**G. Describe your plan for sustaining these efforts after the funding period ends? Address in your plan: funding sources, hiring practices, professional development, changes in policies and practices.**

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

By indicating with a mark on the below items, the \_\_\_\_\_LEA or Charter Holder name\_\_\_\_\_ fully and completely assures 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 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;
- If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements

**I. 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.**

**Arizona Department of Education has applied, through its SEA level application, for all of the Waivers offered for the School Improvement Grant. If Arizona receives approval for these waivers, all waivers automatically apply to any LEA in the state.**

The LEA must indicate 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.

\_\_\_\_\_ LEA or Charter Holder \_\_\_\_\_ will implement the below marked waivers:

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds. School(s): \_\_\_\_\_
  
- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model. School(s): \_\_\_\_\_
  
- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold. School(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**J. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement intervention models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.**

**J. Before submitting its application for School Improvement Grant, the LEA must consult with all relevant stakeholders.**

The LEA has consulted with the following stakeholders:


**STEP 2: COMPLETE PLANNING TEMPLATE ON ALEAT**

**K. The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take during the 2010-2011 school year to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II schools identified in the LEA's application.**

**To be completed in ALEAT Plan**

**STEP 3: COMPLETE BUDGET ON GRANTS MANAGEMENT**

**L. The LEA must complete the budget information on ADE's Grant Management System.**

**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.**

<b>AREA</b>	<b>Total Points Possible</b>	<b>Minimum Points Needed for Approval</b>
<b>A – Analysis of School Needs</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>B.1 – Analysis of LEA Capacity</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>B.2 – Analysis of LEA Commitment</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>C – Root Causes</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>D – School's to Be Served</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>E – LEA's Accountability</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>F – Budget</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>G – Sustainability</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

**LEA applications must meet the minimum points for each area for approval. In addition, applications must score in the Fully Addressed or Partially Addressed indicators to be approved. Applications that meet the minimum points but receive a rubric score in Not Addressed, specifically in LEA Capacity, will not be approved.**

**Rubric points to be assigned for each component of the LEA application during the review process:**

**Fully Addressed**

**5 – All items addressed**

**4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed**

**Partially Addressed**

**3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness**

**2 – Missing a number of components**

**Not Addressed**

**1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue**

**0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan**

**A. LEA’S ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL NEEDS**

<p><b>Fully Addressed</b> <b>Points: 20-30</b></p>	<p><b>Partially Addressed</b> <b>Points: 12-18</b></p>	<p><b>Not Addressed</b> <b>0-3</b></p>
<p>1. LEA description includes a detailed description of location characteristics, demographic information, size and composition of staff, and community resources disaggregated by school.</p>	<p>1. LEA description includes an adequate description of location characteristics, demographic information, size and composition of staff, and community resources disaggregated by school.</p>	<p>1. LEA description does not include a description of location characteristics, demographic information, size and composition of staff, and community resources disaggregated by school.</p>
<p>2. Culture and Climate of LEA and schools are thoroughly described. Includes references to mission, vision, values and beliefs. Strengths as well as challenges are described.</p>	<p>2. Culture and Climate of LEA and schools are adequately described. Includes limited references to mission, vision, values and beliefs. Strengths are described but not challenges.</p>	<p>2. Culture and Climate of LEA and schools are loosely described. Includes no references to mission, vision, values and beliefs. Neither strengths nor challenges are described.</p>

3. Data analysis was done using multiple sources of data (student achievement, school process, perceptions and demographics). Reports & documents are attached.	3. Data analysis was done using a couple of sources of data (student achievement, school process, perceptions and demographics). Reports & documents are attached.	3. Data analysis was not complete.
4. Data trends were identified using data from 2007, 2008, and 2009. Data was used to identify the needs of each Tier I and Tier II School. Reports & documents are attached.	4. Data trends were identified using data. Some data was used to identify the needs of each Tier I and Tier II School. Reports & documents are attached.	4. Data was not used to identify the needs of each Tier I and Tier II schools
5. Needs assessment was completed by LEA team using provided process and protocols. Included classroom observations, surveys, and principal/teacher interviews. Site visit was conducted.	5. Needs assessment was completed using process and protocols. Some items were not gathered. Site visit conducted.	5. Needs assessment was not completed by LEA.
6. A detailed description of the student learning (observations) of each Tier I and Tier II school to be served is provided. (based on site visit classroom walkthroughs)	6. An adequate description of the student learning (observations) of each Tier I and Tier II school to be served is provided. (based on site visit classroom walkthroughs)	6. No description of the student learning (observations) of each Tier I and Tier II school to be served was provided.

<b>B.1a EVALUATION OF LEA CAPACITY</b>		
<b>Fully Addressed Points: 68-85</b>	<b>Partially Addressed Points: 34-51</b>	<b>Not Addressed Points: 0-6</b>
Standard 1: Leadership Systems		
On a path for rapid district improvement		
1. Evidence of: dramatic changes in district structures, culture, policies,	Evidence of: Some changes in district structures, culture,	Evidence of: Limited changes in district that addresses only some

and process; recent implementation of research-based instructional, data, and assessment strategies; changes and improvements that are recognized system-wide and sustainable; process for use of incentives for Tier I and Tier II schools	policies, and process; recent implementation of research-based strategies; improvements that are recognized system-wide; beginning process for use of incentives for Tier I and Tier II school	structures, policies, and process; limited implementation of research-based strategies; few improvements that are recognized system-wide; no process for use of incentives for Tier I and Tier II school
<b>Shared Leadership</b>		
1. LEA vision, mission, goals and student learning standards are shared and articulated throughout the LEA. Leaders are focused on student achievement. There are multiple shared leadership opportunities. Leaders facilitate decision-making with data. LEA has a vigorous process for developing instructional leaders.	LEA vision, mission, goals and student learning standards are shared. Leaders are somewhat focused on student achievement. There are a few shared leadership opportunities. Some leaders facilitate decision-making with and without data. LEA has a process for developing instructional leaders.	LEA vision, mission, goals and student learning standards are not shared. Leaders are not focused on student achievement. There are a no shared leadership opportunities. Leaders do not facilitate decision-making with data. LEA does not have a process for developing instructional leaders.
<b>Quality Planning</b>		
1. A comprehensive plan for the continuous improvement of the LEA, with a focus on student learning is established. Articulation and integration of all elements is due to high quality planning. Leadership team ensures all elements will be implemented by all appropriate parties.	A plan for the continuous improvement of the LEA, with a focus on student learning is established. Some articulation and integration of the elements is due to planning efforts. Leadership team ensures elements will be implemented.	A plan for the continuous improvement of the LEA is established. No articulation or integration in plan. Leadership team does not ensure any elements will be implemented.
<b>Teacher Evaluation</b>		
1. Development of the teacher evaluation process included input from relevant stakeholders	Development of the teacher evaluation process included some stakeholder's input.	Stakeholders were not involved in the development of the teacher evaluation process.

(teachers, teachers' union, school board, principals, parents, LEA staff)		
2. Multiple sources of data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of a teacher. Data sources include, but are not limited to: lesson plans, classroom observations, classroom walk-throughs, self-assessments, portfolios, student achievement data, student work-sample review).	A few sources of data, including student achievement data, are used to evaluate the effectiveness of a teacher.	Student achievement data is not incorporated into the teacher evaluation system.
3. A framework/model that defines effective teaching has been developed, is clearly communicated, with a plan for training teachers and principals.	A framework/model that defines effective teaching has been developed, but no plan for training of teachers and principals in the process.	A framework/model of effective teaching has not been established.
4. Teacher evaluation is directly tied to professional development providing information for both summative and formative purposes.	Teacher evaluation is loosely tied to professional development with some formative data gathered with a stronger focus on providing summative information.	There is no evidence of a connection between teacher evaluation and professional development and is only used to determine teacher retention.
<b>Standard 2. Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development</b>		
<b>Curriculum Decisions</b>		
1. LEA has a curriculum with essential standards that is aligned to Arizona Academic Standards for each grade level. LEA has a process for monitoring implementation at the school level. LEA provides teachers with a complete set of pacing guides.	LEA has a curriculum that is aligned to Arizona Academic Standards for each grade level. LEA has a limited process for monitoring implementation at the school level. LEA provides teachers with limited pacing guides.	LEA has a curriculum that is aligned to Arizona Academic Standards for each grade level. LEA does not have a process for monitoring implementation at the school level. LEA does not provide teachers with pacing guides.
<b>Instruction</b>		
1. The LEA has a well-defined, process for monitoring and	The LEA has a process for monitoring and evaluating the	The LEA does not have a process for monitoring and evaluating the

evaluating the effectiveness of instruction including the use of research-based strategies, implementation fidelity, adjustments made based on data, and the impact of learning.	effectiveness of instruction that includes one or more of the following: use of research-based strategies, implementation fidelity, adjustments made based on data, or the impact of learning.	effectiveness of instruction.
Collaborative Model/Job-Embedded Professional Development		
1. Effective job-embedded professional learning is provided for all teachers. The primary objective is building teacher capacity to implement effective instructional strategies that ensure student success. Professional learning is a priority budget item. Professional learning is planned, aligned and leads to increased student learning. Staff-wide conversations focus on systemic changes and continuous improvement.	Job-embedded professional learning is provided for all teachers. The primary objective is building teacher capacity to implement effective instructional strategies that ensure student success. Professional learning is somewhat planned and sometimes leads to increased student learning. Some staff conversations focus on changes and continuous improvement.	Job-embedded professional learning is not provided for all teachers. Professional learning is not planned. Staff conversations do not focus on continuous improvement.
Standard 3: Assessment Systems		
Using Data		
1. The LEA has a comprehensive data system that allows for the collection of student data down to the individual student level. There is a systematic reliance on data as a basis for decision-making at all levels of the system throughout the school year. LEA facilitates conversations to improve the	The LEA has a data system that allows for the collection of student data down to the classroom level. There is a reliance on data for decision-making throughout the school year. LEA facilitates some conversations to improve instructional practices. Changes are based on data and	The LEA does not have a data system for the collection of student performance data. There is not a reliance on data for decision-making. LEA does not facilitate conversations to improve instructional practices. Changes are not based on data and the educational needs of students.

effectiveness of instructional practices on students' learning. LEA and school goals are set based on present levels of performance along with grade level standards. Changes are based on the analysis of data and the educational needs of students. Professional development is based on the instructional needs of teachers.	the educational needs of students. Professional development is somewhat based on the instructional needs of teachers.	Professional development is not based on the instructional needs of teachers.
Standard 4: Culture, Climate, and Communication		
Involvement of Stakeholders		
1. Stakeholder representatives are completely involved in the decision-making process. Their input is sought frequently and continually. An effective system and process for ongoing communication with stakeholders is established.	Stakeholder representatives are somewhat involved in the decision-making process. Their input is sought. A system and process for ongoing communication with stakeholders is being established.	Stakeholder representatives are not involved in the decision-making process. Their input is not sought. The system and process for ongoing communication with stakeholders is ineffective or not established.
Commitment to High Standards		
1. LEA has an established culture of high expectations for student achievement that is promoted by the LEA's mission and vision. Policies and practices are established to continue a culture of continuous improvement, data literacy and collaboration. The LEA has an existing process to monitor the LEA/School culture.	LEA is working to create a culture of high expectations for student achievement. The LEA's mission and vision is being updated and revised. Policies and practices are being evaluated to include a culture of continuous improvement, data literacy and collaboration. The LEA is developing a process to monitor	LEA does not have a culture of high expectations for student achievement. The LEA does not have a mission and vision. Policies and practices do not promote a culture of continuous improvement, data literacy and collaboration. The LEA does not have a process to monitor the LEA/School culture.

	the LEA/School culture.	
<b>Standard 5: Resource Management</b>		
1. There is an established system for student-centered fiscal management that allows for prioritization of resources for school improvement.	1. There is a fiscal management system in place that supports isolated school improvement.	1. There is a fiscal management system in place.
2. LEA has and will continue to leverage all resources to support and sustain improvement plans.	2. LEA has leveraged some resources to support improvement plans. Limited sustainability is included.	1. LEA has not leveraged resources to support improvement plans. Sustainability plan is not included.

<b>B.1b LEA COMMITMENT</b>		
<b>Fully Addressed Points: 28-35</b>	<b>Partially Addressed Points: 14-21</b>	<b>Not Addressed Points: 0-3</b>
<b>Design and implementation of interventions aligned with the requirements of the selected model</b>		
1. Plan addresses all of the required components for the chosen model, was completed collaboratively, involved stakeholders, addressed policies and procedures	Plan addresses all of the required components for the chosen model, involved some stakeholders, and addressed some policies and some procedures	Plan did not address the required components for the chosen model, did not involve stakeholders, and did not address policies and/or procedures
<b>Screening, selecting and assuring the quality of external providers</b>		
1. Stakeholders were involved in determining need for an external provider and the process was transparent and fair.	Some stakeholder input was used in determining need for external provider.	No evidence of stakeholder involvement is evident in the process for determining need.
2. Specific goals of the relationship with the external partner, measureable expectations and criteria for	Goals, measureable expectations and selection criteria are in place, but are general.	No evidence of goals, measureable expectations or selection criteria.

selection have been developed		
3. Budget includes adequate funding to ensure goals are addressed and that many external providers are compelled to apply.	Budget includes funding, but interest is limited to a few external providers	Funding is not adequate to attract the interest of potential external providers
4. A contract is in place that outlines roles and responsibilities, as well as explicit and measureable outcomes, including interim indicators of growth.	A contract is in place and addresses some, but not all, of the necessary requirements of roles, responsibilities, measureable outcomes and interim indicators of growth.	No contract has been developed.
Alignment of other resources with the intervention model		
1. All funding sources that the school is eligible for are considered when developing the LEA plan (Title I, IDEA, etc.)	Some funding sources that the school is eligible for are considered when developing the LEA plan (Title I, IDEA, etc.)	No other funding sources that the school is eligible for are considered when developing the LEA plan (Title I, IDEA, etc.)
Policies and practices modified to enable it schools to implement the selected model(s) fully and effectively		
1. All necessary modifications to policies, procedures and practices related to decision-making, staffing, governance, use of data, staff evaluation, professional development, parent-community involvement are formalized, approved at all levels, clearly communicated and are ready to implement	Necessary modifications to some policies, procedures and practices related to decision-making, staffing, governance, use of data, staff evaluation, professional development, parent-community involvement are approved at all levels, communicated and are almost ready to implement	Necessary modifications to policies, procedures and practices have not been made or approved at any level, and are not ready to implement

### C. ROOT CAUSES

--	--	--

<b>Fully Addressed Points: 32-40</b>	<b>Partially Addressed Points: 16-24</b>	<b>Not Addressed Points: 0-3</b>
1. Conclusions LEA draws are aligned with data summary. Conclusions are based on analyzed data, observations and findings.	1. Conclusions LEA draws are somewhat aligned with data summary. Conclusions are somewhat based on analyzed data, observations and findings.	1. Conclusions LEA draws are not aligned with data summary. Conclusions are not based on analyzed data, observations and findings.
2. LEA identifies all the root causes based on the analyzed data. There is clear evidence that the LEA has made these determinations based on all data available.	2. LEA identifies most root causes based on the analyzed data. There is some evidence that the LEA has made these determinations based on data available.	2. LEA identifies few root causes. There is no evidence that the LEA has made these determinations based on any data.
3. LEA has thoroughly described the practices that might be contributing to a lack of student progress.	3. LEA has described the practices that might be contributing to a lack of student progress.	3. An inadequate description of the practices that might be contributing to a lack of student progress was provided.
4. LEA thoroughly describes the identified strengths, needs, and barriers of the systems and provides a detailed plan for addressing the needs and barriers.	4. LEA describes the identified strengths, needs, and barriers of the systems and provides a plan for addressing the needs and barriers.	4. Inadequate description of the identified strengths, needs, and barriers of the systems and does not provide a detailed plan for addressing the needs and barriers.
5. LEA's plan to address the barriers and needs includes delineated steps, a process to monitor progress, a timeline, persons responsible, and an evaluation process.	5. LEA's plan to address the barriers and needs includes some steps, a loosely defined process to monitor progress, and a general timeline.	5. LEA's plan does not address the barriers and needs.
6. A detailed description of how students' learning needs will be improved by the model chosen was provided.	6. An adequate description of how students' learning needs will be improved by the model chosen was provided.	6. An inadequate description of how students' learning needs will be improved by the model chosen was provided.

7. LEA provides comprehensive justification for choice of intervention model that includes data, team observations and findings. There is a clear match of the school to the model.	7. LEA provides a justification for choice of intervention model that may include data, team observations and findings.	7. LEA provides a limited or general justification for choice of intervention without data, observations, or findings mentioned.
8. LEA provides a detailed and specific explanation for how student achievement will improve by implementing chosen model, addressing access to more effective instruction, increased learning time and expanded learning opportunities.	8. LEA provides an adequate explanation for how student achievement will improve by implementing the chosen model, briefly addressing access to more effective instruction, increased learning time and expanded learning opportunities.	8. LEA provides a limited explanation for how student achievement will improve by implementing the chosen model. No specifics are addressed.

<b>D. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED</b>		
<b>Fully Addressed Points: 12-15</b>	<b>Partially Addressed Points: 6-9</b>	<b>Not Addressed Points: 0-1</b>
1. Tier I and Tier II schools to be served are listed along with the intervention model the LEA has chosen.	1. Some Tier I and Tier II schools to be served are listed but one or more schools don't have a model chosen.	1. Tier I and Tier II schools to be served are not listed.
2. LEA provides a complete list of Tier III schools that are prioritized based on school needs.	2. LEA provides a list of Tier III schools that are prioritized based on unknown variables.	2. LEA does not provide a prioritized list with rationale of Tier III schools.

3. LEA provides a thorough and detailed explanation of the schools' needs and reason for their priority.	3. LEA provides an explanation of the schools' needs and general reasons for their priority.	3. LEA provides a limited explanation of the schools' needs and general reasons for their priority.
--	--	---

**E. LEA'S ACCOUNTABILITY**

<b>Fully Addressed Points: 28-35</b>	<b>Partially Addressed Points: 14-21</b>	<b>Not Addressed Points: 0-3</b>
1. Annual goals set for Tier I and/or Tier II school in the areas of reading, math and/or graduation rate are: established using baseline data, achievable as well as rigorous, and set to close achievement and performance gaps.	1. Annual goals set for Tier I and/or Tier II school in the areas of reading, math and/or graduation rate are: achievable and established using baseline data.	1. Annual goals set for Tier I and/or Tier II school in the areas of reading, math and/or graduation rate are not achievable nor based on baseline data.
2. Goals for Tier I and/or Tier II schools include a comprehensive plan for monitoring (including intermediate benchmarks), timeline for monitoring, and person responsible.	2. Goals for Tier I and/or Tier II schools include a plan for monitoring, timeline for monitoring, and person responsible.	2. Goals for Tier I and/or Tier II schools include a limited plan for monitoring.
3. Plan includes clear consequences for achieving and not achieving the set goals.	3. Plan includes ambiguous consequences for achieving and not achieving the set goals.	3. Plan does not include consequences for achieving and not achieving the set goals.

4. LEA provides a detailed support plan to be provided to Tier III schools based on the specific needs of the schools. Plan includes type and level of support, frequency, alignment to need, time line (with intermediate benchmarks), and an evaluation procedure.	4. LEA provides a support plan to be provided to Tier III schools based on the needs of the schools. Plan includes type of support, time line, and an evaluation procedure.	4. LEA provides a limited support plan to be provided to Tier III schools that is not based on the needs of the schools. Plan does not include: type and level of support, frequency, alignment to need, time line (with intermediate benchmarks), and an evaluation procedure.
5. Annual goals set for Tier III schools in reading, math and/or graduation rate are: established using baseline data, achievable as well as rigorous, and set to close achievement and performance gaps.	5. Annual goals set for Tier III schools in reading, math and/or graduation rate are: achievable and established using baseline data.	5. Annual goals set for Tier III schools in reading, math and/or graduation rate are not achievable nor based on baseline data.
6. Goals for Tier III schools include a comprehensive plan for monitoring (including intermediate benchmarks), timeline for monitoring, and person responsible.	6. Goals for Tier III schools include a plan for monitoring, timeline for monitoring, and person responsible.	6. Goals for Tier III schools include a limited plan for monitoring.
7. The LEA's technical assistance plan is fully aligned to the needs of the school, addresses the root cause for not making progress and may include any of the following: LEA level use of data, intensified site visits, more frequent monitoring, targeted PD plan in partnership with district, assignment of school to School Improvement Specialist,	7. The LEA's technical assistance plan is aligned to the needs of the school, slightly addresses the root cause for not making progress, and includes a few of the following: LEA level use of data, intensified site visits, more frequent monitoring, targeted PD plan in partnership with district, assignment of school to School Improvement Specialist,	7. The LEA does not have technical assistance plan for schools that addresses the causes for not making progress.

monthly principal meetings to discuss data, mentor principal,	monthly principal meetings to discuss data, mentor principal,	
---	---	--

<b>F. ANALYSIS OF BUDGET</b>		
<b>Fully Addressed Points: 16-20</b>	<b>Partially Addressed Points: 8-12</b>	<b>Not Addressed Points: 0-2</b>
<b>Budget process</b>		
1. A well documented process is in place for wise and informed use of funds that focuses on student achievement, budget is clearly communicated, demonstrates expenditure of sufficient resources, including time, personnel, funding, and technology using many funding sources. Comprehensive three year budget for LEA and schools is submitted using the provided template.	A process is in place that contains some of the elements necessary for development of an adequate budget. Three year budget for LEA and schools is submitted using the provided template.	No elements necessary for an adequate budget are evident. Budget for LEA and schools is submitted.
<b>Funding of chosen model</b>		
2. Budget fully addresses the allocation of resources to completely implement all of the intervention model components. Aligned with school goals, sufficient professional development dollars, evidence of funding for LEA	Budget addresses the allocation of resources to implement all of the intervention model components. Budget is loosely aligned with school goals, some professional development and LEA capacity building dollars	Budget does not address the allocation of resources to implement the intervention model components. Budget lacks sufficient information to determine adequacy.

capacity building.	provided.	
<b>Personnel</b>		
3. LEA prioritizes resources (i.e.; provide financial incentives) to provide extensive funding for the recruitment, training and retention of highly effective staff.	Some funds are allocated to support recruitment, training and retention of highly effective staff.	No evidence that funds are being allocated to support recruitment, training and retention of highly effective staff.
<b>Resources and supplies</b>		
4. Funding supports research-based practices, materials and programs; supports school goals; improvement of instructional opportunities; extended learning; and implementing interventions.	Funding supports most, but not all of the following: research-based practices, materials and programs; supports school goals; improvement of instructional opportunities; extended learning; and implementing interventions.	There is not a clear relationship between funding items and research, loosely addresses goals, improvement of instruction or extended learning.

<b>G. SUSTAINABILITY PLANS</b>		
<b>Fully Addressed Points: 8-10</b>	<b>Partially Addressed Points: 4-6</b>	<b>Not Addressed Points: 0-1</b>
1. Clear plan for sustaining efforts at the end of the funding period (included funding, hiring practices, professional development, and other changes in policy/procedures) that was created with involvement from stakeholders and reflects expected change in culture of the school.	Plan is developed and addresses some, not all of the following: funding, hiring practices, professional development, and other changes in policy/procedures.	Minimal or no key elements were addressed in the plan.
2. A working document outlining a 5-year plan for implementation of the model that communicates how	A 5-year plan is created that addresses some, but not all, of the required elements.	The 5-year plan is incomplete and does not address the required components

funding obligations addressed with SIG monies will be supported, how support will be provided to continue necessary policies and practices, describes ongoing involvement of stakeholders		

# School Improvement Grant - 1003(g) Funds

## LEA APPLICATION TIER I, TIER II and/or TIER III

## GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

March 12, 2010

Arizona Department of Education  
School Effectiveness Division  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT SECTION  
1535 W. Jefferson St., Bin #10  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

## Table of Contents

---

### **Table of Contents – Brief** *Change page numbers as document changes*

<b>Step 1</b>		
Part I	Overview of the SIG Grant .....	4
Part II	Forming Your Team .....	7
Part III	Collecting and Working with Your Data .....	11
Part IV	Choosing Your Model .....	16
<b>Step 2</b>		
Part V	What is Your Capacity to Implement the Model? .....	21
Part VI	Completing the Application (GUIDANCE) .....	22
Part VII	ADE/SII Rubric for Use in Evaluating Applications .....	42
Part VIII	Baseline Data: to be Submitted with SIG LEA Application .....	44
Part VIII	Links to Resources .....	46

---

### **Table of Contents – Detailed**

#### **Step 1**

##### **Part I – Overview of the SIG Grant**

###### **Introduction**

- The Purpose of the 2009 School Improvement Grant -1003(g)
- The Guiding Principles
- Arizona’s Definition of “Persistently Lowest Performing” Schools

###### **Guidance**

This guidance document consists of activities that are recommended to be completed by the LEA prior to the formal completion of the School Improvement Grant Application, as well as Guidance for Completing the SIG Application.

Before you complete your application, activities include:

- Identifying the LEA Team
- Gathering appropriate resource materials
- Analyzing the LEA and schools’ needs
- Choosing a model
- Determining capacity of the LEA to implement one of the four models

**As you complete your application, please consult with your ADE Program Specialist and refer to the guidance offered within this document.**

##### **Part II – Forming Your Team**

- Identifying the LEA Team

### **Part III – Collecting and Working with Your Data**

- Identifying and Gathering Resources
- Analysis of LEA and Schools Needs and Root Causes
  - Gathering data
  - What is the data telling you?
  - What are possible causes?

### **Part IV – Choosing Your Model**

- The Four Models
  - Detailed description of the four models
  - Things to consider when selecting and implementing a model
  - Criteria Funding Matrix – examples of allowable expenses for each model

## **Step 2**

### **Part V - What is Your Capacity to Implement the Model?**

- Determining LEA’s capacity to implement the model

### **Part VI – Completing the Application**

- Guidance and directions for completing the application

### **Part VII – ADE/SII Rubric for Use in Evaluating Applications**

- Evaluation rubric

### **Part VIII – Baseline Data to be Submitted with SIG LEA Application**

- An SEA must report metrics for the school year prior to implementing the intervention (if the data are available) to serve as a baseline, and for each year thereafter for which the SEA allocates school improvement funds under section 1003(g) of the NLB.

### **Part VIII – Links to Resources**

- Links to numerous tools and resources to assist the LEA in planning and implementing the four models

## **PART ONE – OVERVIEW OF THE SIG GRANT**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### ***The Purpose of the School Improvement Grants***

Section 1003(g) of the **Elementary and Secondary Education Act** provides for the U.S. Secretary of Education to allocate funds to SEAs for the purpose of school improvement. Within the regulations and guidelines established by the Secretary, each SEA administers grants to LEAs to “enable the lowest-achieving schools” to meet accountability requirements. In 2009 the U.S. Department of Education announced a dramatic increase in the funds that would be provided to SEAs under section 1003(g) while issuing program requirements that

ADE/School Effectiveness/School Improvement & Intervention\_09 SIG LEA App

charged the SEAs with channeling the funds to LEAs for the “persistently lowest-achieving schools” to support rapid improvement through one of four intervention models.

### **Guiding Principles**

- Students who attend a state’s persistently lowest-achieving school deserve better options and can’t afford to wait
- Not quantity, but quality
- Need to build capacity and support at all levels (school, LEA and state)
- Not a one-year activity

The School Improvement Grant program for 2009 strongly amplifies the restructuring provisions of NCLB and commits a massive surge of funding to rid the nation of its persistently lowest-achieving schools. The SIG provisions make it clear that change must be dramatic, improvement rapid, and results significant. Moving beyond the restructuring provisions of NCLB, the SIG program:

- Considers student growth in determining school progress
- Sharply focuses on the “persistently lowest-achieving schools”
- Limits strategies employed under the transformation model to a defined and robust set of effective practices;
- Stresses the importance of talent, the human capital necessary for rapid school improvement; and
- Requires changes in governance and leadership to pave the way for rapid and sustained improvement.

When considering “restructuring,” the research highlights four areas that need focus. Those areas are governance, leadership factors, organizational factors and environmental factors. Following are some questions related to restructuring:

#### **Governance**

This is management of the turnaround process at the district level, including identification of schools that will use a turnaround strategy, selection of turnaround leaders, and ongoing support and management of turnaround schools. What governance role should the district play during a school turnaround effort? How should the district oversee and support the turnaround leader? How much freedom to act should the district give turnaround leaders?

#### **Environmental Factors**

In addition to district governance, many factors outside the control of an individual school’s leader and staff affect the success of a turnaround attempt. How should the district and the school best engage the surrounding community in the turnaround effort? How much time should be provided for the change?

#### **Leadership Factors**

Research suggests that the turnaround leader is often the determining factor for a turnaround’s success or failure. Most often, a new leader is required for a successful turnaround. Recognizing the limitations of the school’s current leadership and selecting the right replacement are essential to the turnaround process. What are the characteristics to look for in a school turnaround leader? What specific actions do successful turnaround leaders take once they are on the job? How should the district assess a potential school leader’s qualifications?

#### **Organizational Factors**

ADE/School Effectiveness/School Improvement & Intervention\_09 SIG LEA App

One of the largest challenges of turnaround efforts is galvanizing staff members—old and new—under a new school leader. What do research and previous experience teach us about how to do this well? How important is replacing existing staff? How should remaining staff be managed and new staff trained to create a school culture that supports learning? What elements of school design are most important in turnaround schools? (p.9 of *Restructuring Handbook*)

The document, “*Turnarounds with New Leaders and Staff*,” published by the **Comprehensive Center for School Reform and Improvement**, addresses these four components in more detail. These four components are recommended to be considered as you complete the activities under **GETTING STARTED**.

### ***Arizona’s Definition of “Persistently Lowest Achieving” Schools***

**Tier I.** Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is:

3. Among the lowest-achieving 5 percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring  
**OR**
4. A high school that has not had a graduation rate of 60 percent or greater in any of the past three years.

**Tier II.** Any high school (high schools are defined as schools serving grades (9-12) eligible for but did not receive Title I funds that is

3. Among the lowest-achieving 5 percent of high schools  
**OR**
4. Has not had a graduation rate of 60 percent or greater in any of the past three years. **(Should it be 60% average over three years??)**

**Determining the Lowest-Achieving 5 Percent:** Arizona ranked schools using the single percentage method defined in federal guidance using current year test results (p. 5). Arizona also ranked schools by progress achieved. Progress was measured as the average annual change in percent proficient over the past three years. A school’s final ranking was determined by averaging the two ranks.

**Exceptions:** Schools identified as credit recovery were not included on the list. To be identified as credit recovery, a school had to have met the State Board’s definition of an alternative school, and to have identified itself through its publicly posted mission statement on its school report card as a credit recovery school.

**Link to “PLA” Definition on Arizona Department of Education’s Website:**

**<http://www.ade.az.gov/azlearns/aypdeterminations.asp>**

## PART II – FORMING YOUR TEAM

### *Identifying the LEA Restructuring Team*

The first major action is to form a district team. This team will be responsible for organizing and leading the restructuring process. Research and experience indicate that having a strong restructuring governance team is a key component of success.

This is a huge job. Big change takes a focus on student learning. The team must be committed to taking *new* approaches when previous efforts have not worked well enough for failing children.

Having a team is not enough if your superintendent and school board are not ready to support big changes with resolve. Even when top leadership—the superintendent or school board—initiates and leads the restructuring process, a team of people is needed to plan, execute, and monitor major change in multiple schools.

Keep this working team small enough to focus on action. Teams larger than seven members may have more trouble making decisions and taking action. Your district team may begin its work with only a few central office staff members. The remainder of Step 1 will help you add others.

One of your early steps will be including all important stakeholders in other ways. You also may choose to involve outside restructuring experts or process facilitators to help, either at this time or later. (*Taken from School Restructuring Handbook, p.18*)

Consider the following characteristics as you identify team members:

- Diverse representation—represent areas of student needs (special education, English language learners, community’s culture, administrative, teacher leaders, assessment/data person, other stakeholders)
- Experienced and successful with school improvement
- Strong skills in curriculum, instruction, and assessment
- Evidence of instructional leadership practices
- Good communication skills

**Tool #4**, below, is recommended as you identify your LEA team.

#### **Tool 4 - Restructuring Team Checklist**

**Team Members:** Who should be on your team to organize restructuring throughout the district? Readiness and willingness to drive major change are important, but credibility and district knowledge also are important.

**Lead Organizer:** In a smaller district, the superintendent may lead the team. In a larger district, this might be a deputy or assistant superintendent or other senior person who is ready and able to organize a major change process. In some cases, a credible outsider who is familiar with the district schools may be best. Strong team leadership skills are essential to keep the team motivated, informed, and productive through a challenging change process.

Qualifications to consider for your total working team include people with...

#### **A Drive for Results**

- A record of implementing change despite political and practical barriers

- An unyielding belief that all children—no matter how disadvantaged—can learn
- Organizing and planning skills to keep the decision process and implementation for each failing school on track

**Relationship and Influence Skills**

- Good relationships with a wide range of district staff, parents and community organizations
- Willingness and ability to disagree with others politely; a “thick skin”
- Teamwork skills to complete tasks responsibly and support team members
- Strong influence skills

**Readiness for Change**

- An open mind about ways to improve student learning
- Willingness to learn about what kinds of big changes work under differing circumstances
- Willingness to try new restructuring strategies
- No political agenda that may interfere with student learning-centered decisions

**Knowledge to do What Works** (or willingness to acquire it quickly)

- Knowledge of the formal and informal decision-making processes in your district
- Knowledge of past efforts to change and improve schools in your district
- Knowledge of education management, effective schools research and the like, with a focus on what has been proven to produce student learning results with disadvantaged children.

Consider using *Tool # 10* from the *School Restructuring Handbook* (see below)

**Tool 10 - Step 1 Organizer’s Checklist**

**A. Get Started**

- Decide who will be on the initial district restructuring team.
- Assess your district’s capacity to restructure low-performing schools directly.

**B. Plan Stakeholder Roles\*\***

- Make a plan to include stakeholders in choosing school restructuring strategies.
- Invite or notify stakeholders to participate as decided; *make additions to district restructuring team first, as decided.*

**C. Prepare Your Team to Perform**

- Determine leadership and roles on the district restructuring team.
- Determine whether and which external experts and facilitators are needed.
- Determine process for the district restructuring team.
- Create a standing agenda for district restructuring team meetings.

\*\*For additional information on involving stakeholders in the decision-making process, go to the section on Stakeholders in this document or in the *School Restructuring Handbook*.

**Tools (Available in *School Restructuring Handbook*)**

- *What Works When Restructuring Decision Tree*, Tool 3 (page 26)
- *Restructuring Team Checklist*, Tool 4 (page 27)

- Assessing Your District’s Capacity to Lead Change—a Guided SWOT Analysis, Tool 5 (page 28)
- District Behavior Shifts to Enable Success in Previously Unsuccessful Schools, Tool 6 (page 29)
- Restructuring Stakeholder Summary, Tool 7 (page 30)\*
- Restructuring Stakeholder Planner, Tool 8 (pages 31–32)\*
- Meeting Action Planner, Tool 9 (page 33)

\*These tools are included in this document, as well as the *School Restructuring Handbook*.

### Stakeholder Planner for Restructuring

**District:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

**School:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:**

- Fill in the names of the people completing the tool (District Leadership Team) and the date.
- Fill out requested information in columns below

**Name(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Stakeholders	Expected Stakeholder Reaction to Restructuring	Ways to Include Without Preventing Successful Restructuring
Principals		
Teachers		
Other School Staff		
District Administrators		
Students		
Parents		
Special Education		
ELL		
Community Groups:		
School Board		
Teacher Union		

External Experts		
Other		

**PART III – COLLECTING AND WORKING WITH YOUR DATA**

***Gathering Resource Materials***

**Gathering Data**

Determining the most effective model begins with a careful analysis of the data related to the desired changes. However, planners can get lost in the myriad data that are available. Carefully selecting the data to be used to determine not only the current status but also what the LEA will accept as evidence of success is critical. Consider using the following types of data points in setting the LEA’s long-term improvement goals and determining the success in reaching them.

**Individual Schools’ Performance Data**

- Online Reading and Math data can be located via common logon, then
  - AZ LEARNS/Adequate Yearly Progress
  - AYP/ AZ LEARNS Evaluations
  - 2008 2009 AYP/AZ Evaluations
- Provide reading, math, and writing data for all items on the “Individual Schools’ Student Performance Data Chart”.
- Include data for years 2007, 2008, and 2009.
- Not Meeting the Standard is the combined percent or number of students included in the “Approaches” and “Falls Far Below” categories.



**List of Potential Data available for Review**

<b>Student Achievement Data</b>	<b>Instructional Data</b>	<b>Family Support</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Standardized test scores, including AIMS, ACT, SAT, and others</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> District benchmark assessments, district averages, school and grade level averages</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Performance assessments, formative assessments</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Criterion-referenced tests, including those from test publishers</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Classroom grades</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Number of students receiving failing grades</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Student portfolios</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Readiness testing</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Promotion/retention rates</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Graduation/dropout rates</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Advanced placement, Honor Roll lists</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Special programs: special needs, Title I, gifted and talented</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Success in postsecondary schools</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Attendance, Tardies, Discipline referrals</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Data disaggregated by gender</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Classroom observation data</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation data by administrators</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Amount of time spent on subject areas</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Types of classroom assessments used</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Lesson plans</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Alignment of instruction with curriculum, assessments and state standards</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Time audit of instructional techniques</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> On-task time in classrooms</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Wait time for student responses</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Types of questions asked in class</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> How learning styles are addressed in instruction</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Instructional assistance available to students</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Grouping patterns for instruction</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Technology use during instruction</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Class size</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Student surveys about instructional strategies</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Graduate feedback on effectiveness of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Before and after-school programs</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Assistance with homework</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Number of homeless children</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Number of migrant children</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Single-parent households</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Socioeconomic level of families</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Education and background of parents</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Preschool experiences available</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Availability of technology in the home</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Information available to families about educational programs</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Communication methods between school and home</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Home visits by school personnel</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Parent-school associations</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Parent/family support and involvement in the school</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Parent attendance (e.g. conferences, other)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Surveys, such as the ‘What Works in Schools’ online survey</li> </ul>

<input type="checkbox"/> Data disaggregated by race/ethnicity <input type="checkbox"/> Data disaggregated by language proficiency <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	( <a href="http://www.whatworksinschools.org">www.whatworksinschools.org</a> ) or other Parent/Guardian/Community Surveys <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
---	--	---

<b>Community Support</b>	<b>School Climate/Environment</b>	<b>Organizational Data</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Recreational opportunities for students <input type="checkbox"/> Financial support provided to the school <input type="checkbox"/> Communications with the public <input type="checkbox"/> Human services available <input type="checkbox"/> Attendance at school events <input type="checkbox"/> School newsletters/news articles <input type="checkbox"/> Media coverage <input type="checkbox"/> Participation of community on advisory boards <input type="checkbox"/> Partnerships between school and business and industry <input type="checkbox"/> Scholarships from community organizations <input type="checkbox"/> Demographics of the community, including per capita income, race/ethnicity, attendance at public and private schools, home ownership, educational background, and age <input type="checkbox"/> Community use of school facilities <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting of student progress to the community <input type="checkbox"/> Community surveys on attitudes and	Feedback from community, parents, and students AND/OR <input type="checkbox"/> Surveys from parents and the community; <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Staff surveys</b> ; AND Surveys of student perceptions of: <input type="checkbox"/> Academic safety <input type="checkbox"/> Physical safety <input type="checkbox"/> Emotional safety <input type="checkbox"/> Sense of belonging <input type="checkbox"/> Peer relationships <input type="checkbox"/> Student-adult relationships <input type="checkbox"/> Conflict resolution processes <input type="checkbox"/> Rule violations <input type="checkbox"/> Counseling programs available <input type="checkbox"/> Student assistance programs <input type="checkbox"/> Student participation in extracurricular activities <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Identified vision and mission of the district and school <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Staff surveys</b> on collegiality, trust/confidence, accountability, risk-taking, communication, recognition, inquiry <input type="checkbox"/> Organizational surveys, such as the What Works In Schools Online Staff Survey ( <a href="http://www.whatworksinschools.org">www.whatworksinschools.org</a> ) <input type="checkbox"/> Professional development opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Staff surveys</b> of professional development effectiveness <input type="checkbox"/> Personnel evaluation processes <input type="checkbox"/> Internal communications and processes <input type="checkbox"/> Decision-making procedures <input type="checkbox"/> Planning processes <input type="checkbox"/> Support for innovations <input type="checkbox"/> Assistance programs available <input type="checkbox"/> Educational level of school personnel <input type="checkbox"/> Budget allocations and processes <input type="checkbox"/> District costs per student

<p>perceptions about school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Private/business/foundation contributions</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</li></ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Teacher loads and assignments</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Traditions</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Celebrations</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</li></ul>
--	--	--

## **What Does Your Data Tell You?**

- Gather all existing data for making observations about the data
- Look at the trends over time (over three or more years)
- Disaggregate by ethnicity, subgroups, gender, other relative groups
- Disaggregate by subject area

## **Observations, Discussion and Documentation**

What patterns do you observe in the data?

Study the data and discuss patterns that members see. Record the observations as “data findings” for all members to see. Be sure each statement indicates:

- What was the pattern and over what period of time?
- What was the source?
- Which subjects or skills?
- Which students?

## **Examples:**

- Percent of students at proficient and above has increased every year for the past three years for 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students with disabilities.
- Attendance rate was below 80% for girls in grades 6, 7, and 8.
- Mean math scales have increased for the past five years for all students in 10<sup>th</sup> grade, though less than one standard deviation.

Identify the possible root causes. When the team is creating their hypotheses, the focus needs to be on what the district and school have control over. This is not the time to place blame, but to determine those things that if changed, will have the most positive effect on student achievement.

## **Hypotheses**

What is it that you are doing that might contribute to these data patterns?

### **Hypotheses should:**

Be explanations that come from school and classroom factors

Be explanations about practices that can be altered

### **Hypotheses should NOT:**

Be regarding characteristics of individuals

Be explanations about unalterable factors

**Example:**

Instead of...	Use this...
These students are poor	Students of poverty are not gaining ample access to reading materials from our school

The following chart is an example of how the LEA Team may want to organize the information from the previous activities:

<b>Observations</b> <i>What patterns do we observe?</i>	<b>Hypotheses of Root Causes</b> <i>What do we do that might contribute to the patterns we see?</i>	<b>Solutions</b> <i>What could we do that might impact the data?</i>

**PART IV – CHOOSING YOUR MODEL**

**Selecting an Intervention Model**

- *Use the information and guiding questions below, in conjunction with your data analysis and analysis of LEA capacity, to determine the most appropriate model for your Tier I or Tier II school.*

The School Improvement Grant directs LEAs to select for their Tier I and Tier II schools one of four intervention models:

- Turnaround model:** The LEA replaces the principal (although the LEA may retain a recently hired principal where a turnaround, restart, or transformation was instituted in past two years) and rehiring no more than 50% of the staff; gives greater principal autonomy; implements other prescribed and recommended strategies;

- **Restart model:** The LEA converts or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, charter management organization, or education management organization;
- **School closure:** The LEA closes the school and enrolls the students in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving; or
- **Transformation model:** The LEA replaces the principal (although the LEA may retain a recently hired principal where a turnaround, restart, or transformation was instituted in past two years); implements a rigorous staff evaluation and development system; rewards staff who increase student achievement and/or graduation rates and removes staff who have not improved after ample opportunity; institutes comprehensive instructional reform; increases learning time and applies community-oriented school strategies; and provides greater operational flexibility and support for the school.

For most schools eligible for School Improvement Grants, the persistence of their low achievement calls for dramatically new governance structures, human capital, decision-making mechanisms, and operational practices. Change of this magnitude and immediacy is most likely through:

- Turnaround (infusion of talent and change in decision-making and operational practices); or
- Restart (change in governance and decision-making, an infusion of talent, and change in operational practices).

When the school's context and conditions do not suggest that a turnaround or restart is possible, the transformation model pertains and brings with it change in decision making, strategic staff replacement, and substantial improvement of operational practices. When the LEA (in consultation with the SEA) determines that the students attending a persistently low-achieving school may be better served by attending other schools, and when turnaround, restart, and transformation do not offer the certain promise of rapid improvement, the school is a candidate for closure.

### **The Turnaround Model**

Because the turnaround model relies principally upon an infusion of human capital, along with changes in decision-making and operational practice, the following considerations must be taken into account in determining if turnaround is the best fit for a persistently low-achieving school:

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA assign effective teachers and leaders to the lowest achieving schools?
3. How will the LEA begin to develop a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders to work in turnaround schools?
4. How will staff replacement be executed—what is the process for determining which staff remains in the school and for selecting replacements?
5. How will the language in collective bargaining agreements be negotiated to ensure the most talented teachers and leaders remain in the school?
6. What supports will be provided to staff being assigned to other schools?
7. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
8. What is the LEA's own capacity to execute and support a turnaround? What organizations are available to assist with the implementation of the turnaround model?

9. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the infusion of human capital?
10. What changes in operational practice must accompany the infusion of human capital, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

### **The Restart Model**

1. Are there qualified charter management organizations (CMOs) or education management organizations (EMOs) willing to partner with the LEA to start a new school (or convert an existing school) in this location?
2. Will qualified community groups initiate a homegrown charter school? The LEA is best served by developing relationships with community groups to prepare them for operating charter schools.
3. Based on supply and capacity, which option is most likely to result in acceptable student growth for the student population to be served—homegrown charter school, CMO, or EMO?
4. How can statutory, policy, and collective bargaining language relevant to the school be negotiated to allow for closure of the school and restart?
5. How will support be provided to staff that are reassigned to other schools as a result of the restart?
6. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
7. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the charter school with access to contractually specified district services and access to available funding?
8. How will the SEA assist with the restart?
9. What performance expectations will be contractually specified for the charter school, CMO, or EMO?
10. Is the LEA (or other authorizer) prepared to terminate the contract if performance expectations are not met?

### **The Transformation Model**

1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
2. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?
3. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
4. What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?
5. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

### **School Closure Model**

1. What are the metrics to identify schools to be closed?
2. What steps are in place to make certain closure decisions are based on tangible data and readily transparent to the local community?
3. How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?
4. Which higher-achieving schools have the capacity to receive students from the schools being considered for closure?
5. How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?
6. How will current staff be reassigned—what is the process for determining which staff members are dismissed and which staff members are reassigned?
7. Does the statutory, policy, and collective bargaining context relevant to the school allow for removal of current staff?

8. What supports will be provided to recipient schools if current staff members are reassigned?
9. What safety and security considerations might be anticipated for students of the school to be closed and the receiving school(s)?
10. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
11. How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?
12. What is the impact of school closure to the school's neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?
13. How does school closure fit within the LEA's overall reform efforts?

(The above information was taken from pp. 16-18 of the *Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants*)

## School Intervention Models

### Criteria Funding Matrix

<b>TURNAROUND / TRANSFORMATION MODELS:</b>		
Criteria – Required	Explanation	Allowable Budget Items
(i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates</li> </ul>	Turnaround Principal stipend.  Approved Intervention and Supplemental core materials, expository and narrative classroom and library books, and research-based instructional software.
(ii) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent;</li> <li>• Select new staff;</li> </ul>	Instructional Interventionist /Academic Coach
(iii) Implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May include financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions</li> </ul>	Teacher stipends for willingness to work in high-need school.  Performance-based stipends for teachers and administrators.

(iv) Provide staff with ongoing, high quality, job-embedded professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must be aligned with school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.</li> </ul>	<p>Targeted professional development for teachers, administrators and Leadership Team to attend ADE-approved trainings, including registration fees and related travel.</p> <p>Substitute teachers to enable local professional development days.</p>
(v) Adopt a new governance structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May include, but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Require school to report to a new “turnaround office” in the LEA or SEA.</li> <li>○ Hire a “turnaround leader” who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer.</li> <li>○ Enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA for added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	LEA School Improvement Coordinator to facilitate and oversee implementation of LEA's school improvement plan and site-based support/activities at Tier I, II & III schools.
(vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive assessments for screening, diagnosis, monitoring progress that inform instructional decisions.</li> <li>• Must be research-based and “vertically aligned” from one grade to the next and aligned with State academic standards.</li> </ul>	<p>Approved Assessments and Supplemental Assessments of comprehension-related student skills.</p> <p>Annual fee for processing student data.</p> <p>Training for new teachers.</p>
(vii) Continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources of student data include formative, interim, and summative assessments.</li> </ul>	Assessment Coordinator / Data Entry Specialist
(viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased learning time” means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Instruction in core academic subjects.</li> <li>○ Instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education.</li> <li>○ Teacher collaboration, planning, and professional development within and across grades and subjects.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Teacher salary stipends for before- and after-school tutoring, intersession and summer school instructional programs.</p> <p>Substitute Teachers to enable teacher collaborative time days.</p> <p>Stipends for teachers for team planning, lesson design, data analysis, preparation of common assessments, review of instructional strategies.</p> <p>Full-day kindergarten or prekindergarten programs.</p>
(ix) Provide appropriate social-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnering with parents and parent</li> </ul>	Behavior Interventionist / Parent

<p>emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.</p>	<p>organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs</p>	<p>Engagement Specialist to work with family involvement action teams (FIAT).</p> <p>Summer transition programs or freshman academies.</p> <p>IGA/Contract/Partnership to provide identified need-based support services to students.</p>
---	--	---

## Step 2

### **PART V – WHAT IS OUR CAPACITY TO IMPLEMENT THE MODEL?**

#### ***Determining LEA's Capacity to Implement the Model(s)***

- ***Review the tools, process and data collected in Step I of this guidance***
- ***The LEA Team needs to complete the chart in the application, Section B., pages 2-8 of the SIG LEA Application packet***

This grant makes possible the opportunity to implement significant changes in order to dramatically improve student performance, however, grants will only be awarded to LEAs who demonstrate the capacity to fully implement a selected model. (Tier I and Tier II).

The School Improvement and Intervention Section will be using a rubric to evaluate all applications (this rubric is included at the end of this guidance for your reference). Be specific as possible. If the evidence is not cited, we will assume it is not in place and your application may be rejected.

**Note:** All indicators are based on the Arizona LEA Standards and Rubrics, School Restructuring Under No Child Left Behind by CSRI; the Federal Guidance for the School Improvement Grants; and current research on Turnaround Models.

## **PART VI – COMPLETING THE APPLICATION**

### ***Directions for Completing the Application***

There is one application for all LEAs with Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. This one application is used even if you are an LEA with only Tier III schools. If you are applying to implement one of the four models in your Tier I and/or Tier II schools, you need to complete all the sections of the application. The LEA Team will need to analyze the data for each school included in its application. If you only have Tier III schools that you are applying for, Sections A.1-A.3, C.1-C.3, E.2-E.4, F.1, G.1,H, I and J need to be completed.

*Guidance: Fill in the information, paying careful attention to providing working email and phone contacts. These individuals will be our primary contact for the grant.*

<b>LEA Name:</b>	
<b>Superintendent:</b>	<b>Federal Programs Director:</b>
<b>LEA Contact Information</b>	
<b>Mailing Address:</b>	<b>Email address:</b>
<b>Telephone number:</b>	<b>Superintendent</b>
<b>Fax:</b>	<b>Fed. Prog. Director</b>

### **IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS**

*Guidance: Fill in the names of the schools in improvement in your district. At right, mark appropriate Tier for each school.*

<b>School Name</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>

**Where are we now?**

**A.1. Who are we? (as an LEA, school, staff, and community)**

*Guidance: Use existing descriptions where possible; i.e. board member application, teacher application, web page items which describe the district? Once all of the descriptions have been compiled, edit to ensure all parts of the question are addressed.*

- Provide a brief description of the LEA and each school to be served using School Improvement Grant funds. Explain how the LEA and school(s) are organized; describe the characteristics of the student population, the teaching and administrative staff; and discuss the level of community involvement and parent engagement.

--

**A.2 How do we do operate and do business at the LEA and school levels?**

*Guidance: Copy and paste from the answer above into this section. For each part of the description of the school community, provide an appropriate comment about climate, culture, values, and beliefs. (What is the mission statement? Have core values and beliefs been identified for the district.... for each individual school?)*

- Based on the description in A.1, provide a brief description of the climate, culture, values and beliefs that are part of the LEA and schools.

--

**A.3 How are our students doing?**

*Guidance: Please review data collected in Step 1 of this guidance. Consider all information about the students including:*

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Student Achievement: overall proficiency in reading and math over a number of years (three or more)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Attendance: attendance percentage of the school (three or more years)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Drop-out Rate: What is the drop-out rate of the school for the last three (or more) years?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Ethnicity: What is the percentage of students in various ethnicity categories?</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Gender: male/female percentage numbers</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Grade Level: What are the grade levels that the school serves?</i>
--	--

- Provide detailed summary of the student data for each Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III school. Include data documents or reports as attachments.

## B. DESCRIPTION OF LEA'S CAPACITY

### B.1 How effective are our processes?

*Guidance: Analysis of LEA's Capacity.*

1. Convene the current LEA Leadership Team to complete the LEA Capacity Indicators.
2. Citing specific evidence, data, resources, etc, complete each indicator describing what is currently in place (Column 1); what is currently lacking in the LEA systems (Column 2); and what it would take to put it in place or improve upon it.(Column 3)
3. In Column 4 rank the LEA\* based on the LEA's ability to create quick, dramatic change. Use the following rating scale:

*3 = It's already in place. Choose this if the system is currently in place as of spring 2010. It is working well and needs little modifications or changes.*

*2 = It can be put in place in 2010-2011. Choose this if it is possible to immediately put this system in place for this coming school year. By the end of the year, this indicator will be fully functional and working.*

*1 = It will be difficult to put into place. Choose this if it can be put into place by June 2011. There are major hurdles to overcome in order for this to be a reality.*

**Below is a sample chart. Complete ALL the indicators in the application.**

- LEA demonstrates 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 required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

*\*Key for last column: 3= it's already in place; 2= we can put it in place in 2010-2011; 1= it will be difficult to put in place*

Behavior for successful restructuring of persistently low achieving schools	What are the strengths? What is in place?	What are the weaknesses? What is lacking in the system?	What changes will be made to address the weaknesses and improve on the strengths?	Rate the LEA for its capacity to create change for each of the indicators*:
<b>Standard 1: Leadership Systems</b>				
Administrators are chosen for getting results, influencing				<i>What data do you have to support your rating?</i>

others and willingness to change				<i>What other evidence do you have?</i>
----------------------------------	--	--	--	---

**Note:** All indicators are based on the Arizona LEA Standards and Rubrics, School Restructuring Under No Child Left Behind by CSRI; the Federal Guidance for the School Improvement Grants; and current research on Turnaround Models.

## **B.2. Describe the actions the LEA has taken or will take to address the following:**

*Guidance: The following section, B., has four questions to be answered relating to four topics.*

### ***Design and Implement Interventions***

*This section should be completed at the LEA level with consideration given to input from stakeholders of identified schools, which would include the formulation of a comprehensive committee to identify and prioritize all steps in the implementation process. This section should consist of a detailed developed assessment of data that has been thoroughly analyzed by the LEA Leadership Team. Prioritize the identified focus areas. Each identified focused area that is addressed by the implementation plan **should include a general** timeline.*

*In completing the areas related to actions the LEA has taken, and those the LEA will take, these actions should be pertinent and essential to the implementation process with direct emphasis on supporting the chosen model. The following should be included:*

- *distribution of financial support*
- *significant changes in teaching and learning*
- *curricular needs*
- *recruitment and retention of highly effective staff*
- *the evaluation and use of data and assessment*
- *comprehensive professional development plan aligned to instruction and learning needs*
- *the monitoring process to be used*
- *adjustments in facilities*
- *parental and community engagement*

**Screen and Select External Providers – *Is there new guidance for this section? If so, we should compare to ensure the following is correct:***

*The LEAs should develop a complete process that explicitly outlines the appropriation and use of external providers in this section. This section should address the screening process to be used for selecting all external providers that will support the chosen model, steps, and implementation plan. The selection should run parallel with established internal procedures and guidelines, as well as, follow any SEA established guides and policies.*

*Selecting an external provider should include:*

- *Identified procedures & guidelines*
- *Data indicating the effectiveness of the external provider*

### ***Alignment of Other Resources***

*This section should describe any additional resources (e.g. financial resources, additional grants, facilities, programs, etc.) that will be used that are external to the grant but will contribute to the implementation process. A description of these resources and the supplemental support they will provide to each intervention should be included in this section.*

*The additional resources should include:*

- *Specific requirements of additional resources (grants, programs, etc.)*
- *How will the resource(s) compliment the chosen model?*
- *What is the purpose and intent of the supplemental resource/program?*
- *Who does this resource target or support?*
- *What are the procedures and guidelines for implementation of the program/resource?*
- *Are there any specific monitoring or reporting requirements or expected outcomes?*
- *Are there pre-existing agreements which could influence implementation of the model selected (e.g. IGA, other)*

**Modification of Policies**

*In order to implement certain plans or parts of plans a modification of internal policies may be needed. Identify changes in existing policies, procedures and practices that will need to be made in order to fully implement the chosen model. The modifications should also identify the responsible person(s) for either implementing or creating the policy changes along with the timeline for full or partial policy implementation. The changes should directly support the chosen model, step, and implementation plan created.*

*Modifications of policies may include the following areas:*

- *Staffing prioritization changes*
- *Budgetary reallocations*
- *Professional development additional needs*
- *Redirection of staff evaluation focus and process*
- *Modification of bargaining unit agreements*
- *Adjustment or revision of calendar*

**B.2. Describe the actions the LEA has taken or will take to address the following:**

*Guidance: Answer the following questions using the guidance that was provided for each section of this table. Each answer should include as much detail as possible and take into account actions at the district level as well as actions for each individual school that will apply for SIG funding:*

	<b>Actions LEA has taken:</b>	<b>Actions LEA will take: Include a general timeline</b>
--	-------------------------------	--

<b>Design and implement interventions aligned with the requirements of the selected model;</b>		
<b>Describe the process the LEA will use to screen and select quality external providers;</b>		
<b>Alignment of other resources;</b>		
<b>Policies and Practices LEA will modify to enable its schools to implement the selected intervention(s) fully and effectively</b>		

**C. ROOT CAUSES**

**How did we get to this place?**

After the data has been examined and analyzed the LEA must determine the root causes from the results. Based on the analyzed information, examine possible reasons for current level of performance. This requires the LEA to move from problem identification to problem solving.

**C.1 Provide the conclusions the LEA has reached, that is based on the analyzed data from the previous section.**

- Include the data used for analysis, the observations, findings, identified root causes, and conclusions reached by the team.

--

*C.2 Guidance: Identify the strengths, needs and barriers of the LEA and its schools. Based on the previous analysis, identify in what areas the students excel and in what areas the students need help. Be specific in identifying subgroups and grade levels.*

*Based on the previous analysis, identify the areas that the LEA and school(s) have established systems in place that help facilitate increased student achievement; i.e. strong policies, aligned curriculum, evaluation of staff, data warehouse system, etc. Identify systems that are inhibiting student progress. Refer to the School Improvement Standards and Rubrics Self-Assessment data and the school(s)'ASIP prioritized areas of need addressing student learning, assessment, culture and climate, parent engagement, etc.*

*Based on the previous analysis, identify any school or district barriers that are impeding the school improvement process, such as district policies, culture or climate concerns, school board and community concerns, association contracts, etc.*

**C.2 Identify the strengths, needs and barriers of the LEA and schools.**

*Student Strengths*


*System Strengths*


*Student Needs*


*System Needs*


*School Barriers*


*District Barriers*


C.3.

**C.3 Provide an outline of the steps the district will take to address the needs and barriers of the school, as well as, the district's needs and barriers in supporting this school:**

--

**C.4 Identify the intervention model that is chosen for each Tier I and/or Tier II school. Provide a brief justification - including how student achievement will be improved by this model.**

*Guidance: Identify the intervention model. Each model has specific mandatory components, time frames, and structures. Include in the justification why this model was chosen based on the previously stated data and information, how this particular model will provide significantly increased student achievement, or how this model will provide structures to enable the LEA to move forward.*

--

## D. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

**D.1 Identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.** (The model is identified after the team analyzes the data, identifies the schools’ needs and examines LEA capacity to serve the school.)

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	INTERVENTION MODEL CHOSEN			
				turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

**D.2 Prioritize, by need, the district’s TIER III schools:**

*Guidance: Identify and prioritize Tier III schools. Every school in Title I school improvement that has not been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school is considered a Tier III school. Funding will be given based on the LEA’s ability to provide the capacity to create change. See E.2 for guidance on how to prioritize Tier III schools.*

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	AYP Designation	Area of Need(s) Based on 2009 AIMS Assessment

**D.3 If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I and/or Tier II school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each school:**

*Guidance: Lack of Capacity Statement. An LEA is responsible for improving the quality of its schools and increasing student achievement. The School Improvement and Intervention Section of ADE is dedicated to helping LEAs provide the highest quality of instruction and attainment of student achievement possible. If an LEA does not believe they have the capacity to serve their schools, ADE will help to provide the support needed for 2010-2011 so that in the upcoming years the LEA may re-apply for funding. Provide below the information needed to explain why the LEA is unable to implement any of the four models at this time. ADE will determine the LEA’s capacity for implementation and take the necessary steps to ensure the LEA has the capacity for the following year. **If an LEA has both Tier I and Tier III schools, they must implement a Tier I model in order to receive any additional funding for their Tier III schools.***

## E. LEA'S ACCOUNTABILITY

**E.1 Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading, math and or graduation rate that have been established in order to monitor the Tier I and Tier II schools. Using the Analysis of Data completed in A.3., complete the following for each Tier I and/or Tier II school being served:**

*Guidance: Beginning with the goal area: Reading/Language Arts on B.5, cite, under the topic "Goal Area", what the goals are for Reading/Language Arts for each subgroup and for all students; then, do the same for math and graduation rate. In creating the goals, be sure to use the results of the previous data analysis and the percent proficient requirements, as that will inform the team as to whether significant changes are needed for the whole school or for a specific grade and/or sub-group, (see page 38, "School Restructuring Under No Child Left Behind: What Works When?").*

Goal Area	Goals	Baseline
Reading		<i>What level of proficiency, (percentage), are students currently performing?</i>
Math		<i>What level of proficiency, (percentage), are students currently performing?</i>
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)		<i>What level of proficiency, (percentage), are students currently graduating?</i>

For each Goal in:	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person(s) Responsible
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Process</b></p> <p><i>Describe how students' progress will be monitored/checked, ( what assessments, programs, software will teachers use to determine how each student is progressing)</i></p> <p><i>Also, describe how decisions will be made as to HOW instruction needs to change AND what else needs to be done as a result of the progress</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Timeline</b></p> <p><i>How often each type of progress monitoring will occur AND</i></p> <p><i>How often AND how progress monitoring data will be used to inform instruction</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Position, Name</i></p> <p><i>(responsible for progress monitoring and for using the results to inform instruction)</i></p>

	<i>monitoring results.</i>		
<b>Reading</b>			
<b>Math</b>			
<b>Graduation Rate</b>	<i>High Schools only</i>		

**E.2 Using the prioritized list developed in D.2, provide a description of the support that the LEA will provide to each Tier III school. Include the interventions provided by level of need.**

*Guidance on Identification of Tier III school: The LEA will identify the Tier III schools in the district using the same criteria as Tier I and Tier II schools:*

- *Absolute performance on AIMS (three year trend)*
- *Student growth (three year trend)*

*The LEA will prioritize the Tier III schools based on need from highest to lowest.*

<b><i>Highest Need</i></b>	<b><i>Medium Need</i></b>	<b><i>Lowest Need</i></b>
<i>Low student achievement and/or growth but showing movement up, capacity is there but needs support, sustainability questionable, resources available but not fully utilized, data gathered but not focused to drive instruction, consistently in school improvement, leadership is struggling to develop a model of collaboration</i>	<i>Student achievement and growth show improvement but may not be at level where it should be, school has capacity and ability to sustain changes, resources available and utilized, data utilized but not consistently to drive instruction, in school improvement for three or less years, adequate instructional leadership and some staff are using a collaborative model</i>	<i>Student achievement and growth on upward trend and at acceptable levels, school demonstrates capacity and sustainability, resources utilized, data drives instruction, strong parental involvement, in school improvement for three or less years, strong leadership and collaborative environment</i>

*The LEA will provide a description of the support it will provide its Tier III schools based on the level of need. This support **may include, but is not required to include**, the choice of one of the four models. (Top priority will be given to those LEAs that commit to a chosen model as long as the LEA provides substantial evidence of LEA/school capacity to fully implement the chosen model). Other LEA support choices can be internal and/or external and be funded or non-funded support. The support will include timelines based on the level of need as well as the support provided.*

*Examples of other LEA support may include:*

- *The LEA will work with staff on development and analysis of quarterly benchmarks, a progress monitoring process, and student interventions based on assessment data.*
- *The LEA will provide training on the use and analysis of different types of data, especially data from formative and summative assessments, to develop appropriate lessons and units, as well as modify instructional practice.*
- *The LEA will supply release time for staff development to focus on specific instructional strategies, differentiated instruction, Structured English Immersion (SEI), time-on-task, as well as time for staff to collaborate on effective instructional practices.*
- *The LEA will provide release time to support district mentoring, peer coaching and K-12 horizontal and vertical curriculum articulation, evaluate current curricular programs*
- *The LEA will provide funding for proven data supported programs.*

- *The LEA will meet with site leadership monthly or more frequently as needed*
- *The LEA will assist in revising and updating the Arizona School Improvement Plan through technical assistance, meeting with the leadership team, and reviewing the needs assessment and priorities of the school.*
- *The LEA will review data quarterly with the site leadership.*

**E.2 Using the prioritized list developed in D.2, provide a description of the support that the LEA will provide to each Tier III school. Include the interventions provided by level of need.**

School	Level of Need			Describe LEA Support (Internal and/or External) Funded and non-Funded support	Timeline
	Highest	Medium	Lowest		

*E.3 See guidance for E.1*

**E.3 Describe the annual goals the LEA has established in order to hold accountable your Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.**

Goal Area	Goals	Baseline	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person Responsible
			Process	Timeline	
Reading/Language Arts					
Math					
Graduation Rate					

**E.4 Describe the LEA’s technical assistance plan for schools that do not achieve the progress that is expected.**

*Guidance: In a brief format, outline the steps the LEA will take to hold the schools accountable for their progress in either implementing the chosen model or implementing the stated interventions. Explain the evaluation process the LEA will use to ensure that the chosen model/interventions will be implemented with fidelity. Explain how the LEA will provide ongoing technical assistance and monitoring throughout the year to ensure quality of implementation. Explain the outcome actions/consequences the LEA will take if the school does not make the significant student achievement that is expected.*

## F. BUDGET

### BUDGET DEVELOPMENT

➤ *Teri? Is this the excel spreadsheet below that they will receive?*

**Attachments to support budget work:**

- Criteria Funding Matrix (this was included in Step I as part of the guidance)
- Sample Budget

➤ *A formal budget will be completed on ADE's Grant Management System that needs to include the following information (this will be completed only after the LEA Application and the ALEAT Action Plan are completed and approved by the School Improvement Section. Use this excel spreadsheet to estimate the costs necessary to fully implement the chosen model/interventions*

### LEA Name

### LEA SIG 1003(g) Budget and Line Item Detail Descriptions Turnaround / Transformation Models

<u>Line Item</u>	<u>School SIG 1003(g) Budget</u>	<u>Line Item Detail Descriptions / Explanations</u>
<b>Instruction 1000</b>		
		\$
Salaries	6100	-
Employee Benefits	6200	
Purchased Professional Services	6300	
Purchased Property Services	6400	
Other Purchased Services	6500	
Supplies	6600	
Other Expenses	6800	
		\$
Sub-total		-
<b>Support Services 2100, 2200, 2600 – 2900</b>		
		\$
Salaries	6100	-
Employee Benefits	6200	
Purchased Professional Services	6300	
Purchased Property Services	6400	
Other Purchased Services	6500	
Supplies	6600	
Other Expenses	6800	
Sub-total		

**Support Services - Admin 2300, 2400, 2500**

Salaries	6100
Employee Benefits	6200
Purchased Professional Services	6300
Purchased Property Services	6400
Other Purchased Services	6500
Supplies	6600
Other Expenses	6800
Sub-total	

**Indirect Cost**

Restricted Indirect Cost Rate	6910
-------------------------------	------

**Capital Outlay**

Property	6700
----------	------

**Total**


---

<sup>1/</sup> Footnotes:

**F. Using the Budget Excel spreadsheet, provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to –**

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

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

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000.

Attach LEA budget as an appendix.

**G. SUSTAINABILITY**

*Guidance: Once identified as a Tier I, II, or III school for 2010, the LEA will receive funding for three years. To ensure that continuous school improvement and reform continues, after the funding from federal dollars end, it is necessary for the LEA to provide evidence that there is capacity for district and school sustainability. For ideas and resources see pp. 85-86 of the **Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants**). Below are some ideas to think about as the LEA plans for sustainability.*

1. *Invite faculty and community input in the planning stage and subsequently seek continued support and involvement of all stakeholders to ensure continuity of the reform effort.*

2. *Create contingency plans to address possible changes in staffing and resources.*
3. *Ensure that new staff is committed to adopting the reform measures.*
4. *Provide dedicated time and space for teams of educators to seek ways to maintain reforms and identify strategies for further improvement.*
5. *Provide professional development to educators on how to engage in ongoing problem solving, thereby establishing a culture geared toward continuous improvement.*

**G. Describe your plan for sustaining these efforts after the funding period ends? Address in your plan: funding sources, hiring practices, professional development, changes in policies and practices.**

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

By indicating with a mark on the below items, the \_\_\_\_\_ **District or Charter Holder name** \_\_\_\_\_ fully and completely assures 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 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;
- If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements

**I. 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.**

**Arizona Department of Education has applied, through its SEA level application, for all of the Waivers offered for the School Improvement Grant. If Arizona receives approval for these waivers, all waivers automatically apply to any LEA in the state.**

The LEA must indicate 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.

\_\_\_\_\_ **District or Charter Holder** \_\_\_\_\_ will implement the below marked waivers:

Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds. School(s): \_\_\_\_\_

“Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model. School(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold. School(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**J. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement intervention models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.**

*Guidance: Before submitting its application for School Improvement Grant, the LEA must consult with all relevant stakeholders. Use the chart below to help with the consultation process. Then complete section J.*

**District:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**School:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Stakeholder Summary for Restructuring**

**Instructions:** Use this tool to make a stakeholder plan.

- Fill in the names of the people completing the tool (District Leadership Team) and the date.
- Review the list of possible stakeholders in the far left column.
- Use Tool 8 Restructuring Stakeholder Planner on pages 31–32 to decide how you will involve various stakeholders.
- Record your decisions here or use this as a checklist to ensure you have planned for all important stakeholders.

**Name(s):** \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Stakeholders	Representatives’ Role(s) in Restructuring Decisions	Communication Plan for All Stakeholders	
		Action	Date Completed
Principals			
Teachers			
Other School Staff			
District Administrators			

Students			
Parents			
Special Education			
ELL			
Community Groups:			
School Board			
Teacher Union			
External Experts			
Other			

**J. Before submitting its application for School Improvement Grant, the LEA must consult with all relevant stakeholders.**

The LEA has consulted with the following stakeholders:


**PART II.**

**K. The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II schools identified in the LEA’s application.**

**Part 3 Guidance:**

**ACTION PLAN**

*Once the LEA has an Approved LEA Application, the team will need to complete the following on the ALEAT system: (Your LEA Improvement Education Program Specialist will assist you with this)*

- **To be completed in ALEAT Plan. The first step is to ensure that all parties responsible for the implementation of the improvement process that will need access to ALEAT have access. Send a list of these names to ADE Technical Support for the ALEAT link to be put on their common-logon access. If they currently do not have access to common-logon, that is the LEAs decision as to the level of responsibility that is to be granted.**

- **Once ALEAT link has been provided on common-logon, contact Tee Lambert in Title I for the password to access ALEAT for the first time. Once the LEA is able to gain access to the site follow the directions below. Title I LEAs will already have completed Goals 1-8 for 2009-2010. (If the LEA is not a Title I LEA, contact your LEA Improvement Education Program Specialist to assist you in the following process.)**
- **On ALEAT, add a Goal #9: Title it: School Improvement. Flag the goal, strategies, and action steps as “Restructuring” (This goal will be accepted by your LEA Improvement Specialist)**
- **Write a smart goal for the overarching outcome that is to be achieved in the 2010-2011 school year.**
- **Write a strategy for each individual school that is in school improvement in either Tier I, II, or III.**
- **Write specific action steps that will be taken that were provided in the approved application. Include in the action steps the person responsible, budget estimations, professional development needed, etc. Status updates will be required quarterly and monitored consistently by ADE.**

## Criteria Funding Matrix School Intervention Models Preliminary Budget

**School Name:**

**Tier:**

**TURNAROUND / TRANSFORMATION MODELS:**

Criteria – Required	Explanation	Allowable Budget Items
(i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates</li> </ul>	Turnaround Principal stipend. Approved Intervention and Supplemental core materials, expository and narrative classroom and library books, and research-based instructional software.
(ii) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent;</li> <li>· Select new staff;</li> </ul>	Instructional Interventionist /Academic Coach
(iii) Implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· May include financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions</li> </ul>	Teacher stipends for willingness to work in high-need school. Performance-based stipends for teachers and administrators.
(iv) Provide staff with ongoing, high quality, job-embedded professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Must be aligned with school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.</li> </ul>	Targeted professional development for teachers, administrators and Leadership Team to attend ADE-approved trainings, including registration fees and related travel. Substitute teachers to enable local professional development days.
(v) Adopt a new governance structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· May include, but is not limited to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Require school to report to a new “turnaround office” in the LEA or SEA.</li> <li>o Hire a “turnaround leader” who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer.</li> <li>o Enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA for added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	LEA School Improvement Coordinator to facilitate and oversee implementation of LEA's school improvement plan and site-based support/activities at Tier I, II & III schools.

**TURNAROUND / TRANSFORMATION MODELS:**

Criteria – Required	Explanation	Allowable Budget Items
(vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Comprehensive assessments for screening, diagnosis, monitoring progress that inform instructional decisions.</li><li>· Must be research-based and “vertically aligned” from one grade to the next and aligned with State academic standards.</li></ul>	Approved Assessments and Supplemental Assessments of comprehension-related student skills. Annual fee for processing student data.  Training for new teachers.
(vii) Continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Sources of student data include formative, interim, and summative assessments.</li></ul>	Assessment Coordinator / Data Entry Specialist
(viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Increased learning time” means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Instruction in core academic subjects.</li><li>o Instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education.</li><li>o Teacher collaboration, planning, and professional development within and across grades and subjects.</li></ul></li></ul>	Teacher salary stipends for before- and after-school tutoring, intersession and summer school instructional programs.  Substitute Teachers to enable teacher collaborative time days. Stipends for teachers for team planning, lesson design, data analysis, preparation of common assessments, review of instructional strategies. Full-day kindergarten or prekindergarten programs.
(ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students’ social, emotional, and health needs</li></ul>	Behavior Interventionist / Parent Engagement Specialist to work with family involvement action teams (FIAT). Summer transition programs or freshman academies. IGA/Contract/Partnership to provide identified need-based support services to students.

**Total:**

**TURNAROUND / TRANSFORMATION MODELS:**

Criteria – Required	Explanation	Allowable Budget Items
---------------------	-------------	------------------------

**RESTART MODEL:**

Criteria – Required	Explanation	Allowable Budget Items
---------------------	-------------	------------------------

Convert or close school and reopen under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organizaion (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.	A restart school must enroll, withing the grades it serves, all formter students who wish to attend the school.	
---	---	--

**CLOSURE MODEL:**

Criteria – Required	Explanation	Allowable Budget Items
---------------------	-------------	------------------------

LEA Closes a school and enrolls the sudents who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. Schools must be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include but not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.	LEA may use SIG funds to pay certain reasonable and necessary costs associated with closing a Tier I or Tier II school	Parent and community outreach and or meetings, transition services to parents and students, student and parent orientation activities;
---	--	--

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total



**LEA / Charter Holder Name**

**School Improvement Grant (SIG) Budget Summary**

**Turnaround / Transformation Models**

<u>Line Item</u>		LEA SIG 1003(g) Budget Totals	School Budgets			LEA Budget
			School #1 Name	School #2 Name	School #3 Name	
<b>Instruction 1000</b>						
Salaries	6100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Employee Benefits	6200	-	-	-	-	-
Purchased Professional Services	6300	-	-	-	-	-
Purchased Property Services	6400	-	-	-	-	-
Other Purchased Services	6500	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies	6600	-	-	-	-	-
Other Expenses	6800	-	-	-	-	-
Sub-total		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Support Services 2100, 2200, 2600 - 2900</b>						
Salaries	6100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Employee Benefits	6200	-	-	-	-	-
Purchased Professional Services	6300	-	-	-	-	-
Purchased Property Services	6400	-	-	-	-	-
Other Purchased Services	6500	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies	6600	-	-	-	-	-
Other Expenses	6800	-	-	-	-	-
Sub-total		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Support Services - Admin 2300, 2400, 2500</b>						
Salaries	6100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Employee Benefits	6200	-	-	-	-	-
Purchased Professional Services	6300	-	-	-	-	-
Purchased Property Services	6400	-	-	-	-	-
Other Purchased Services	6500	-	-	-	-	-
Supplies	6600	-	-	-	-	-
Other Expenses	6800	-	-	-	-	-
Sub-total			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>Indirect Cost</b>						
Restricted Indirect Cost Rate	6910	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Capital Outlay</b>						
Property	6700	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	
<b>Total</b>		\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	

<sup>1/</sup> Footnotes:

**LEA Name**

**LEA SIG 1003(g) Budget and Line Item Detail Descriptions**

**Turnaround / Transformation Models**

<u>Line Item</u>		<u>School SIG 1003(g) Budget</u>		<u>Line Item Detail Descriptions / Explanations</u>
<b>Instruction 1000</b>				
Salaries	6100	\$	-	
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$	-	
<b>Support Services 2100, 2200, 2600 - 2900</b>				
Salaries	6100	\$	-	
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$	-	
<b>Support Services - Admin 2300, 2400, 2500</b>				
Salaries	6100			
Employee Benefits	6200		-	
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$	-	
<b>Indirect Cost</b>				
Restricted Indirect Cost Rate	6910	\$	-	
<b>Capital Outlay</b>				
Property	6700			
<b>Total</b>		\$	-	

<sup>1/</sup> Footnotes:



This is incomplete and needs to be re-entered by Teri.

**Part VII – ADE/SII Rubric for Use in Evaluating Applications**

- The rubric ADE/SII staff will use to evaluate the application

**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.

<b>A. LEA’S ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL NEEDS</b>				
<b>Fully Addressed 4/ 5</b>	<b>Partially Addressed 2/3</b>	<b>Not Addressed 0/1</b>	<b>School 1</b>	<b>School 2</b>
1. LEA description includes a detailed description of location characteristics, demographic information, size and composition of staff, and community resources disaggregated by school.	1. LEA description includes an adequate description of location characteristics, demographic information, size and composition of staff, and community resources disaggregated by school.	1. LEA description does not include a description of location characteristics, demographic information, size and composition of staff, and community resources disaggregated by school.	Score: Rationale:	Score: Rationale:
2. Culture and Climate of LEA and schools are thoroughly described. Includes references to mission, vision, values and beliefs. Strengths as well as challenges are described.	2. Culture and Climate of LEA and schools are adequately described. Includes limited references to mission, vision, values and beliefs. Strengths are described but not challenges.	2. Culture and Climate of LEA and schools are loosely described. Includes no references to mission, vision, values and beliefs. Neither strengths nor challenges are described.	Score: Rationale:	Score: Rationale:
3. Data analysis was done using multiple sources of data (student achievement, school process, perceptions and demographics). Reports & documents are attached.	3. Data analysis was done using a couple of sources of data (student achievement, school process, perceptions and demographics). Reports & documents are attached.	3. Data analysis was not complete.	Score: Rationale:	Score: Rationale:

4. Data trends were identified using data from 2007, 2008, and 2009. Data was used to identify the needs of each Tier I and Tier II School. Reports & documents are attached.	4. Data trends were identified using data. Some data was used to identify the needs of each Tier I and Tier II School. Reports & documents are attached.	4. Data was not used to identify the needs of each Tier I and Tier II schools	Score: Rationale:	Score: Rationale:
5. Needs assessment was completed by LEA team using provided process and protocols. Included classroom observations, surveys, and principal/ teacher interviews. Site visit was conducted.	5. Needs assessment was completed using process and protocols. Some items were not gathered. Site visit conducted.	5. Needs assessment was not completed by LEA.	Score: Rationale:	Score: Rationale:
6. A detailed description of the student learning (observations) of each Tier I and Tier II school to be served is provided. (based on site visit classroom walkthroughs)	6. An adequate description of the student learning (observations) of each Tier I and Tier II school to be served is provided. (based on site visit classroom walkthroughs)	6. No description of the student learning (observations) of each Tier I and Tier II school to be served was provided.	Score: Rationale:	Score: Rationale:

**School Improvement Grant**

**BASELINE DATA (To be submitted with SIG LEA Application)**

An SEA must report these metrics for the school year prior to implementing the intervention, if the data are available, to serve as a baseline, and for each year thereafter for which the SEA allocates school improvement funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. With respect to a school that is closed, the SEA need report only the identity of the school and the intervention taken--i.e., school closure.

<b>SCHOOL DATA</b>	<b>BASELINE</b>	
	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010 (If available)</b>
Which intervention the school used (i.e., turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation )		
AYP status		
Which AYP targets the school met and missed		
School improvement status		
Number of minutes within the school year		
<b>STUDENT OUTCOME/ACADEMIC PROGRESS DATA</b>		
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics (e.g., Basic, Proficient, Advanced), by grade and by student subgroup		
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup		
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup		
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency		

Graduation rate		
Dropout rate		
Student attendance rate		
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes		
College enrollment rates		
<b>STUDENT CONNECTION AND SCHOOL CLIMATE</b>		
Discipline incidents		
Truants		
<b>TALENT</b>		
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system		
Teacher attendance rate		

## PART VIII - LINKS TO RESOURCES

\*\*One of the reference materials available is, “*School Restructuring Under No Child Left Behind: What Works When? A Guide for Educational Leaders.*” After certain sections below you will see page numbers in parenthesis. These page numbers will refer to the above handbook. An additional resource, “*Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants,*” can be downloaded from the following site; <http://www.centerii.org/handbook/> .

### **Data Quality Campaign**

<http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/>

### **Mass Insight Education – Meeting the Turnaround Challenge**

<http://www.massinsight.org/turnaround/reports.aspx>

### **Center on Instruction**

<http://www.centeroninstruction.org/>

### **Center on Innovation and Improvement**

<http://centerii.org/>

### **National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality**

<http://www.tqsource.org/>

### **National School Reform Faculty (protocols to facilitate a wide variety of focused discussions)**

<http://www.nsrffharmony.org/protocols.html>

### **National Center on Response to Intervention**

[http://www.rti4success.org/index.php?option=com\\_frontpage&Itemid=1](http://www.rti4success.org/index.php?option=com_frontpage&Itemid=1)

### **Doing What Works**

<http://dww.ed.gov/>

### **All Things PLC**

<http://www.allthingsplc.info/>