


SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Idaho State Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 650 W. State Street Boise, ID 83702
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Marybeth Flachbart Position and Office: Deputy Superintendent, Division of Student Achievement and School Improvement Contact's Mailing Address: 650 W. State Street Boise, ID 83702 Telephone: (208) 332-6954 Fax: (208) 334-2228 Email address:	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Thomas Luna, Superintendent of Public Instruction	Telephone: (208) 332-6815
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X _____	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.....	i
Revised August 6, 2010	i
Part I: SEA Requirements	1
A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS:	1
B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:.....	2
C. CAPACITY:.....	7
D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:	8
E. ASSURANCES:	11
F. SEA RESERVATION:	12
G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS:	13
H. WAIVERS:	14
Part II: LEA Requirements	16
Attachments.....	0
Attachment 1: List of Tier I, II, III Schools by District	1
Attachment 2: Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools for use in Determining Priority in School Improvement Grant and the State Fiscal Stabilization Funds	9
Attachment 3: Methodology – Determining Tiers I, II, and III for School Improvement Grants	15
Attachment 4: LEA Instructions for School Improvement Grants	32
Attachment 5: LEA Application for School Improvement Grants	67
Attachment 6: Scoring Guide for District Application.....	83
Amendments & Clarifications Based Upon USDoE Reviewer Feedback	0
Amendment 1 (6-16-2010):	1
Amendment 2 (7-13-2010):	1

The Idaho State Department of Education is referred to as ISDE and SDE in the following responses.

Part I: SEA Requirements

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS:

The list of Idaho's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools is provided in Attachment 1. Idaho's definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools is included in Attachment 2. The methodology used to determine Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools is described in Attachment 3.

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Below are the criteria the Idaho SDE will use to evaluate district applications.

Part 1

(1). The first evaluation will be an analysis of the process the district used to select the reform model proposed for each Tier I and Tier II school. The district's application will be assessed based on the extent to which the district:

- Used the recommended resources provided by the SDE:
 - Capacity Builder (Appendix A-I).
 - The Center on Education Effectiveness Perceptual Surveys (Appendix B-I).
 - Focus Visits-curriculum and instructional audits provided by SDE team (Appendix C).
 - State level assessments (Idaho Reading Indicator, Primary Math Assessment, Direct Writing Assessment, Direct Math Assessment, Idaho Standard Achievement Test).
- Reviewed and referenced the state's online strategic school improvement tool, Ways to Increase School Effectiveness (WISE Tool). The tool was developed by the Center on Innovation and Improvement.
- Local interim and formative assessments.
- Teacher qualifications and placement.
- Distribution of highly qualified teachers.
- Budget, including per pupil expenses.
- Revisited prior attempts by the LEA to engage in school improvement activities.
- Addressed areas identified in the District Level Improvement plan that might impede or enhance the school(s) ability to implement necessary changes.
- Engaged relevant stakeholders groups, including:
 - Local education associations regarding teacher evaluation and assignments (evidence may include a memorandum of understanding and/or timeline for collaboration on matters related to contracts, schedules, school reform, evaluation, policies, procedures).
 - Local School Board Members.
 - Parents of students both within schools in Tiers I and II as well as all schools within the LEA.
 - Community partners.

(2). The district's demonstration of their willingness and commitment (with assistance from the SDE) to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the district's application in order to implement fully and effectively the

selected intervention model in each school. Each district's application must demonstrate commitment to build capacity in the following areas:

- Develop the necessary infrastructure to support change at both the school and district level (creation of a district leadership position that is directly responsible for the implementation of the selected model within Tier I and Tier II schools, plan to review district policies, procedures, and manuals during the coming school year, system in place to review interim assessment data at each of the schools, etc.).
- Identified district leader's attendance at all SDE sponsored professional development workshops.
- Willingness to partner with external technical assistance providers (may include but is not limited to participation in the Idaho Building Capacity Project).
- Creation of a timeline for the implementation of the basic elements of the selected model during the 2010-2011 school year. The district must select a reform model prior to the beginning of the school year and begin implementation of the basic elements of the model at the beginning of the school year. However, certain elements such as job-embedded professional development, identifying and rewarding teachers and principals that have impacted student achievement, may occur later in the school year. At a minimum, basic elements, for each model include:
 - Turnaround Model: Replace the principal, grant new principal sufficient operational flexibility (staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; develop and adopt locally-determined "turnaround" competencies to screen all existing staff, rehiring up to 50% and select new staff; and identify processes for providing increased learning time to students and staff and for designing job-embedded professional development in collaboration with staff. The district will provide timelines indicating its commitments to address the remaining required actions.
 - Restart Model: A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school into a charter school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. Restart models must be implemented in School Year 2010-11 and must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school. In Idaho, such a charter school must be authorized under the LEA rather than the Charter School Commission, and the district will hold the EMO responsible for the meeting the final requirements associated with the intervention model. Additional information regarding the process of conversion may be obtained at http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/charter_schools/. (Note: A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides "whole-school operation" services to an LEA.) **While federal guidance does not require it, Idaho State policy requires that it is mandatory for any CMO or EMO that enters into an agreement to operate a Tier I**

or II school must attend state sponsored professional development offered by the State Department of Education.

- School Closure: Establish a timeline for school closure and reassign students to other higher-achieving schools within the district.
- Transformation Model: Replace the principal (unless the school has implemented the Transformation Model in the last two years, including assigning a new principal); grant principal sufficient operational flexibility (staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; provide timeline for identifying and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as with the state content standards, develop schedules for extending learning time, and creating community-oriented schools; and provide plan for ensuring that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance from the district and external partners.

A full description of the reform models and required elements can be found on the U.S.

Department of Education's web site <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>

- Provide a description of the process for selecting the new principal and teachers (Aligning staff competencies to student needs).
- Provide evidence of School Board commitment.
- Provide timeline and process to build sufficient district level and school level staff to implement the selected model.
- If applicable, provide evidence from personnel associations with respect to teacher evaluations requirements (consider student achievement as part of the evaluation process).
- If applicable, provide evidence of the availability and qualifications of selected EMO.

(3). The district's budget includes sufficient funds to implement fully and effectively the selected reform model as well as to support the school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of SIG funds. Applications will be evaluated based on:

- Proposed budget for each Tier I and Tier II school the district is applying to serve.
- Proposed budget for each Tier III school.
- Overall proposed budget, with supporting rationale, indicates how district will allocate school improvement funds over a three year period, with separate budgets for each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it is applying to serve.
- Proposed budget includes a plan for how the improvement efforts will be sustained once the funding period ends.
- If applicable, the proposed budget reflects amounts agreed upon between the district and SDE to provide technical assistance and other support services.

Part 2

The actions in Part 2 are ones that the district may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a SIG grant, but most likely they will occur after receiving the grant. With the approval of the district, the SDE may provide technical assistance and support to implement all or part of the actions listed below.

(1). Each district's application and subsequent monitoring of implementation will be assessed based on the extent to which the LEA addresses the following components:

- Conducted (or commits to conducting) a Focus Visit at both the district and school level (Schools in Tier I and Tier II).
- Describes the district's action to recruit, screen, select, assign, and retain high performing teachers and administrators.
- Describes other district procedures and practices to support full and effective implementation of the reform model (e.g. staffing, calendar/time, budgeting).
- Describes district actions which will promote the continuous use of student data (e.g. formative, interim, and summative assessments).
- Describes the district actions which will promote the use of classroom walkthroughs by district and school level leaders to inform professional development.
- Describes the process to ensure a clear focus on student learning and communicating and reinforcing high expectations and accountability for teachers/leaders.
- Describes district actions which will ensure both vertical and horizontal curriculum alignment.
- Describe district actions to ensure that each identified Tier I and Tier II school receives ongoing, intensive, technical assistance from central office staff.
- Specifically addresses each "required action" (see attachments 4, 5, 6 for details) on the selected reform model.

(2). Align resources with the intervention:

- Coordinate resources (in addition to SIG funds) needed to fully implement the selected reform model. Resources may include: personnel assignments, federal, state, and local funding sources and funding from private/public partnerships, technology (data systems, and assessment systems); partnerships with community agencies.
- Describe the systemic process in which the central office and building leaders will work together to analyze, coordinate, blend and align available resources to support the reform model.

(3). Modify practices or policies, if necessary, to enable full and effective implementation of the reform model.

- Identifies a process to review current practices and policies which support or impede reform efforts at the identified Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools. Evidence provided by

the district may include: timeline for review of current policies and practices; process for annual review and revision of board policies and procedures; opportunity for stakeholder involvement and input; data used to assess implementation of reform model, and impact.

- Identifies processes and polices related to recruiting and retaining highly effective educators to work in the LEA's persistently low-achieving schools.
- Describes processes for intentional, frequent communications between superintendent/district central office and staff in Tier I, II and III schools. (Response should include multiple methods for ongoing communication and opportunities for collaboration.)
- Describes the process to examine system-wide alignment of programs and practices with the reform model. (May include: identification of current programs and practices which may support or impede intervention, description of timeline and data collected, strategies for aligning programs with required actions.)

(4). Sustain the reforms after funding period ends. Describes the system-wide infrastructures the district has developed, or will develop, to sustain reforms in Tiers I, II and III schools over time. District's response may identify:

- Board adopting policies and practices.
- Systems and supports for Tier I and II schools to sustain changes (designated district liaison, retention of highly effective educators, extended learning time, new governance model).
- Systems of support for Tier III schools to sustain changes over time.
- Tools, systems, and practices supporting the use of data to inform district, school, and classroom decision making.
- Establishing an annual process for goal setting (within content areas and for both all students and individual subgroups).
- Establishing a process for ongoing job-embedded professional development.
- Calendar and schedule which provides extended learning time (both students and staff).
- System for continued alignment of curriculum.
- Budget which uses federal, state, and local education funding to sustain reform.
- Decision-making processes at the district and school levels which provide for multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement and input.

C. CAPACITY:

The SDE will use the following criteria to evaluate whether a district lacks the capacity to implement a school reform model in each Tier I and Tier II School.

When determining the capacity to use SIG funds as prescribed in the final guidelines (Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Act, U.S. Department of Education, January 2010):

- Number of Tier I and Tier II schools in the district and whether or not they reflect a feeder pattern.
- Partnership with external technical assistance providers (Capacity Builder, Institute of Higher Education, Educational Management Organization, etc.).
- Teacher talent (highly qualified, advanced degrees, nationally board certified, demonstrated success in accelerating student learning).
- District's ability to recruit a sufficient number of new educators.
- Infrastructures and system-wide supports (coordinated and aligned standards-based curriculum and assessments, response to intervention framework) to fully implement one of the four reform models.
- District's assessment that it can have the greatest impact on student achievement by focusing resources heavily on Tier I, II schools.
- District's assessment of the ability to serve both the needs of Tier I and II schools as well as any Tier III schools it is applying to serve.
- For the closure model, access and proximity to higher-performing schools.
- **Districts must intend to meet the needs of Tier I and II schools if they intend to serve Tier III schools.**

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

(1). The SDE will implement the following:

A. Process – The LEA share of SIG funds (i.e. 95% of the state’s allocation from the U.S. Department of Education) will be allocated as prescribed in federal guidelines, and priority will be given to districts based on final guidelines:

- SDE will give first priority to districts that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
- If SIG grants have been awarded to each district that requested funds that serve a Tier I or Tier II school, then the SDE may award remaining SIG funds to LEAs that seek to serve Tier III schools.
- A district with Tier I or Tier II schools will not be awarded SIG funds to serve only Tier III schools.

B. Timeline

Recruitment of potential Technical Assistance Providers (related to the application process) was started March 1, 2010.

An initial list of external SIG reviewers was completed April 15, 2010.

Districts will be notified of potential eligibility on April 23, 2010. (With the notice of potential eligibility will be a draft of Directions for LEAs, Application for LEAs, Scoring Rubric).

Within one week of receiving approval by the U.S. Department of Education the Idaho SDE will:

- Select a date for the submission of District Applications.
- Schedule a two hour webinar and invite all districts with schools in Tiers I and II to participate.
- The webinar will go over:
 - i. The State’s Application for 1003(g) funds.
 - ii. Date for “Statement of Interest” MOUs due from districts.
 - iii. Directions to LEAs.
 - iv. Application for LEAs.
 - v. Scoring Rubric used by reviewers.
 - vi. Method for receiving onsite technical assistance for the application process.
 - vii. Deadline for submission of Proposals.
 - viii. Post the Idaho Application to the SDE web site.

- Issue contracts for both external reviewers and technical assistance providers.
- Establish dates for proposal reviews (tentative dates have been set for July 19-23, 2010).
- Establish date for award announcements (tentative date has been set for July 30, 2010).
- Allocated funds will be available to successful applicants immediately after award announcements.
- Approved applications will be posted to SDE's web site within 48 hours of award announcements.
- Districts and schools will begin conditions for implementing models August 2010.
- Districts and schools will begin implementation of intervention models September 2010.

(2) The SDE will monitor each district that receives a SIG to ensure that it is implementing a reform model fully and effectively in the Tier I and II schools that it has been approved to serve.

The process will include:

- Appointment of SDE Director to oversee the process (Director will be part of the Student Achievement and School Improvement Division of the SDE).
- Director will:
 - Oversee the scheduling of Focus Visits in each of the LEAs and schools.
 - Schedule review of implementation progress (both through online strategic planning tool – WISE and onsite visits from regional School Improvement Coordinators).
 - Schedule phone and in-person interviews with key district and school leaders.
 - Review of quarterly cash balance reports for each funded LEA.

(3) The SDE's process for reviewing the district's annual goals for student achievement and if applicable annual goals for reducing dropout rate, for its Tier I and Tier II schools will include:

- Baseline CEE survey data (perceptual data).
- Summary of current classroom observation data (if not currently in place then the district will report on its progress towards implementing regular walk-throughs in each of the Tier I and II schools).
- Tri-annual reports of student achievement data for each participating school (first, fifth, and ninth month of the academic year).
- The reports shall include (at a minimum) the prior spring's ISAT data.
- Idaho Reading Indicators results (if applicable).
- Primary Math Assessment results (if applicable).
- Results of local interim or formative assessments (if not currently in place then the district will report on its progress towards implementing interim assessments).

(4) In determining whether or not to renew a District's award, the SDE will consider:

- The difference between annual goals (stated in application) and the outcomes.
- The difference between the individual school results and state results in reading, math, and science for the "all students" category and for each sub-group.

- The difference between the individual school and other schools funded with SIG funds.
- Actions district has taken to accelerate improvement in identified schools.
- Actions district has taken to build capacity both within the school and the district.
- Evidence of the district's fidelity to the selected reform model.
- The SDE will provide each district with a written summary of its findings.

(5) In the event that the SDE does not have sufficient funds to serve all eligible schools for which each district applies, allocations will be prioritized as follows:

- Districts that apply to serve either Tier I or Tier II schools.
- Districts that apply to serve only Tier III schools (except if the district has a Tier I or II school) and is an LEA identified as being among the highest need (combination of student achievement, demographics, years in improvement, graduation rate, and available local resources).
- Awards will only be made to LEAs applying to serve Tier III schools after awards have been made to fully serve, throughout the period of availability of funds all Tier I and Tier II schools in the state.

(6) The SDE may use one or both of the following factors in prioritizing among Tier III schools:

- Established need of the LEA applying to serve Tier III schools (among the highest need).
- Demonstrated evidence of commitment to improve student achievement (may include participation in: Idaho Building Capacity Project, Superintendents Network, Central Office Staff Network, Principals Academy of Leadership, Total Instructional Alignment, etc.).

E. ASSURANCES:

By submitting this application, the Idaho SDE 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 SDE 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).
- ✓ 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:

Idaho intends to reserve five percent of its School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance. Between the ARRA and regular components of the SIG Fund, Idaho expects the five percent reservation to amount to approximately \$620,000. The Idaho Department of Education will utilize these funds to pay for administrative costs associated with personnel. Specifically, portions of employee salaries both within the division of Student Achievement and School Improvement and regional school improvement centers, will be funded through the SEA reservation in relation to time spent on School Improvement activities and technical assistance related to the grant. Additionally, the state intends to coordinate and oversee the technical assistance that is paid for by LEAs in the activities outlined (page 59, Attachment 4), such as the Idaho Building Capacity project. Therefore, costs associated with travel, meetings, and other technical assistance costs will be figured into the SEA reservation amount. Lastly, the state intends to use SIG funds to implement an external evaluation in partnership with Education Northwest, our regional education laboratory. As described in Appendix D, the evaluation process will (a) establish and maintain data collection systems that systematically and efficiently collect data to meet both federal reporting and evaluation needs and (b) collect and analyze data to provide timely information to the state about implementation and outcomes. As such, the external evaluation will enable the state to continuously improve the implementation processes entailed with the School Improvement Grant activities and determine if they are succeeding in improving student outcomes.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS:

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 SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

H. WAIVERS:

Below is a list of requirements for which the ISDE is seeking a waiver.

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

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve 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 school 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 Department of Education 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 Department of Education 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 Department of Education 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 a 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 Department of Education 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.

Part II: LEA Requirements

The School Improvement Grant (SIG) Instructions to LEAs are provided in Attachment 4. The *School Improvement Grant (SIG) District Application* is provided in Attachment 5. For required information for Part II, sections A-E of the application, please refer to the following pages in Attachment 5.

A.	Schools to be Served.....	54
B.	Descriptive Information.....	55
C.	Budget.....	54
D.	Assurances.....	64
E.	Waivers.....	65

Attachments

Attachment 1: List of Tier I, II, III Schools by District

Attachment 1:

List of Tier I, II, III Schools by District

LEA Name	NCES LEA ID	School Name	NCES School ID	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
ABERDEEN DISTRICT	1600030	ABERDEEN MIDDLE SCHOOL	160003000829	X			
ABERDEEN DISTRICT	1600030	ABERDEEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160003000828			X	
AMERICAN FALLS JOINT DISTRICT	1600060	WILLIAM THOMAS MIDDLE SCHOOL	160006000589			X	
AMERICAN FALLS JOINT DISTRICT	1600060	A F INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	160006000816			X	
AMERICAN FALLS JOINT DISTRICT	1600060	HILLCREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160006000005			X	
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	FORT HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160027000026	X			
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	BLACKFOOT COMMUNITY LEARNING	160027000796	X			
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	INDEPENDENCE ALTERNATE HIGH	160027000689			X	
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	BLACKFOOT SIXTH GRADE SCHOOL	160027000030			X	
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	I T STODDARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160027000028			X	
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	DONALD D. STALKER ELEMENTARY	160027000031			X	
BLACKFOOT DISTRICT	1600270	WAPELLO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160027000032			X	
BLAINE COUNTY DISTRICT	1600300	WOODSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160030000908			X	
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	LOWELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160036000063			X	
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	WHITNEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160036000078			X	
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	KOELSCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160036000060			X	
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160036000059			X	
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	HORIZON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160036000009			X	
BOISE INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1600360	WHITTIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160036000079			X	
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT	1600930	TELFORD ACADEMY (ALT)	160093000649			X	
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT	1600930	CLOVERDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160093000630			X	
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT	1600930	ROCKY MOUNTAIN MIDDLE SCHOOL	160093000168			X	

LEA Name	NCES LEA ID	School Name	NCES School ID	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT	1600930	UCON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160093000178			X	
BONNEVILLE JOINT DISTRICT	1600930	FAIRVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160093000172			X	
BOUNDARY COUNTY DISTRICT	1600420	NAPLES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160042000092			X	
BRUNEAU-GRAND VIEW JOINT DIST	1600450	BRUNEAU ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160045000098			X	
BRUNEAU-GRAND VIEW JOINT DIST	1600450	RIMROCK JR-SR HIGH SCHOOL	160045000100			X	
BRUNEAU-GRAND VIEW JOINT DIST	1600450	GRAND VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160045000099			X	
BUHL JOINT DISTRICT	1600480	Buhl Middle School	160048000103			X	
BUHL JOINT DISTRICT	1600480	POPPLEWELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160048000101			X	
BUTTE COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600490	ARCO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160049000007			X	
BUTTE COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600490	BUTTE COUNTY MIDDLE SCHOOL	160049000662			X	
CALDWELL DISTRICT	1600510	JEFFERSON MIDDLE SCHOOL	160051000105	X			
CALDWELL DISTRICT	1600510	Syringa Middle School	160051000109			X	
CALDWELL DISTRICT	1600510	LEWIS AND CLARK ELEMENTARY	160051000835			X	
CALDWELL DISTRICT	1600510	LINCOLN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160051000106			X	
CAMBRIDGE JOINT DISTRICT	1600570	CAMBRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160057000112			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	CASSIA EDUCATION CENTER (ALT)	160066000540			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	BURLEY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	160066000125			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	WHITE PINE ELEMENTARY	160066000387			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	DECLO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160066000126			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	DECLO JR HIGH SCHOOL	160066000610			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	DWORSHAK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160066000128			X	
CASSIA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1600660	MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEMENTARY	160066000130			X	
COEUR D'ALENE DISTRICT	1600780	PROJ CDA HIGH SCHOOL	160078000694			X	
COEUR D'ALENE DISTRICT	1600780	SKYWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160078000799			X	

LEA Name	NCES LEA ID	School Name	NCES School ID	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
CULDESAC JOINT DISTRICT	1600870	CULDESAC SCHOOL	160087000164			X	
EMMETT INDEPENDENT DISTRICT	1601020	KENNETH CARBERRY INTERMEDIATE	160102000797			X	
FIRTH DISTRICT	1601080	FIRTH MIDDLE SCHOOL	160108000326			X	
FIRTH DISTRICT	1601080	A W JOHNSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160108000196			X	
FREMONT COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601110	CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160111000622			X	
FREMONT COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601110	LINCOLN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160111000202			X	
FREMONT COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601110	SOUTH FREMONT JR HIGH	160111000625			X	
GARDEN CITY COMMUNITY CHARTER DIST	1600013	GARDEN CITY COMMUNITY CHARTER	160001300890			X	
GLENNS FERRY JOINT DISTRICT	1601230	GLENNS FERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160123000219			X	
GLENNS FERRY JOINT DISTRICT	1601230	GLENNS FERRY MIDDLE SCHOOL	160123000744			X	
GLENNS FERRY JOINT DISTRICT	1601230	GLENNS FERRY HIGH SCHOOL	160123000220			X	
GOODING JOINT DISTRICT	1601260	GOODING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160126000223			X	
GOODING JOINT DISTRICT	1601260	GOODING MIDDLE SCHOOL	160126000222			X	
HOMEDALE JOINT DISTRICT	1601470	HOMEDALE HIGH SCHOOL	160147000248			X	
HORSESHOE BEND SCHOOL DISTRICT	1601500	HORSESHOE BEND ELEMENTARY	160150000506			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	DORA ERICKSON ELEM SCHOOL	160153000256			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	A H BUSH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160153000252			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	LINDEN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160153000263			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	THERESA BUNKER ELEMENTARY	160153000270			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	CLAIR E. GALE JR HIGH SCHOOL	160153000255			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	FOXHOLLOW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160153000726			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	ETHEL BOYES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160153000260			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	EAGLE ROCK JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	160153000257			X	
IDAHO FALLS DISTRICT	1601530	WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160153000633			X	

LEA Name	NCES LEA ID	School Name	NCES School ID	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
IDAHO VIRTUAL ACADEMY DISTRICT	1600004	IDAHO VIRTUAL ACADEMY	160000400859			X	
JEFFERSON COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601570	ROBERTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160157000278			X	
JEFFERSON COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601570	HARWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160157000634			X	
JEFFERSON COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601570	MIDWAY MIDDLE SCHOOL	160157000275			X	
JEFFERSON COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1601570	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160157000276			X	
JEROME JOINT DISTRICT	1601590	JEROME MIDDLE SCHOOL	160159000285			X	
JEROME JOINT DISTRICT	1601590	HORIZON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160159000272			X	
JEROME JOINT DISTRICT	1601590	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160159000283			X	
KAMIAH JOINT DISTRICT	1601620	KAMIAH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160162000286			X	
KELLOGG JOINT DISTRICT	1601650	PINEHURST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160165000294			X	
KELLOGG JOINT DISTRICT	1601650	SUNNYSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160165000297			X	
KENDRICK JOINT DISTRICT	1601680	JULIAETTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160168000298			X	
KIMBERLY DISTRICT	1601710	KIMBERLY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160171000300			X	
KUNA JOINT DISTRICT	1601770	ROSS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160177000915			X	
KUNA JOINT DISTRICT	1601770	HUBBARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160177000596			X	
LAKE PEND OREILLE DISTRICT	1600002	LAKE PEND OREILLE ALT HIGH SCH	160000200691			X	
LAKE PEND OREILLE DISTRICT	1600002	FARMIN STIDWELL ELEMENTARY SCH	160000200615			X	
LAPWAI DISTRICT	1601830	LAPWAI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160183000317			X	
MADISON DISTRICT	1601920	MADISON MIDDLE SCHOOL	160192000210			X	
MADISON DISTRICT	1601920	KENNEDY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160192000338			X	
MARSING JOINT DISTRICT	1601980	MARSING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160198000351			X	
MARSING JOINT DISTRICT	1601980	MARSING MIDDLE SCHOOL	160198000636			X	
MCCALL-DONNELLY DISTRICT	1602030	MCCALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160203000356			X	
MELBA JOINT DISTRICT	1602070	MELBA MIDDLE SCHOOL	160207000254		X		
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	MC MILLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160210000363			X	

LEA Name	NCES LEA ID	School Name	NCES School ID	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	SUMMERWIND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160210000364			X	
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	LINDER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160210000639			X	
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	USTICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160210000374			X	
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	DESERT SAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160210000901			X	
MERIDIAN JOINT DISTRICT	1602100	PEREGRINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160210000794			X	
MINIDOKA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1602190	HEYBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160219000382			X	
MINIDOKA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1602190	RUPERT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160219000666			X	
MINIDOKA COUNTY JOINT DISTRICT	1602190	PAUL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160219000641			X	
MOUNTAIN HOME DISTRICT	1602250	WEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160225000403	X			
MOUNTAIN HOME DISTRICT	1602250	HACKER MIDDLE SCHOOL	160225000745		X		
MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600139	CLEARWATER VALLEY JR/SR HIGH SCHL	160013900936			X	
MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600139	GRANGEVILLE ELEM MIDDLE SCHOOL	160013900946			X	
MURTAUGH JOINT DISTRICT	1602310	MURTAUGH MIDDLE SCHOOL	160231000407		X		
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	WEST MIDDLE SCHOOL	160234000422			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	IOWA ELEMENTARY	160234000375			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	SHERMAN ELEMENTARY	160234000379			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	EAST VALLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL	160234000811			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	SNAKE RIVER ELEMENTARY	160234000507			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	CENTENNIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160234000409			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	WILLOW CREEK ELEMENTARY	160234000833			X	
NAMPA SCHOOL DISTRICT	1602340	ENDEAVOR ELEMENTARY	160234000947			X	
PARMA DISTRICT	1602550	PARMA MIDDLE SCHOOL	160255000080			X	
PARMA DISTRICT	1602550	MAXINE JOHNSON ELEMENTARY	160255000449			X	
PAYETTE JOINT DISTRICT	1602580	MC CAIN MIDDLE SCHOOL	160258000455			X	
PAYETTE JOINT DISTRICT	1602580	PAYETTE PRIMARY SCHOOL	160258000171			X	

LEA Name	NCES LEA ID	School Name	NCES School ID	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
PAYETTE JOINT DISTRICT	1602580	WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160258000456			X	
PLUMMER-WORLEY JOINT DISTRICT	1600815	LAKESIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160081500719	X			
PLUMMER-WORLEY JOINT DISTRICT	1600815	LAKESIDE HIGH SCHOOL	160081500720			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	KINPORT ACADEMY	160264000686			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	TYHEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160264000483			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	CLAUDE A WILCOX ELEM SCHOOL	160264000465			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	SYRINGA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160264000481			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160264000475			X	
POCATELLO DISTRICT	1602640	LEWIS & CLARK ELEMENTARY SCH	160264000476			X	
POST FALLS DISTRICT	1602670	POST FALLS MIDDLE SCHOOL	160267000489			X	
POST FALLS DISTRICT	1602670	MULLAN TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160267000800			X	
PRESTON JOINT DISTRICT	1600960	PRESTON JR HIGH SCHOOL	160096000612			X	
PRESTON JOINT DISTRICT	1600960	OAKWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160096000181			X	
RICHFIELD DISTRICT	1602760	RICHFIELD SCHOOL	160276000497			X	
SHELLEY JOINT DISTRICT	1602910	SHELLEY SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	160291000510			X	
SHELLEY JOINT DISTRICT	1602910	DONALD J HOBBS MIDDLE SCHOOL	160291000723			X	
SHELLEY JOINT DISTRICT	1602910	HAZEL STUART ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160291000511			X	
SHOSHONE JOINT DISTRICT	1602940	SHOSHONE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160294000512	X			
SHOSHONE JOINT DISTRICT	1602940	SHOSHONE MIDDLE SCHOOL	160294000850		X		
SNAKE RIVER DISTRICT	1602970	SNAKE RIVER JR HIGH SCHOOL	160297000520		X		
SNAKE RIVER DISTRICT	1602970	RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160297000518			X	
SODA SPRINGS JOINT DISTRICT	1603000	HOWARD E THIRKILL PRIMARY SCH	160300000525			X	
ST. MARIES JOINT DISTRICT	1603060	HEYBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160306000485			X	
ST. MARIES JOINT DISTRICT	1603060	UPRIVER ELEMENTARY-JR HIGH SCHOOL	160306000536			X	
SUGAR-SALEM JOINT DISTRICT	1603090	CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160309000537			X	

LEA Name	NCES LEA ID	School Name	NCES School ID	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
TETON COUNTY DISTRICT	1603180	TETON MIDDLE SCHOOL	160318000544			X	
TETON COUNTY DISTRICT	1603180	DRIGGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160318000754			X	
TROY SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600009	TROY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160000900581			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	MAGIC VALLEY ALTERNATIVE HIGH	160324000703			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	ROBERT STUART JR HIGH SCHOOL	160324000553			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	HARRISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160324000549			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	BICKEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160324000548			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	VERA C O'LEARY JR HIGH SCHOOL	160324000552			X	
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT	1603240	OREGON TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160324000316			X	
VALLEY DISTRICT	1603270	VALLEY SCHOOL	160327000558			X	
VALLIVUE SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600600	WEST CANYON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160060000119			X	
VALLIVUE SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600600	EAST CANYON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160060000115			X	
VALLIVUE SCHOOL DISTRICT	1600600	BIRCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160060000778			X	
WALLACE DISTRICT	1603300	SILVER HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160330000562			X	
WENDELL DISTRICT	1603360	WENDELL MIDDLE SCHOOL	160336000571			X	
WENDELL DISTRICT	1603360	WENDELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160336000570			X	
WEST BONNER COUNTY DISTRICT	1600001	PRIEST RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160000100619			X	
WEST JEFFERSON DISTRICT	1603400	TERRETON ELEM-JR HIGH SCHOOL	160340000280			X	
WILDER DISTRICT	1603480	HOLMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	160348000585	X			
WILDER DISTRICT	1603480	WILDER MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL	160348000530			X	

**Attachment 2: Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools for
use in Determining Priority in School Improvement Grant and the State
Fiscal Stabilization Funds**

Attachment 2:

Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools for use in Determining Priority in School Improvement Grant and the State Fiscal Stabilization Funds¹

Tier I Schools:

There are two types of Tier I schools: those Title I funded schools with (a) the lowest-achievement and lack of progress over time and/or (b) a graduation rate less than 60% for three consecutive years.

A) Lowest Achievement with Lack of Progress

Lowest Achievement – For the purposes of identifying the lowest-achieving schools, the Idaho Department of Education used the “all students” category based on those students who take the state’s assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 10). The “all students” category includes all students tested in those grade levels in each school, such as those with limited English proficiency (LEP), those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have disabilities, and all other categories required by the ESEA. All public schools in the state of Idaho were included; no waivers were sought to exclude schools from the process due to any particular minimum n-count.

For the purpose of these federal funding streams, Idaho defines lowest-achievement by ranking Title I funded schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, using a method that combines the two sets of 2009 data in the “all students” category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure upon which all Title I funded schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring are sorted. The ranking procedure works as follows:

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

¹ No Idaho schools have been excluded from this definition on the basis of a minimum n-count. No system of weighting is used to determine levels of proficiency or AYP status. The school classifications above are determined as set forth in the *State of Idaho Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook*.

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

Step 6: Rank order the “added ranks” for each of the schools in the relevant set of schools. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rate would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 7: Calculate the lowest five percent or five schools, whichever is greater, based upon the added ranks using the additional criteria of “lack of progress” below.

Lack of Progress – Once schools are sorted in the process above, Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Persistent lack of progress is defined as not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the “all students” category in one of the following ways:

- **BOTH** reading and mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 2 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively, **OR**
- **EITHER** reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 3 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively.

A school makes adequate yearly progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or

neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier I.

B) Persistently Low Graduation Rate

Additionally, any Title I funded high school (a “secondary school” is defined in Idaho code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof) with a graduation rate (as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b)) lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years shall be identified as Tier I.²

Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier I.

Tier II Schools:

There are two types of Tier II schools: those Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools with (a) the lowest-achievement and lack of progress over time and/or (b) a graduation rate less than 60% for three consecutive years. Secondary schools are defined in Idaho Code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof.

A) Lowest Achievement with Lack of Progress

Lowest Achievement – For the purposes of identifying the lowest-achieving secondary schools that are eligible but not Title I funded, the Idaho Department of Education used the “all students” category based on those students who take the state’s assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 10). The “all students” category includes all students tested in those grade levels in each school, such as those with limited English proficiency (LEP), those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have disabilities, and all other categories required by the ESEA. All public schools in the state of Idaho were included; no waivers were sought to exclude schools from the process due to any particular minimum n-count.

For the purpose of these federal funding streams, Idaho defines lowest-achievement by ranking Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools using a method that combines the two sets of 2009 data in the “all students” category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure upon which all Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools are sorted. The ranking procedure works as follows:

² Currently no high school in Idaho has had a graduation rate lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years.

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

Step 6: Rank order the “added ranks” for each of the schools in the relevant set of schools. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rate would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 7: Calculate the lowest five percent or five schools, whichever is greater, based upon the added ranks using the additional criteria of “lack of progress” below.

Lack of Progress – Once schools are sorted in the process above, Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Since Idaho has one accountability system, even Title I eligible, but not funded, schools are classified according to adequately yearly progress standards. Therefore, persistent lack of progress is defined by all of the following criteria:

- Not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the “all students” category for EITHER reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009, AND
- Not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the “all students” category at least one or more times in EITHER reading or mathematics for school years 2006-2007 or 2007-2008 respectively, AND

- Having (a) fewer students scoring proficient or advanced (i.e., a decreasing proficiency trend) in (b) EITHER reading or mathematics or both in the “all students” category in school year 2008-2009 when compared to school year 2006-2007.

A Title I eligible, but not funded, school makes adequate yearly progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier II.

B) Persistently Low Graduation Rate

Additionally, any Title I eligible, but not funded, high school (a “secondary school” is defined in Idaho code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof) with a graduation rate (as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b)) lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years shall be identified as Tier I.

Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier II.

Tier III Schools:

All Title I funded schools that are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, but which are not Tier I schools are classified in Tier III. LEAs may apply for 1003(g) SIG funds for Tier III schools according to the requirements and regulations outlined in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010).

Attachment 3: Methodology – Determining Tiers I, II, and III for School Improvement Grants

Attachment 3:

Methodology – Determining Tiers I, II, and III for School Improvement Grants

References:

- **SIG-A** - *School Improvement Grants Application: Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (January, 2010)
- **SIG-G** - *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010)

This document is organized according to the steps outlined in *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) as set forth in Section A-18, the required sequence of steps for developing the final list of persistently lowest-achieving schools in Tiers I and II.

Step 1: Relevant Definitions

A) Secondary School

Idaho code defines a “secondary school” as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof. However, Idaho also has combinations of schools that may extend lower than grade seven (7), but which still contain secondary grades. Therefore the classification "elementary/secondary school" defines schools that serve grades one (1) through twelve (12) inclusive, or any combination thereof. (IDAPA 33-1001)

B) Number of Years – Graduation Rate

Three consecutive years of graduation rates are calculated based upon data from 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08 respectively. Final graduation data for 2008-09 were not available yet for use in calculations for the SIG fund.

C) Number of Years – Lack of Progress

Lack of progress calculations are based on data and statewide Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements for 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 respectively. Idaho requires the same accountability structure for all schools regardless of Title I funding or eligibility. Therefore, AYP determinations are stable constructs for both Tier I and Tier II schools in the persistently lowest-achieving definition.

D) Achievement

Rank order to determine the lowest achievement was based upon the most recent 2008-09 ESEA accountability data in both Reading/Language Arts (the Idaho accountability assessment is specifically

called “Reading”) and Mathematics. The “all students” category was utilized. Percent proficient or advanced was calculated based upon all students in the building who took the test, regardless of grade level, and then aggregated according to proficiency bands to determine the number proficient or advanced out of the total number taking the test. For example, if there were ten students in grade 3, ten in grade 4, ten in grade 5, and ten in grade 6; and if four 3rd graders, six 4th graders, eight 5th graders, and ten 6th graders were proficient in each grade respectively; the calculation would be as follows: $(4+6+8+10) / (10+10+10+10) = (28 / 40) = 0.7$. In this example, **70%** of the students in the school were proficient.

E) Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Final requirements under section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) specify that School Improvement Grants (SIGs) will be available to a state’s Title I schools that are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, with priority of funding to be reserved for the persistently lowest-achieving schools described by two of three tiers. According to SIG requirements, each state must determine the persistently lowest-achieving schools according to the following definitions:

Persistently lowest-achieving schools means, as determined by the State —

(a)

(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

(2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

(b) To identify the lowest-achieving schools, a State must take into account both--

(i) The academic achievement of the “all students” group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(ii) The school’s lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the “all students” group.

The Idaho Department of Education (IDE), therefore, used the SIG guidance document to specify how “lowest achievement” and “lack of progress” were to be identified in order to meet the above requirements. Therefore, IDE more specifically defines its three tiers of eligible schools by taking into account achievement and progress according to the following definitions and criteria for Tier I (a1), Tier II (a2), and Tier III (Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I).

Tier I Schools:

There are two types of Tier I schools: those Title I funded schools with (a) the lowest-achievement and lack of progress over time and/or (b) a graduation rate less than 60% for three consecutive years.

A) Lowest Achievement with Lack of Progress

Lowest Achievement – For the purposes of identifying the lowest-achieving schools, the Idaho Department of Education used the “all students” category based on those students who take the state’s assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 10). The “all students” category includes all students tested in those grade levels in each school, such as those with limited English proficiency (LEP), those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have disabilities, and all other categories required by the ESEA. All public schools in the state of Idaho were included; no waivers were sought to exclude schools from the process due to any particular minimum n-count.

For the purpose of these federal funding streams, Idaho defines lowest-achievement by ranking Title I funded schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, using a method that combines the two sets of 2009 data in the “all students” category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure upon which all Title I funded schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring are sorted. The ranking procedure works as follows:

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using

assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

Step 6: Rank order the “added ranks” for each of the schools in the relevant set of schools. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rank would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 7: Calculate the lowest five percent or five schools, whichever is greater, based upon the added ranks using the additional criteria of “lack of progress” below.

Lack of Progress – Once schools are sorted in the process above, Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Persistent lack of progress is defined as not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category in one of the following ways:

- **BOTH** reading and mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 2 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively, **OR**
- **EITHER** reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 3 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively.

A school makes Adequate Yearly Progress by either reaching the state's proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier I.

B) Persistently Low Graduation Rate

Additionally, any Title I funded high school (a "secondary school" is defined in Idaho code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof) with a graduation rate (as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b)) lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years shall be identified as Tier I.³

Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier I.

Tier II Schools:

There are two types of Tier II schools: those Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools with (a) the lowest-achievement and lack of progress over time and/or (b) a graduation rate less than 60% for three consecutive years. Secondary schools are defined in Idaho Code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof.

A) Lowest Achievement with Lack of Progress

Lowest Achievement – For the purposes of identifying the lowest-achieving secondary schools that are eligible but not Title I funded, the Idaho Department of Education used the "all students" category based on those students who take the state's assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 10). The "all students" category includes all students tested in those grade levels in each school, such as those with limited English proficiency (LEP), those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have disabilities, and all other categories required by the ESEA. All public schools in the state of Idaho were included; no waivers were sought to exclude schools from the process due to any particular minimum n-count.

For the purpose of these federal funding streams, Idaho defines lowest-achievement by ranking Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools using a method that combines the two sets of 2009 data in the "all students" category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure upon which all Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools are sorted. The ranking procedure works as follows:

³ Currently no high school in Idaho has had a graduation rate lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years.

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

Step 6: Rank order the “added ranks” for each of the schools in the relevant set of schools. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rank would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 7: Calculate the lowest five percent or five schools, whichever is greater, based upon the added ranks using the additional criteria of “lack of progress” below.

Lack of Progress – Once schools are sorted in the process above, Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Since Idaho has one accountability system, even Title I eligible, but not funded, schools are classified according to adequately yearly progress standards. Therefore, persistent lack of progress is defined by all of the following criteria:

- Not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category for EITHER reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009, AND
- Not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category at least one or more times in EITHER reading or mathematics for school years 2006-2007 or 2007-2008 respectively, AND

- Having (a) fewer students scoring proficient or advanced (i.e., a decreasing proficiency trend) in (b) EITHER reading or mathematics or both in the “all students” category in school year 2008-2009 when compared to school year 2006-2007.

A Title I eligible, but not funded, school makes Adequate Yearly Progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in that category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier II.

B) Persistently Low Graduation Rate

Additionally, any Title I eligible, but not funded, high school (a “secondary school” is defined in Idaho code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof) with a graduation rate (as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b)) lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years shall be identified as Tier II.

Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier II.

Tier III Schools:

All Title I funded schools that are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, but which are not Tier I schools are classified in Tier III. LEAs may apply for 1003(g) SIG funds for Tier III schools according to the requirements and regulations outlined in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010).

Newly Eligible Schools:

ISDE did not choose to include the option of “newly eligible schools” that was authorized under the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010. Therefore, any such Title I eligible, but not funded, schools are not included in the data or analysis for the SIG fund.

Step 2: Determine Number That Makes Up Each Tier

A) There are 652 schools in the State of Idaho for which Adequate Yearly Progress is calculated.	
Tier I	Tier II
B) Of those 652 schools, there are 376 Title I funded schools <i>276 schools removed for not being Title I funded</i>	B) Of those 652 schools, there are 308 schools that elementary/secondary schools or secondary schools. <i>343 schools removed for being solely elementary schools</i>
C) Of the 376 Title I funded schools, 161 schools are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. <i>215 schools removed for not being in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring</i>	C) Of the 308 schools, 100 schools are eligible for Title I funds, but are not served by Title I funds. <i>208 schools removed for either not being eligible or for being Title I funded and therefore part of the Tier I equation.</i>
D) Given a set of 161 schools, 5% is equal to 8 schools.	D) Given a set of 100 schools, 5% is equal to 5 schools.
Graduation Rates: High schools with a graduation rate of less than 60% over three consecutive years would be added to Tier I (if Title I funded) or Tier II (if Title I eligible, but not funded). No high school in Idaho has a graduation rate that meets this criteria. Therefore, no high schools were added to Tiers I or II.	
Tier III	
E) Given a set of 161 schools that are Title I funded and in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, any such school that is not in Tier I is in Tier III. Therefore, 161 possible Title I funded schools less 8 schools in Tier I equals 153 schools ($161 - 8 = 153$).	
Total Schools in Tier I	8
Total Schools in Tier II	5
Total Schools in Tier III	153

Step 3: Determine Method for Combined Proficiency Rates

For the purpose of the SIG Fund Idaho determines combined proficiency rates by using the two sets of 2009 data in the “all students” category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure. The ranking procedure works as follows:

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

The two ranks added together serve as the combined, or composite, value that represents the percent of proficient students in each school relative to all other schools in the state. The chart below demonstrates how these ranks are added.

School Name	Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Math 2008-09	State Rank for Math Proficiency	Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Reading 2008-09	State Rank for Reading Proficiency	Composite Ranks (i.e., Added Ranks)
School A	16	1	30	1	2
School B	29	3	33	2	5
School C	33	4	53	3	7
School D	25	2	63	6	8
School E	42	5	57	4	9

Step 4: Determine Method for Lack of Progress

Lack of Progress – Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section*

1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Persistent lack of progress is defined as not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category in one of the following ways:

- **BOTH** reading and mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 2 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively, **OR**
- **EITHER** reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 3 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively.

A school makes Adequate Yearly Progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Because the Lack of Progress definition is dichotomous, a school either makes progress, or it does not make progress. Thus, any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier I.

Step 5: Determine Weights for Achievement

No weights are assigned to academic achievement. As described in Step 3, both reading/language arts and mathematics are counted equally. All schools are ranked in each content area relative to all other schools in the state. Then, the two content area ranks are “added” to determine a composite, or combined, ranking.

Step 6: Determine Weights for Type of School

No weights are assigned to the type of school. Idaho has numerous combinations of schools: elementary schools, secondary schools, elementary/secondary schools, separate secondary schools, and so forth (IDAPA 33-1001). There is no statistically valid reason to weight one category of school over the other.

Step 7: Rank Lowest to Highest Achievement for Tier I

Using the “combined ranks” method described in Step 3, all Title I funded schools are ranked in order from lowest rank to highest rank. The “added ranks” for each of the schools serves as a composite rank. The school with the lowest composite rank (*e.g.*, 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rank would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 8: Apply Lack of Progress to the Ranked Tier I List

As described in the SIG guidance document, the Lack of Specific Progress method is dichotomous. Specifically, it says: “Under this example, there are only two options: a school makes progress, as defined by the SEA, or the school does not” (SIG-G, p.7). Therefore, the identification of schools that are low achieving and persistently so is a two layer process. The composite rank earned in Step 7 is based upon 2009 data. Then, each school is defined as either making sufficient progress or not. Persistent lack of progress for Tier I is defined as not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category in one of the following ways:

- **BOTH** reading and mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 2 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively, **OR**
- **EITHER** reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 3 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively.

A school makes Adequate Yearly Progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier I.

The following chart demonstrates an example of how the combinations of Adequate Yearly Progress in each of the “all students” categories were used to define the specific progress made over the course of three years.

School Name	Composite Rank (i.e., Added Ranks)	Did the school make AYP in 2006-2008? (Y/N)				Combinations Missed AYP Out of 4 Possible(2006-2008)	Did the school make AYP in 2009? (Y/N)		Combination Missed AYP (2009)	Lack of Progress Criteria (i.e., 2009 + previous years combination)	Did School Make Specific Progress? (Yes / No)
		Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2006-07	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2006-07	Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2007-08	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2007-08		Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2008-09	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2008-09			
Example School A	2	N	N	N	N	4	N	N	Both	BOTH + 4	YES

Example School B	7	N	N	N	N	4	Y	Y	n/a	Neither + 4	NO
Example School C	19	Y	N	N	N	3	N	N	Both	BOTH + 3	YES
Example School D	18	Y	N	N	N	3	N	Y	One	EITHER + 3	YES
Example School E	27	N	N	N	N	4	N	Y	One	EITHER + 4	YES
Example School F	28	Y	N	N	Y	2	Y	Y	n/a	Neither + 2	NO
Example School G	39	Y	N	Y	N	2	N	N	Both	BOTH + 2	YES
Example School H	38	Y	Y	N	N	2	N	Y	One	EITHER + 2	NO
Example School I	42	N	N	N	N	4	N	Y	One	Either + 4	YES
Example School J	41	N	N	N	Y	3	Y	Y	n/a	Neither + 3	NO

Step 9: Count Up the Relevant Number for Tier I

The relevant list of Tier I schools is then determined by counting up from the lowest ranked schools that also are marked “Yes” for Lack of Specific Progress until the number set forth in Step 2 above is reached. In this case, 8 schools are identified for Tier I.

Case-by-Case Scenarios. In counting up the number of Tier I schools, there were two schools that were initially identified for inclusion in Tier I. IDE analyzed the data for these schools using the “case-by-case” scenario presented in section A-17 of the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010). Section A-17 states an SEA may not exclude categories of schools in identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, except in one narrow circumstance. It goes on to say: “One narrow exception to the general rule above may be a category consisting of schools specifically designed to serve over-age, under-credited students—i.e., schools designed to re-engage students who have dropped out of high school and who, by definition, cannot graduate within the standard number of years” (p.8). In the case of these schools, it was deemed that the schools were alternative high schools that fall under this exception to the rule. By virtue of the fact that they serve populations that are continuously in flux due to drop outs who are being re-engaged, it was determined that the schools would be more appropriately served in Tier III.

Step 10: Identify Relevant Title I High Schools Based on Graduation Rate for Tier I

No Idaho Title I secondary schools had a graduation rate lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years. Therefore, no high schools were identified.

Step 11: Add Relevant Title I High Schools to Tier I Based on Graduation Rate

Because no secondary schools were identified in Step 10, none were added to Tier I in this step.

Step 12: Rank Lowest to Highest Achievement for Tier II

Using the “combined ranks” method described in Step 3, all Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools are ranked in order from lowest rank to highest rank. The “added ranks” for each of the schools serves as a composite rank. The school with the lowest composite rank (*e.g.*, 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest composite rank would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 13: Apply Lack of Progress to the Ranked Tier II List

As described in the SIG guidance document, the Lack of Specific Progress method is dichotomous. Specifically, it says: “Under this example, there are only two options: a school makes progress, as defined by the SEA, or the school does not” (SIG-G, p.7). Therefore, the identification of schools that are low achieving and persistently so is a two layer process. The composite rank earned in Step 12 is based upon 2009 data. Then, each school is defined as either making sufficient progress or not. Since Idaho has one accountability system, even Title I eligible, but not funded, schools are classified according to adequately yearly progress standards. Because secondary schools’ AYP is usually analyzed on the basis on just one grade level (*e.g.*, 10th), persistent lack of specific progress is defined more robustly by all of the following criteria being true:

- Criteria 1 – Not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category for EITHER reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009, AND
- Criteria 2 – Not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the “all students” category at least one or more times in EITHER reading or mathematics for school years 2006-2007 or 2007-2008 respectively, AND
- Criteria 3 – Having (a) fewer students scoring proficient or advanced (*i.e.*, a decreasing proficiency trend) in (b) EITHER reading or mathematics or both in the “all students” category in school year 2008-2009 when compared to school year 2006-2007.

A Title I eligible, but not funded, school makes Adequate Yearly Progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either

missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier II.

The following chart demonstrates an example of how the combinations of Adequate Yearly Progress in each of the “all students” categories were used to define the specific progress made over the course of three years.

School	Composite Rank (i.e., Added Ranks)	Change in Math			Change in Reading			AYP All Students 2006 to 2008					AYP All Students 2009			Lack of Progress Criteria			Did School Lack Specific Progress? (Yes / No)
		Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Math 2006-07	Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Math 2008-09	Difference: Math 2007 to 2009	Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Reading 2006-07	Percent Prof/Adv: All Students – Reading 2008-09	Difference: Reading 2007 to 2009	Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2006-07	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2006-07	Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2007-08	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2007-08	Missed AYP Count - 2006 to 2008	Met AYP: All-Students – Math 2008-09	Met AYP: All-Students – Reading 2008-09	Missed AYP Count - 2009	Criteria 1 (T/F)	Criteria 2 (T/F)	Criteria 3 (T/F)	
Example 1	3	24	39	15	43	63	20	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	0	F	F	T	No
Example 2	8	29	41	12	40	75	35	Y	N	Y	Y	1	Y	Y	0	F	T	T	No
Example 3	10	57	52	-5	74	70	-4	N	N	N	N	4	N	N	2	T	T	T	YES
Example 4	21	70	65	-5	62	76	14	Y	N	Y	Y	1	Y	Y	0	F	T	T	No
Example 5	24	85	54	-31	85	83	-2	N	N	Y	Y	2	N	Y	1	T	T	T	YES
Example 6	25	64	63	-1	82	82	0	N	Y	N	Y	2	N	Y	1	T	T	T	YES
Example 7	27	55	45	-10	73	84	11	Y	Y	N	Y	1	N	Y	1	T	T	T	YES
Example 8	42	64	69	5	80	83	3	N	Y	Y	N	2	Y	Y	0	F	T	T	No

Step 14: Count Up the Relevant Number for Tier II

The relevant list of Tier II schools is then determined by counting up from the lowest ranked schools that also are marked “Yes” for Lack of Specific Progress until the number set forth in Step 2 above is reached. In this case, 5 schools are identified for Tier II.

Step 15: Identify Relevant Title I Eligible High Schools Based on Graduation Rate for Tier II

No Idaho Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary school had a graduation rate lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years. Therefore, no secondary schools were identified.

Step 16: Add Relevant Title I Eligible High Schools to Tier II Based on Graduation Rate

Because no secondary schools were identified in Step 15, none were added to Tier II in this step

Attachment 4: LEA Instructions for School Improvement Grants

1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Instructions to LEAs

Due 5:00 p.m., Friday, July 16, 2010

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Please read the following information before completing the questions in the *School Improvement Grant (SIG)* application.

- To prepare districts for implementing school intervention models and improvement activities in the 2010-11 school year, a portion of SIG funds will be available immediately after awards announced.
- Depending on continued funding, grantees may be eligible to renew their SIG grants for up to two additional one-year periods (2011-12 and 2012-13).
- Directions:
 - In order to expedite funding of successful proposals the applications will be sent to reviewers electronically. Therefore district applications must be submitted electronically to Steve Underwood, sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov no later than 5:00 p.m. Friday, July 16, 2010.
 - Districts should use this application as a template. In other words you may paste your responses into this word document.

PURPOSE of GRANT

Idaho has always reserved 4% of our Title I allocation to support School Improvement. Resources available from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (1003g) allow the Idaho SDE to greatly extend the amount of support offered to schools. The purpose of these funds is to turn around the lowest 5% of persistently low-achieving Title I schools and Title I-eligible secondary schools.

Based on federal guidelines, SIG funds will be used in Idaho to:

- Provide financial resources to qualifying districts to implement selected intervention model(s) in identified Tier I and Tier II schools with strict fidelity, per federal regulations (see definitions of Tier I Schools and Tier II Schools below in Criteria for Awarding SIGs to Districts on pages 34-38 and on the U.S. Department of Education's web site <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>).
- Provide financial resources to qualifying districts to support activities and services in identified Tier III schools, per federal regulations (a definition of Tier III Schools can be found on page 39 and on the U.S. Department of Education's web site <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>).

- Provide technical assistance and training to use Idaho’s online strategic planning tool – WISE (Ways to Improve School Effectiveness) for all schools in Tier I and Tier II, as well as Title I schools in needs improvement, correction action or restructuring.
- Provide financial resources to support the use of approved technical assistance providers (Capacity Builders) to LEAs implementing one of the four reform models (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation) or to LEAs with Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- Provide financial resources to aid districts and schools in developing effective structures and conditions essential to continuous improvement and to sustain reforms after the funding period ends. Schools in qualifying districts may apply to part of state-wide efforts such as:
 - i. Focus Visits
 - ii. Training for School Board Trustees
 - iii. Superintendents Network
 - iv. Central Office Staff Network
 - v. Principals’ Academy of Leadership
 - vi. Aligning Instruction (Vertically and to Standards)
 - vii. College Exams (ACT/SAT)
 - viii. Dual Credit Opportunities
 - ix. Expanding Early Childhood Opportunities

CRITERIA FOR AWARDING SIGs TO DISTRICTS

Based on federal guidelines, School Improvement Grants (SIGs) are available to districts which 1) demonstrate greatest need; and 2) provide evidence of strongest commitment to use SIG funds to raise student achievement substantially and graduation rates (if applicable). Districts also must demonstrate the capacity to both implement and sustain reforms over time. Definitions of Persistently Lowest-achieving Schools, Greatest Need, Required Interventions, and Strongest Commitment follow:

In federal guidelines greatest need is established by segmenting schools into three categories: Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III. Schools in Tier I and Tier II are considered *persistently low achieving*. The following is Idaho’s methodology Idaho has used to determine the Tiers.

Tier I Schools:

There are two types of Tier I schools: those Title I funded schools with (a) the lowest-achievement and lack of progress over time and/or (b) a graduation rate less than 60% for three consecutive years.

A) Lowest Achievement with Lack of Progress

Lowest Achievement – For the purposes of identifying the lowest-achieving schools, the Idaho Department of Education used the “all students” category based on those students who take the state’s assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 10). The “all students” category includes all students tested in those grade levels in each school, such as those with limited English proficiency (LEP), those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have disabilities, and all other categories required by the ESEA. All public schools in the state of Idaho were included; no waivers were sought to exclude schools from the process due to any particular minimum n-count.

For the purpose of these federal funding streams, Idaho defines lowest-achievement by ranking Title I funded schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, using a method that combines the two sets of 2009 data in the “all students” category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure upon which all Title I funded schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring are sorted. The ranking procedure works as follows:

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

Step 6: Rank order the “added ranks” for each of the schools in the relevant set of schools. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rank would be the

highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 7: Calculate the lowest five percent or five schools, whichever is greater, based upon the added ranks using the additional criteria of “lack of progress” below.

Lack of Progress – Once schools are sorted in the process above, Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Persistent lack of progress is defined as not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the “all students” category in one of the following ways:

- **BOTH** reading and mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 2 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively, **OR**
- **EITHER** reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009 **AND** 3 or more out of 4 possible combinations for reading and mathematics for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 respectively.

A school makes adequate yearly progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier I.

B) Persistently Low Graduation Rate

Additionally, any Title I funded high school (a “secondary school” is defined in Idaho code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof) with a graduation rate (as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b)) lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years shall be identified as Tier I.⁴

Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier I.

Tier II Schools:

There are two types of Tier II schools: those Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools with (a) the lowest-achievement and lack of progress over time and/or (b) a graduation rate less

⁴ Currently no high school in Idaho has had a graduation rate lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years.

than 60% for three consecutive years. Secondary schools are defined in Idaho Code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof.

A) Lowest Achievement with Lack of Progress

Lowest Achievement – For the purposes of identifying the lowest-achieving secondary schools that are eligible but not Title I funded, the Idaho Department of Education used the “all students” category based on those students who take the state’s assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (i.e., students in grades 3 through 8 and 10). The “all students” category includes all students tested in those grade levels in each school, such as those with limited English proficiency (LEP), those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, those who have disabilities, and all other categories required by the ESEA. All public schools in the state of Idaho were included; no waivers were sought to exclude schools from the process due to any particular minimum n-count.

For the purpose of these federal funding streams, Idaho defines lowest-achievement by ranking Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools using a method that combines the two sets of 2009 data in the “all students” category in both reading and mathematics. Idaho is utilizing the guidelines from section A-15, Example 2 – The Adding Ranks Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to develop such a ranking procedure upon which all Title I eligible, but not funded, secondary schools are sorted. The ranking procedure works as follows:

Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 2: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 3: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for each school using assessment data from the most recent school year available. (Using the State report card data under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)

Step 4: Assign a rank order for each school based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the lowest percent proficient to the highest percent proficient. The lowest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.

Step 5: Add the numerical rank for reading/language arts to the numerical rank for mathematics for each school (e.g., “added ranks”).

Step 6: Rank order the “added ranks” for each of the schools in the relevant set of schools. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for

both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rate would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools.

Step 7: Calculate the lowest five percent or five schools, whichever is greater, based upon the added ranks using the additional criteria of “lack of progress” below.

Lack of Progress – Once schools are sorted in the process above, Idaho defines lack of progress by using the guidelines from section A-16, Example 2 – The Lack of Specific Progress Method, in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010) to evaluate the degree to which the lowest-achieving schools have persistently lacked improvement. Since Idaho has one accountability system, even Title I eligible, but not funded, schools are classified according to adequately yearly progress standards. Therefore, persistent lack of progress is defined by all of the following criteria:

- Not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the “all students” category for EITHER reading or mathematics for school year 2008-2009, AND
- Not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the “all students” category at least one or more times in EITHER reading or mathematics for school years 2006-2007 or 2007-2008 respectively, AND
- Having (a) fewer students scoring proficient or advanced (i.e., a decreasing proficiency trend) in (b) EITHER reading or mathematics or both in the “all students” category in school year 2008-2009 when compared to school year 2006-2007.

A Title I eligible, but not funded, school makes adequate yearly progress by either reaching the state’s proficiency target for the particular subgroup or by decreasing the numbers of non-proficient students by 10% in each category. Thus, the lack of progress definition demonstrates that the school has either missed the target or neglected to improve by 10% in 2009 and a combination of prior years. Any schools that are ranked low, but which have shown progress are bumped out of Tier II.

B) Persistently Low Graduation Rate

Additionally, any Title I eligible, but not funded, high school (a “secondary school” is defined in Idaho code as a school that serves grades seven (7) through twelve (12), or any combination thereof) with a graduation rate (as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b)) lower than 60% for 3 consecutive years shall be identified as Tier I.

Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier II.

Tier III Schools:

All Title I funded schools that are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, but which are not Tier I schools are classified in Tier III. LEAs may apply for 1003(g) SIG funds for Tier III schools according to the requirements and regulations outlined in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (January 20, 2010).

REQUIRED INTERVENTIONS FOR TIER I AND II SCHOOLS

The final guidance of the 1003g application to states specifies that SIGs will be awarded to eligible districts committing to implement one of the following four federally-defined school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools.

- **Turnaround model**, which includes, among other actions, replacing the principal and rehiring up to 50% of the school's staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with the State's academic standards. A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model or a new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).
- **Restart model**⁵, in which a district converts the school to a charter school or closes and reopens it under the management of an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
- **School closure**, in which the district closes the school and enrolls the students who attended the school in other higher-achieving schools in the district.
- **Transformation model**, which addresses areas critical to transforming persistently low-achieving schools. These areas include: developing teacher and principal leader effectiveness (depending on the length of tenure this could mean replacing the current administrator), implementing comprehensive instructional reform strategies, extending learning time and creating community connections, and providing operating flexibility and sustained support.

Additional information on each of these reform models can be found in the Center on Innovation & Improvement's *Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants, 2009*, www.cii.org. There are links to the *Handbook* on both the Idaho State Department of Education's web site, www.sde.idaho.gov and Boise State's Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies <http://csi.boisestate.edu/improvement/SIHome.html> In addition to **Greatest Need**, federal guidelines require States to look at **Strongest Commitment** and Capacity of the district to serve identified schools. The State must consider, at a minimum, the extent to which the application shows the district's efforts and/or plans to:

- Analyze school needs and match interventions to those needs.
 - Analysis of school needs must include:

- Disaggregated analysis of student achievement data and if applicable outcome data (graduation rates, percentage of students going on to post-secondary opportunities, dropout rate).
 - Use of the Center for Educational Effectiveness (CEE) survey⁶ to gather perceptual data from students, teachers, parents.
 - Participation in Focus Visit⁷.
- Design interventions consistent with the four intervention model(s). described in Criteria for Awarding SIGs to Districts above.
- Use an approved technical assistance provider (Idaho Capacity Builder) or demonstrate evidence that the external provider selected by the LEA has a proven track record in turning around low achieving schools.
- Embed interventions in longer-term plans to sustain gains in achievement.
- Align other resources with the interventions.
- Modify practices, policies, and procedures, if necessary, to enable the school(s) to implement both the reform model and the specific interventions fully and effectively.
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

FUNDING

Details for SIG funds include the following:

- Anticipated Amount of Awards for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Schools: Districts may apply for funding ranging from \$50,000 annually to \$2,000,000 annually for each **Tier I**, **Tier II** and **Tier III** school the district applies to serve (see Sample Annual District Allocation Model). This higher limit, which was included by the Consolidated Appropriations Act on December 16, 2009 and published in the new School Improvement Grant Interim Final Requirements on January 15, 2010, permits the SDE to award directly the amount that may be necessary for successful implementation of one of the four intervention models described above in Tier I and Tier II schools. For example, a school of 250 students might need \$150,000 to fully and effectively implement a federally approved reform model, a school with 500 students might require \$250,000 and a large, comprehensive high school might require \$750,000 to implement the reform.
- Availability of Funds: SIG funds will be available in spring of the 2009-10 school year to support grantees in the creation of the necessary conditions for implementing school reform models and improvement activities/services in the 2010-11 school year.
- Priority: The SDE must give first priority to districts that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools. No funds may be awarded to any district for Tier III schools unless and until the SDE has awarded SIG funds to serve fully, throughout the period of availability of SIG funds, all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that districts commit to serve and the SDE determines districts have the capacity to serve. A district with one or more Tier I or

⁶ Sample Center for Educational Effectiveness Survey can be found in Appendix B-2

⁷ Information on Focus Visits can be found in Appendix C

Tier II schools may not receive funds to serve only Tier III schools unless and until it has an approved proposal to serve schools in Tier I and Tier II.

- District-level Activities: District may use SIG funds to conduct district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention model(s) in the district's Tier I and Tier II schools and to support school improvement activities for each Tier III school identified in the district's application.
- As appropriate, State-level Technical Assistance: District will allow the State to holdback sufficient funds for required or requested and agreed-upon State-level technical assistance and other supportive services (technical assistance providers, administration of CEE surveys, assessment of schools' implementation of the selected reform model, state-wide professional development for schools in Tiers I and II, etc.). Requested activities may be for implementing some of the required or permissible activities noted in the intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools, improvement activities in Tier III schools, or associated district-level activities. Districts may also request that the SDE contract with external providers or other services which may be purchased through the SDE.
- Renewal: Depending on continued federal funding, successful applicants may renew their SIG grants for up to two additional one-year periods of funding (2011-12 and 2012-13). To be eligible for renewal, districts will be accountable for ensuring 1) their Tier I and Tier II schools meet, or demonstrate a positive trajectory to meet annual student achievement goals for all students and for subgroups in reading and mathematics, as well as for making progress on the leading indicators; and 2) their Tier III schools are meeting annual goals (subject to approval by SDE) outlined in their improvement plans.

Note: In their application, districts are required to include a timeline of activities for implementing intervention(s) in Tier I and Tier II schools and improvement activities in Tier III schools they are applying to serve. In their timeline, districts should include activities in Year 2 (2011-12) and Year 3 (2012-13) which are essential to sustaining reforms after the funding period ends. The three-year proposed budget which districts are required to provide in their applications should also reflect the expectation for building capacity for sustainability to avoid "funding cliffs" and to ensure reforms will continue into 2013-14 and beyond.

Sample Annual District Allocation Model: The table below provides a sample of how a district might plan to allocate funds in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for one year.

Total # of Schools in Each Tier	Total # of Schools District Applies to Serve	Possible Award	Proposed Budget	Total Proposed Annual Budget
2	2	Between \$50,000 and \$2 million per school	School A (population of <250): \$150,000 School B (population of between 250-500): \$250,000	\$400,000
1	1	Between \$50,000 and \$2 million per school	School C (population of greater than 1,000) \$750,000	\$750,000
11	5	Between \$50,000 and \$2 million per school	\$250,000 (No Tier I or Tier II schools in districts, choosing to serve 5 Tier III schools)	\$250,000

In the event funding for the grants is reduced or eliminated, or if program requirements are changed, the Idaho SDE will collaborate with districts to modify applications.

TIMELINE

The timeline for the SIG Application process follows:

- **Announcement of the SIG Grant opportunity was sent on April 23, 2010** to District Superintendents with Tier I and Tier II Schools.
- Interested LEAs should send a **Statement of Interest to Steve Underwood, sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov as soon as possible or within 5 business days of notification of the state's final approval.**

- Interested LEAs that may be uncertain regarding the particular reform model may request a Focus Visit at anytime. **Scheduling requests should be sent to Jodie Mills, Systems Improvement Coordinator, jmills@sde.idaho.gov.**
- Information regarding the SIG applications will be provided through an IdahoLive session (webinar) within one week of notice of approval by U.S. Dept of Ed. In addition six regional distance sessions will be scheduled through Idaho Live (distance network). The schedule for regional distance sessions will be announced within one week of approval by the U.S. Dept of Ed.
- The Idaho School Improvement Grant (including Application and Instructions) will be published on our state web site along with any amendments submitted to USDoe within one week of the state's final approval.
- The final list of schools in each tier was published on the SDE website on May 1, 2010.
- Final District SIG Applications are due **electronically by 5:00 p.m., Friday, July 16, 2010.**
- **The application should be sent electronically to Steve Underwood at sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov.**
- SDE Review of District *SIG* Applications will be held **July 19-23, 2010.**
- Interviews with District *SIG* Potential Awardees will be held **July 26-27, 2010.**
- Successful District *SIG* Awardees will be notified by the Superintendent Luna on **July 30, 2010.**

WHO SHOULD APPLY?

Districts that submit applications must be willing to implement one of the four specified intervention models in identified Tier I and Tier II schools, and provide improvement activities and services in identified Tier III schools. Districts must also be willing to provide evidence of strong commitment as defined in the instructions. Finally, districts must be willing to participate in assessment, data collection, evaluation, and other activities described in the Assurances in the School Improvement Grant application.

WHAT WILL BE EXPECTED OF THE DISTRICT?

In the Application Process:

Districts must submit their completed School Improvement Grant Application electronically to Steve Underwood by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, July 16, 2010. Districts are required to complete the following actions prior to submitting their application:

- Identify Participating Schools: Only Title I schools and Title I-eligible secondary schools identified by the SDE as a Tier I, Tier II or Tier III school may be served by SIG funds. In its application, each district will identify school(s) it will apply to serve and demonstrate capacity to do so; the district may decide it can best impact student achievement by focusing on a subset of its eligible schools.
- Conduct a School-level Needs Assessments for Identified Tier I and Tier II Schools: Districts must complete a needs assessment for each Tier I and Tier II school the district

is applying to serve. The assessment is intended to assist the district in identifying the intervention model appropriate to each school. District may request technical assistance from the SDE in conducting the needs assessment, and may also request a Focus Visit as a process for determining the best match. The Focus Visit will include classroom observations focusing on instructional practices within the school and interviews with instructional staff. The observation tool and interview protocols align with the WISE Tool as well as the *Nine Characteristics of High Performing School* (Shannon & Blyma, 2007). District-level practices and policies should be reviewed as part of the needs assessment to identify potential barriers in district policy/practices that may impede the district's ability to implement a particular model in a Tier I or Tier II school.

- Engage Stakeholders: The application process also requires the engagement of relevant stakeholder groups, including local trustees and employee associations. It will be essential to collaborate with local education associations on the matter of personnel evaluations and assignments within the specified intervention models.

Throughout the Duration of the Grant:

- Implement Intervention Models in Tier I and Tier II Schools: Participating districts must implement selected intervention model(s) with strict fidelity, per federal regulations. Federal intervention models include: Turnaround, Restart, School Closure, and Transformation. Detailed requirements for each of the four specific school intervention models are available on pages 65650-65655 of the *Final Notice* at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>.
- Support School Improvement in Tier III Schools: Districts must support school improvement activities and services identified in the SIG application at the school or district level for each participating Tier III school.
- Participate in On-going Assessment and Data Collection: Assurances require districts to use the SDE online planning tool (WISE Tool) for posting intervention plans and providing ongoing evidence of implementation and impact of intervention efforts. Data include, but are not limited to, findings from needs assessments and analyses, classroom walk-through summary data, student and classroom assessment data and interventions, evidence of collaboration, and progress toward leading indicators and other measures of performance. Details regarding leading indicators are available on page 65656 of the *Final Notice* at <http://www.ed.gov/programs/sif/applicant.html>. Additionally, participating districts can expect on-site monitoring and technical assistance visits to verify successes and address challenges associated with implementation of the grant.
- Hold Tier I and Tier II Schools Accountable: Districts must hold their Tier I and Tier II schools served with SIG funds accountable each year for meeting, or being on track to meet, achievement goals in reading and mathematics with respect to all students and each subgroup of students, and for making progress on leading indicators.

- Hold Tier III Schools Accountable: Districts must hold their Tier III schools served with SIG funds accountable each year for meeting improvement goals (subject to approval by SDE).
- Participate in Required Evaluations: Districts and participating schools are required to take part in any federally or state (Education Northwest) required evaluations of the School Improvement Grant.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE FROM SDE

As a support to districts choosing to apply for SIG funds, the SDE will offer external District-level technical assistance and instruction in the use of the online strategic planning tool. The same tool will be used for posting school intervention plans and providing ongoing evidence of implementation and impact of intervention efforts. If your district is interested in receiving technical assistance related to the wise tool contact Dr. Lisa Kinnaman, lisakinnaman@boisestate.edu.

In addition LEAs may use any of the planning tools included in the District Improvement Guide created by Boise State University's Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies (Appendix A-1).

Four Federal Intervention Models

There are four intervention models defined in federal guidance for School Improvement Grants: **Turnaround**, **Transformation**, **Closure**, and **Restart**. A district must agree to implement fully and effectively one of these interventions in each Tier I and Tier II school that the district commits to serve.

The **Closure model** does not require any of the components below, but does require that students are sent to other higher-achieving schools in the district.

The **Restart model** requires the district to convert the low-achieving school to a charter school, or to turn the school over to an education management organization (EMO), which is a non-profit or for-profit organization that provides whole school operation services to a district. If the district is interested in converting the school to a charter school they should contact Michelle Clement Taylor at the SDE, mtaylor@sde.idaho.gov. A description for Charter School Developers and Authorizers can be found on the SDE's web site, http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/charter_schools/. If the district chooses to turn the school over to an EMO, the selection process must be rigorous and thorough. A restarted school must enroll, within grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

Any of these models are open to LEAs within Idaho and we encourage district leaders to research all of them before making a selection. We have gathered feedback from district leaders that suggest that most LEAs are considering either the Turnaround or Transformation Model. Highlights of Required Activities and Permissible Activities for the **Turnaround model** and **Transformation model** are described below. A **Turnaround model** may implement any of the Required Activities or Permissible Activities described in the **Transformation model**.

X = Required O = Permissible		
	Turnaround	Transformation
Teachers and Leaders		
Replace the principal.	X	X
Use locally adopted competencies to measure effectiveness of staff who can work in turnaround environment; use to screen existing staff and select new staff.	X	
Screen all existing staff, rehiring no more than 50%.	X	
Implement such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for recruiting, placing, and retaining effective teachers.	X	X

X = Required

O = Permissible

	Turnaround	Transformation
Implement rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals which are developed with staff and use student growth as a significant factor.	O	X
Identify and reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement and graduation rates; identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve professional practice, have not done so.	O	X
Provide additional incentives to attract and retain staff with skills necessary to meet the needs of the students (e.g., bonus to a cohort of high-performing teachers placed in a low-achieving school).	O	X
Ensure school is not required to accept a teacher without mutual consent of teacher and principal, regardless of teacher's seniority.	O	O

X = Required

O = Permissible

	Turnaround	Transformation
Instructional and Support Strategies		
Use data to select and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned to each grade and state standards.	X	X
Provide staff ongoing, high quality, job-embedded professional development aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff.	X	X
Ensure continuous use of data (e.g., formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students.	X	X
Institute a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development.	O	O
Conduct periodic reviews to ensure the curriculum is implemented with fidelity, having intended impact on student achievement, and modified if ineffective.	O	O

Implement a school-wide “response to intervention” model.	○	○
Provide additional supports and professional development to teachers to support students with disabilities and limited English proficient students.	○	○
Use and integrate technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.	○	○
Secondary Schools: Increase graduation rates through strategies such as credit recovery programs, smaller learning communities, etc.	○	○
Secondary Schools: Increase rigor in coursework, offer opportunities for advanced courses, and provide supports designed to ensure low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework.	○	○
Secondary Schools: Improve student transition from middle to high school.	○	○
Secondary Schools: Establish early warning systems.	○	○

X = Required

O = Permissible

Turnaround

Transformation

Learning Time and Support

Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time. Increased learning time includes longer school day, week, or year to increase total number of school hours.	X	X
Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and support for students.	X	O Note: Guidelines indicate school may partner with parents and community organizations to provide these services
Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.	O	X
Extend or restructure the school day to add time for such strategies as advisories to build relationships.	O	O
Implement approaches to improve school climate and discipline.	O	O
Expand program to offer pre-kindergarten or full day kindergarten.	O	O

X = Required O = Permissible		
	Turnaround	Transformation
Governance		
Adopt a new governance structure to address turnaround of school(s); the district may hire a chief turnaround officer to report directly to the superintendent.	X	O
Grant sufficient operational flexibility (e.g., staffing, calendar, and budget) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement and increase high school graduation rates.	X Note: Guidelines indicate <i>Principal</i> is granted operating flexibility.	X Note: Guidelines indicate <i>School</i> is granted operating flexibility.
Ensure school receives intensive ongoing technical support from district, state, or external partners.	O	X
Allow the school to be run under a new governance agreement, such as a turnaround division within the district or state.	O	O
Implement a per-pupil school based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.	O	O

NOTE: Examples of new schools which may be implemented in **Turnaround model** or **Restart model** include theme-based academies, such as STEM or dual language.

Attachment 5: LEA Application for School Improvement Grants

Revised 7-20-2010

This revision replaces “Attachment 5: LEA Application for School Improvement Grants” of the SEA application originally submitted to USDoE.

1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)

District Application

Due 5:00 p.m., Friday, July 16, 2010

The School District's Superintendent, School Board Chair, Title I Director, Fiscal Manager, must all certify that they have read and understand 1) the SIG Assurances and 2) the ARRA Assurances and assure that the information in this application is accurate.

Application Date: _____

Superintendent Name

Signature

School Board Chair Name

Signature

Title I Director Name

Signature

Fiscal Manager Name

Signature

DIRECTIONS:

LEAs are strongly encouraged to read the **Instructions for Districts** before completing this application (see attachment 4). Please answer questions as thoroughly as possible. Applications with missing information will not be considered for funding.

SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

Districts must include the following information for each school it will serve with a SIG Grant.

Building Name	Grades Served (e.g. K-6)	NCES ID#	Student FTE	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Intervention (Tier I and II only)

BUDGET

A district must include a proposed budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the district will expend in each year and for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve. (Successful grantees will receive full funding in year one of the SIG grant. Additional funding will be dependent on the success of the implementation and the continued support of federal funds.)

The budget should include proposed funding amounts and a narrative explaining how the district will allocate SIG funds over a maximum 3-year period. A separate budget table should be created for each school the district intends to serve and the funding should be consistent with both the timeline provided by the LEA for implementation and support required activities. (Guidance for budgets is included in the Directions to LEAs, attachment 4.)

Complete the following table:

- a. Grand total of proposed budget amounts for the district and each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school for a maximum of three years (through September 30, 2013).
- b. Total for each for the district (for a maximum of three years through September 30, 2013)
- c. Total for each year for each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school (for a maximum of 3 years through September 30, 2013). Descriptions should include name of each school, its Tier, and the total proposed budget for that school each year.

Building	Tier	Model	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total

District						
School						
Totals			Total	Total	Total	Total

In addition to cumulative information provide individual proposed budget amounts and a narrative indicating how the district will allocate SIG funds through June 30, 2011, with separate detailed budgets for the district and each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the district is committing to serve.

The budget must provide sufficient funding for the following activities:

- Implement the selected intervention model (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation) in each Tier I and Tier II school
- Conduct district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the district’s Tier I and Tier II schools
- Support improvement activities at the school or district level for each Tier III school identified in the district’s application.

As appropriate, include state-level expenses associated with technical assistance and other support services required or requested and agreed upon by the SDE and district. Requested activities may be for implementing intervention models in Tier I or Tier II, improvement activities in Tier III schools, or associated district-level activities. Districts may also contact the SDE about contracting for either external providers or services.

Building Name	Activity	Budgeted Amount

		Total	

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

The following questions correspond to the Federal Guidelines for the Grant. Districts may also want to review the Scoring Guide that will be used to evaluate the District SIG applications.

Instructions:

Districts applying to serve Tier I and Tier II Schools: Respond to questions 1-6 completely, applications with incomplete answers will not be considered for funding.

Districts applying to serve Tier III schools: Respond to question 7 completely; applications with incomplete answers will not be considered for funding.

1a. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District has committed to serve, describe the process of determining the appropriate intervention model for each school. Include the results of the needs assessment (CEE Survey, Focus Visits, input from Capacity Builders, student achievement data) in the description.

1b. Provide evidence that the district has the capacity to use the SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school in order to fully and effectively implement the required activities of the intervention model selected (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation).

2a. Is the district applying to serve each Tier I school identified by the state?

Yes ___ No ___

If the answer is no please answer question 2b.

2b. Explain why the district lacks the capacity to implement a school intervention model and is choosing not to serve each Tier I school with the SIG funds. Include the name of each Tier I school not served.

3a. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve explain the actions the District has taken (or will take) to design and implement the intervention model consistent with final School Improvement Grant requirements. The District must provide detailed school-by-school information linked to specific interventions.

3b. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve, explain the actions the District has taken (or will take) to ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the District and the Student Achievement and School Improvement Division of the Idaho State Department of Education, or a designated external provider.

3c. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve, explain the actions the District has taken (or will take) to align other new and existing resources to fully implement the reform model.

3d. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve, explain the actions the District has taken (or will take) to modify its practices or policies if necessary and enable its schools to fully and effectively implement the reform model.

3e. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve explain the actions the District will take to sustain reforms once the funding period ends.

4. Provide a timeline that delineates the steps the District will take to implement the basic elements of the selected reform model in each Tier I and Tier II school. The timeline should indicate that the District has the ability to implement the basic elements of the model during the 2010-2011 school year.

5a. Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading and mathematics that the District has established to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG Grants. At a minimum, the goal for maintaining the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the prior year’s ISAT (Spring 2010) should be 95%. Given the significance of the reform model and the infusion of funds districts should set aggressive but realistic goals for increasing the percentage of below basic students to basic, and basic to proficient. If the targeted Tier I or Tier II school is a secondary school, the district should also include annual goals related to increasing graduation rate particularly among specific subgroups of students that have traditionally higher dropout rates.

ANNUAL GOALS READING

(as measured by ISAT)

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic, Proficient, or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced	% of Students maintaining either Proficient or Advanced

ANNUAL GOALS MATH

(as measured by ISAT)

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic, Proficient, or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced	% of Students maintaining either Proficient or Advanced

ANNUAL GOALS SCIENCE

(as measured by ISAT)

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic, Proficient, or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient or Advanced	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced	% of Students maintaining either Proficient or Advanced

5b. Describe how the District will use interim and/or formative assessments as well as other indicators (attendance, discipline referrals, referrals to special education, Title I, classroom grades, etc.) to determine if students are making progress toward the annual goals established by the District.

6. Describe how, as appropriate the District has consulted with relevant stakeholders (School Board Members, Personnel Associations, Building Leadership Teams, Parents, etc.) regarding the District's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

7a. Describe how the district will hold each Tier III school receiving SIG funds accounting for meeting the student achievement goals the school (and district) established. (Goals are subject to approval by the SDE.)

7b. For each Tier III school the District commits to serve, identify the services the school will receive or the improvement activities the school will implement. These services may be provided by the District, or with the approval of the District, by the District and Student Achievement School Improvement Division of the SDE, or external providers. Include the timeline for providing these services and activities.

The following is a list of potential services for Schools in all Tiers. Please note that for schools in Tier I and Tier II participation in these state sponsored activities would be in addition to adopting a selected reform model (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation).

School Improvement Activities

	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III
District Level Supports			
Focus Visits	RA	RA	OPT
Idaho Building Capacity Project	RA	RA	OPT
Lighthouse Training for Trustees	RA	RA	OPT
Superintendents Network	RA	RA	OPT
Central Office Staff Network	RA	RA	OPT
School Level Supports			
Principal Academy of Leadership	RA	RA	OPT
Total Instructional Alignment	RA	RA	OPT
ACT/SAT Assessments	RHSA	RHSA	OPT
Dual Credit Opportunities	RHSA	RHSA	OPT
Expanding Early Childhood	RA	RA	OPT
School Intervention Model: Closure, Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation	RA	RA	OPT
RA – Required RHSA – Required of secondary and high schools OPT – Optional			

Focus Visits

Research and experience have taught us the value of catalyzing conditions (capacity, incentives, and opportunity). Catalyzing conditions begin with an event that raises the level of concern within an LEA. Using Title I-A school improvement funds, we have piloted one type of event – a focus visit. But Idaho has not had the resources to bring the program to scale. While many states have a state team that provides guidance, our focus visits are different. They are research-based and include an analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Prior to the visit, we conduct a complete analysis of both student achievement (gap analysis) and perceptual data. Once on site, we conduct observations of all classrooms (using an adapted version of the Patterns of Practice) and interview at least half the instructional staff using a standard response protocol. We conduct focus groups with students, teachers, parents, and non-instructional staff, in each of the schools within the LEA and based on the triangulation of data collected from the various sources, we make recommendations to the district on the areas of strength and areas for improvement. The process is expensive and time consuming, but we know it works and we have the student achievement data to demonstrate its effectiveness. In the few districts where we have been able to pilot the strategy, we have seen a marked difference in both student achievement and strategic planning. A focus visit can be the first step in the process of transforming an LEA.

Idaho Building Capacity Project (IBC)

IBC provides scaffolded support by distinguished educators for three years to both under-achieving schools and their local district leaders. In the first year, the school and the central office receive the services of a trained, distinguished educator for 30 visits (averaging 8-10 hours per week); in the second year the support decreases to an average of 15-20 hours a month, and in year three, 8-10 hours a month, with the focus on sustainability. We believe that if capacity builders had the benefit of the data collected from a focus visit, the result in terms of student achievement could be faster and more impactful, but with that said, the results of the program are impressive. One of our two pilot districts, Caldwell went from no school meeting AYP to six out of 10 meeting AYP in the first year of the program. The second district had a school of the verge of restructuring which met AYP for the first time in five years. Both school districts had already implemented many improvement programs, but they are quick to attribute much of their success to the value of an executive coach to their administrative team during the implementation of change.

Training for School Board Members / Lighthouse Project

The rural nature of our state and the history of local control serve as evidence that local school board trustees are critical to reform efforts. On average, Idaho school board members' tenure is 17 years. As Delagardelle (2007) stated, "*Quality school board functioning is central to*

the effectiveness of schooling. In fact, the effectiveness of school board governance is the single most important determinant of school district success or failure.” Idaho has participated in the Lighthouse Inquiry Project, and it has had positive results. To access School Improvement Grant funds, we will require each of the school boards of our lowest-achieving school districts to participate in this project as well as work with a local coach, which we call a capacity builder.

Idaho Superintendents’ Network

Idaho has great leaders. Regrettably the geography of our state makes it difficult to collaborate on a regular basis. The SDE recognized this problem and researched alternatives. With the counsel provided by the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII), the Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) at the University of Washington, Boise State University’s Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies and the Department of Education of the State of Kentucky, we formed the Idaho Superintendents’ Network in August 2009. The superintendents have met five times during this academic year. The meeting is facilitated by the Center for Educational Leadership (University of Washington) and is based on their research (funded through a grant from the Wallace Foundation) of the impact of central office staff on quality instruction. We will require that all of the leaders in districts with schools in Tier I and II participate.

Central Office Network

In early 2009, we read an article written by Meredith Honig and Michael Copland that discussed their research on the central office staff’s role in supporting school improvement. The article was so compelling that we contacted Dr. Honig and Dr. Copland, met with them last spring and asked them to partner with us to provide this type of information to Idaho leaders. Their research focused on urban areas, but we believe the same information is valuable to rural school districts in our state. In Idaho, we’ve learned that sometimes you need to go slow to go fast so we collectively decided to focus our efforts on district leaders (superintendents) during the 2009-2010 school year to build their knowledge base and establish a statewide sense of community among these leaders. Dr. Michael Copland and Dr. Sandy Austin from the University of Washington are facilitating our Idaho Superintendents’ Network. Boise State University’s (BSU) Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies has also agreed to partner with the SDE. BSU wants their involvement to both inform their administrator preparation program and help the SDE improve the services. The program is showing early signs of success; however, in the process of creating the network, we exhausted our Title I-A school improvement funds. 1003(g) funds would allow us to expand the program to central office staff. LEAs with schools in Tier I and II would have this as a requirement and LEAs in Tier III would be invited to participate. The group will follow the same systemic process as our

superintendents' network but focus on the central office staff's role in improving the quality of instruction.

Principals Academy of Leadership (PALs)

The success of the Principal Academy of Leadership (PALs) project was the impetus for the Idaho Superintendents' Network. It brings principals struggling to meet the needs of all learners together to discuss their roles in advancing student outcomes. Participation will be a requirement for leaders of Tier I and II schools but we would like to offer the same opportunity to building leaders of schools in Tier III. Each school agrees to participate in instructional reviews (onsite observations of instruction), which consist of observations of each classroom using a research-based tool. While the emphasis of improvement is on math and science, the ultimate goal is to increase the leadership capacity of each principal.

Total Instructional Alignment (TIA)

The Intermountain Center for Educational Effectiveness at Idaho State University will facilitate this part of the support provided to our lowest-achieving schools. It is modeled after *Total Instructional Alignment: from Standards to Student Success* (2007). At its essence, the focus of TIA is teachers working together to establish the most effective ways to deliver content and assess students' mastery on a regular basis. Part of instructional alignment is the alignment of formative assessments. Currently only our larger school districts have instituted end of course assessments at the secondary level, but few have created formative interim assessments. As part of TIA we will include opportunities for teachers to work together to create a state end of course assessments in each of the content areas (Reading, Mathematics, Language Usage, and Science) assessed on the state summative assessment ISAT.

Expanded Opportunities for Students to Participate In College / Career Ready Experiences

- Opportunity to take college entrance exams (SAT/ACT)
- Dual credit opportunities offered to Idaho high school students in science, technology, engineering, and math.
 - Onsite opportunities to take college level courses at Idaho Universities during summer break
 - In-school opportunities to take college level courses in STEM related areas
 - Opportunity to take dual college credit courses while in high school
 - Online opportunities offered through distance learning with Idaho Education Network (IEN) and online learning with Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA)

Expanding Early Childhood Services

Idaho's approach to early childhood has always been very family centric. Finding the balance between government-sponsored opportunities and local control has presented a challenge to education leaders. We have sought input from a variety of stakeholders including Idaho Voices for Children, Idaho Business Coalition for Educational Effectiveness, the Governor's Office, local school boards, higher education, and early childhood experts. We've decided that our most effective approach is to provide guidance and require each of the Tier I schools to create a plan (with support from the SDE) for expanding their early childhood outreach. Though, the specifics will be left up to the LEAs, their options are limited to expanding the pre-K program, implementation of an early learning assessment at kindergarten registration, extended day kindergarten, providing training to parents through a research based program, or providing services related to both adult literacy and parenting.

7c. Describe how the District will address ESEA requirements in each identified Tier III school in corrective action or restructuring based on the 2009-2010 state assessment data. In other words how does the SIG application impact the identified needs in the corrective action or restructuring plan?

ASSURANCES AND WAIVERS

By signing the application, the LEA is agreeing to the assurances on the following page. The LEA application must also include the following waiver page.

Assurances

The LEA 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/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- 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 in the state Grant Reimbursement Application.

Assurances Specific to the Title I ARRA Funds

General Requirements	The district will meet all regular Title I, Part A program assurances.
ARRA Goals	Use ARRA Title I, part A funds to align with the cores goals of the ARRA to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Save and create jobs; • Advance student achievement through school improvement reform consistent with Title I; • Ensure transparency, reporting and accountability; and • Invest one-time ARRA funds in ways that do not result in unsustainable continuing commitments after the funding expires.
Reporting Requirements	Follow all regulations and reporting requirements that are specific to ARRA Title I, Part A, including the requirements for allowable costs in OMB Circular AS-87 and subject to the audit requirements in Circular A-133 as distributed by the United State’s Department of Education.

Waivers

_____ requests a waiver of the requirements it has listed below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement.

The LEA believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve 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.

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

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Note: The Idaho State Department of Education has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds. This waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in the State.

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

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

The LEA assures that it will implement the waiver(s) only if the school 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 LEA assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, it will submit to the Idaho Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each school implementing a waiver, including which specific waivers each school is implementing.

Attachment 6: Scoring Guide for District Application

1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Scoring Guide for District Application

District: _____

Reviewer # _____

Tier I and Tier II Schools: _____

Tier III Schools (if applicable): _____

Directions to Reviewers:

Each application will have at least two reviewers: reviewers are not to compare scores. Follow these steps when scoring each application:

Read and score each section of the application using the Scoring Guide to determine whether the section does not meet standards, meets standards, or is an exemplary plan.

- All districts must complete: Assurances, Certification, Section A: Schools to be Served and Section C: Budget.
- Districts applying to serve Tier I or Tier II schools must respond to Questions 1-6.
- Only districts applying to serve Tier III schools must respond to Questions 7a-7c.

Enter the scores at the bottom of each section and in Points Awarded. The total for each application will be computed separately. In addition to rating the section provide comments if you rated the section as “Does Not Meet Standards.” Districts may be asked to revise their applications and resubmit them if they are serving schools in Tiers I or II.

After scoring the application, please summarize in the space below at least two strengths and one area that you feel could be strengthened. The scoring rubrics will be shared with districts if requested.

Strengths (at least two):

Weakness (at least one):

SCORING GUIDE

Question/Section	Points Possible	Points Awarded	Meets Standards Y/N	Total
Assurances	Required	Required	N/A	Required
Section A: Schools to be Served	Required	Required	N/A	Required
Section B: Descriptive Information				
1a: Selection of Reform Model	0-5			
1b: District Capacity	0-5			
2a. Applying to serve each Tier I school	0-5			

2b. Explanation of lack of district capacity (if applicable)	0-5			
3a: Actions to implement model	0-5			
3b: Actions to provide ongoing technical assistance				
3c: Actions to align resources				
3d: Actions to modify practices or policies				
3e: Actions to sustain reforms				
Question/Section	Points Possible	Points Awarded	Meets Standards Y/N	Total
4: Timeline	0-5			Required
5a: Annual Goals	0-5			Required
5a: Dropout Rate (if applicable)	0-5			
5b: Interim Assessments	0-5			
6a: Stakeholder Involvement	0-5			
Budget	Required	N/A	N/A	Required.
			Total Points	

COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING TABLE FOR DISTRICTS ONLY APPLYING TO SERVE SCHOOLS IN TIER III

Question/Section	Points Possible	Points Awarded	Meets Standards Y/N	Total
7a: Tier III Accountability	0-5			
7b: Tier III Services	0-5			
7c: Tier III and ESEA Requirements	0-5			
Budget	Required	N/A	N/A	Required
			Total Points	

Having reviewed the district’s proposal how ready to do you think the district is to make significant changes within the school(s)? How significant is the change proposed by the district? Please refer to specifics within the application, as well as demographics of the applying school district (size, location, district and build level staffing, prior involvement in state sponsored support).

What additional questions do you have for the district?

SECTION B: DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

1a For each Tier I and Tier II school the District has committed to serve, describe the process of determining the appropriate intervention model for each school. Include the results of the needs assessment (CEE Survey, Focus Visits, input from Capacity Builders, student achievement data) in the description.

- Does the district’s application include a thorough analysis of the four intervention/reform models?
- Does the proposal describe why the particular model was selected?
- Does the application make reference to the Center for Educational Effectiveness Survey?
- Have they had or have they requested a Focus Visit?
- Does the selection of a reform model reflect a thorough analysis of student level achievement?
- Does the proposal take seriously the achievement of specific subgroups (Native American, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient, Students with Disabilities)?
- Has the district articulated how the proposed model will positively impact student outcomes?
- Are there multiple measures (interim and formative assessments)?
- Does the proposal include teacher qualifications and placement?

- Does it include information on their current school improvement plan?
- Has the district either converted to the WISE Tool (online Strategic Planning Tool) or are they committing to do so for the coming school year?
- Has the district consulted relevant stakeholders (trustees, personnel associations, parents, community members)?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

1b. Provide evidence that the district has the capacity to use the SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school in order to fully and effectively implement the required activities of the intervention model selected (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation).

- Does the district refer to any of the research practices provided by the Center on Innovation and Improvement (Distributed through the State Wide System of Support) such as:
 - Toolkit for implementing School Improvement Grant: Transformation Model
 - Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants
 - Exploring the Pathway to Rapid Improvement
 - Breaking the Habit of Low Performance: Successful School Restructuring Stories
 - Megasytem
- Has the district participated in any of the State Sponsored Technical Assistance Opportunities (Superintendents' Network, Idaho Building Capacity, PALs, School Improvement Webinars, Instructional Leader Series)?
- Does the application refer to the Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools?
- Does the proposal explain ways the district has or will reform current policies to support the reform model?
- Have they developed a method to differentiate resources (fiscal, human) across the district?
- Does the proposal describe the method of principal and teacher selection and placement?
- Does the proposal explain the ways in which the district has (or will) address the needs and provide support to Tier I and Tier II Schools?

- Does the proposal include a list of resources (fiscal, leader and teacher assignment, professional development)?
- Does the application include evidence of local board commitment?
- Does it provide a timeline and process to build sufficient central office and school-level administrative leadership?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

2a. Is the district applying to serve each Tier I school identified by the state?

Yes ___ No ___

If the answer is yes skip to responses for question 3a. If the answer is “no” score the responses to 2b.

2b. Explain why the district is choosing not to serve a Tier I school with SIG funds. Include the name of the school.

(Please note that the district may not demonstrate that it lacks capacity to serve Tier I schools if it is intending to serve Tier III schools.)

- Is it a lack of teacher talent (highly qualified, advanced degrees, demonstrated success in accelerating achievement)
- Is it due to a lack of qualified administrators?
- District’s ability to recruit and retain sufficient number of staff?
- Infrastructures within the district (lack of RTI system, non-alignment of curriculum, lack of assessments)

- District has determined that intervention in a Tier II school may be more impactful than intervening in a Tier I school
- For the closure model, access and proximity to higher-performing schools.

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

3a. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve explain the actions the District has taken (or will take) to design and implement the intervention model consistent with final School Improvement Grant requirements.

(Note to Reviewers: Districts were instructed to use the Center on Innovations and Improvements Publication Selecting the Intervention Model and Partners. Because each of the models is different first identify the model and then follow the appropriate rubric has been inserted in the district folder provided by the SDE.)

Transformation - Required

- Has the principal been replaced? (If the principal is new to the school within the last 2 years, the principal may remain as principal if the district has implemented “in whole or part” the required elements of the selected model.
- Has the district implemented such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for hiring, placing and retaining effective teachers?
- Does the proposal indicate the implementation of rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals? In addition to employing the Danielson Framework, does the evaluation take into consideration student growth data, multiple observation-based assessments of performance, ongoing collection of professional reflecting student achievement and increased graduation rates?

- Does the plan Identify and reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement and graduation rates; identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve professional practice, have not done so?
- Does the proposal use data to identify and adopt an instructional program that is research-based and aligned to state standards both vertically and across classrooms?
- Does the proposal identify professional development that is ongoing, job-embedded and aligned to identified needs?
- Has the district ensured the continuous use of student data (formative, summative, diagnostic) to inform and differentiate instruction to meet academic needs?
- Has the district established schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time for all subjects?
- Does the plan include providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community involvement?

Transformation – Permissible

- Provide additional incentives to attract and retain staff
- Ensure school is not required to accept a teacher without mutual consent of teacher and principal
- Partnerships with parent organizations and faith based organizations, health clinics, other state/local agencies
- For secondary schools, credit recovery programs
- Use and integrate technology-based interventions
- Provide additional professional development to teachers to support students with disabilities and English language learners
- Establishment of early warning systems (attendance, discipline referrals, grades, homework, participation)
- Implement a school-wide response to intervention model
- Adopt a new governance structure
- Implement a new school model (themed, dual language academy)
- Implement a per-pupil based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Other factors to consider:

- How will the LEA select a new leader and what experience, training, competencies will the new leader be expected to have?
- How will the LEA enable the new leader to make and sustain strategic staff replacements?
- What is the LEA's capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required and permissible strategies?
- What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting and scheduling must accompany the transformation?
- How will the changes be brought about and sustained?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

Turnaround-Required

- Has the district replaced the principal? (If the principal is new to the school within the last 2 years, the principal may remain as principal if the district has implemented “in whole or part” the required elements of the selected model.
- Has the district used a locally adopted measure to assess the competencies of staff who can work in the turnaround school? The assessment must be to screen all existing staff and select new staff, rehiring no more than 50%.
- Does the district’s application demonstrate that they will implement such strategies as financial incentives and career ladders for hiring, placing and retaining effective teachers?
- Does the proposal use data to identify and adopt an instructional program that is research-based and aligned to state standards both vertically and across classrooms?
- Does the proposal identify professional development that is ongoing, job-embedded and aligned to identified needs?
- Has the district ensured the continuous use of student data (formative, summative, diagnostic) to inform and differentiate instruction to meet academic needs?
- Has the district established schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time for all subjects?
- Has the district included appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and support for students?
- Has the district adopted a new governance structure to address turnaround schools? (The district may hire a chief turnaround office to report directly to the superintendent.)
- Does the district’s plan provide the principal with sufficient operating flexibility in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting to fully implement comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates?

Turnaround – Permissible

- Implement rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals. For example, in addition to employing the Danielson Framework, evaluation takes into consideration student growth data, multiple observation-based assessments of performance, ongoing collection of professional reflecting student achievement and increased graduation rates.
- Identify and reward school leaders and teachers who have increased student achievement and graduation rates; identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities to improve professional practice have not done so.
- Provide additional compensation to attract and retain staff, such as bonus to recruit and place a cohort of high performing teachers together in a low achieving school.
- Ensure school is not required to accept a teacher without mutual consent of teacher and principal
- Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.
- Partner with parent, faith based, and other community based organizations such as health clinics, or other state/local programs.
- Extend the school day to provide such strategies as advisories built into the school day.
- Implement approaches to improve school climate and discipline.
- Expand program to offer pre-kindergarten or full day kindergarten.
- For secondary schools:
 - Increase graduation rate through strategies such as credit recovery.
 - Improve student transition from middle to high school
 - Increase rigor in coursework
 - Offer opportunities for advanced courses
 - Provide supports to ensure that low-income students can take advantage of these programs
 - Establish early warning systems (attendance, discipline referrals, grades, homework completion)
- Institute a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development.
- Conduct periodic reviews to ensure the curriculum is implemented with fidelity, having intended impact on student achievement and modified if ineffective.
- Implement a school-wide response to intervention model
- Provide additional professional development to teachers to support student with disabilities and English language learners.
- Use and integrate technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program.
- Ensure school receives intensive ongoing technical support from district, state, or external providers (CBs)
- Implement a new school model (themed, dual language academy)
- Implement a per pupil school based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

Other factors to consider:

- How will the LEA select a new leader and what experience, training, competencies will the new leader be expected to have?
- How will the LEA enable the new leader to make and sustain strategic staff replacements?
- What is the LEA's capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required and permissible strategies?

- What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting and scheduling must accompany the transformation?
- How will the changes be brought about and sustained?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

School Closure – Required

- Has the district established a plan and timeline for school closure with closure to occur before the beginning of the 2011-12 school year?
- Has the district identified other higher performing schools within reasonable proximity to schools being closed?
- Does the district have a plan for supporting the students in the new schools?

Other factors to consider:

- How will the LEA select a new leader and what experience, training, competencies will the new leader be expected to have?
- How will the LEA enable the new leader to make and sustain strategic staff replacements?
- What is the LEA’s capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required and permissible strategies?
- What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting and scheduling must accompany the transformation?
- How will the changes be brought about and sustained?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

Restart – Requirements

LEAs have the option of either restarting the school as a charter school or selecting an external educational management organization (EMO). The EMO may be either a non-profit or for profit entity.

- If the district intends to close the school and restart it as a Charter School, have they provided evidence of having accessed information from Michelle Clement Taylor, School Choice Coordinator?
- Has the district accessed information provided on the State Department of Education’s website for charter school developers and/or authorizers? (http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/charter_schools/authorizers.htm)
- If the district intends to enter into an agreement with EMO do they have a clear and delineated process for selecting an EMO?
- Has the district compiled a pool of potential EMOs?
- Does the district describe the process they will use to vet each of the EMOs?
- Has the district assured that all former students who wish to attend the restarted school will be granted permission to attend the restarted school?
- How will the district monitor the performance of the EMO?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

3b: For each Tier I and Tier II school the district is applying to serve, explain action the District has taken or will take to ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive support from the District, the Idaho State Wide System of Support or a designated external technical assistance provider.

- Does the proposal describe how the district has determined which external technical assistance providers it has chosen to work with the school?
- Is there a plan for providing technical assistance to the district as it changes policies and procedures that may impede implementation of the selected reform model?
- Does the application describe the types of data the district used to select the provider?
- What specific qualifications is the district looking for? How well is that articulated in the grant?
- How did the district work with the SDE in selecting the provider? (Is it a consultant provided through the Idaho Building Capacity Project?)
- Does the proposal describe an evaluation process which will be used to monitor supports and services provided to the school by both the LEA and external partners?
- Does the application describe the involvement of stakeholders in the selection process?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

3c: For each Tier I and Tier II school the district is applying to serve, explain actions the District has taken, or will take to align other resources to fully and effectively implement the reform model?

- Does the proposal include other local, state, or federal financial resources that will be used to implement the reform model?
- Has the district reached out to other community members to provide support to the school(s). Community members might include health clinics, local law enforcement agencies, library, institutes of higher education, other state and local agencies.
- Is there a plan for continuously reviewing the allocation of resources to ensure implementation and sustainability of the program.
- Will data be collected on the coordination of resources?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

3d. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve, explain the actions the District has taken (or will take) to modify its practices or policies if necessary and enable its schools to fully and effectively implement the reform model.

- Has the district reviewed current practices and policies which either support or impede reform efforts?
- Is there a timeline for the review of current practices (if not completed)?
- Is there a process for annual review and revision of board policies and procedures?
- Has the district researched processes and policies related to recruiting and retaining highly effective leaders and teachers? (Issues related to the master contract, collaborative discussion related to local competency based assessment of teaching practices, competitive salaries and benefits)
- Does the proposal explain how communication will be intentional and frequent between the superintendent, district leaders and staff in participating schools.

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

3e. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve explain the actions the District will take to sustain reforms once the funding period ends.

- Does the proposal describe system-wide infrastructures the district has developed or will develop to sustain reforms in Tier I and II schools?
For example:
 - Board adopted policies and practices, and supports for Tier I and II schools to sustain changes and innovations
 - Tools, systems, and practices supporting the use of data to inform district, school, and classroom decision making
 - Process of delivering collaboratively determined, job-embedded professional developed
 - Calendar and schedule which provide extended learning time
 - System for continued horizontal and vertical curriculum alignment
 - Budget which uses federal, state, and local education funding to sustain reforms
 - Narrative describing the process for differentiating resources to sustain reform efforts
 - Decision making practices at the district and school levels which provide for stakeholder involvement and input in sustaining changes, innovations, and a continuous improvement process.

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

4. Provide a timeline that delineates the steps the District will take to implement the basic elements of the selected reform model in each Tier I and Tier II school. The timeline should indicate that the District has the ability to implement the basic elements of the model during the 2010-2011 school year.

- Does the proposal include a three-year timeline for implementing the selected reform model in each Tier I and Tier II school?
- Does the timeline include the basic (required) elements will be in place during the coming (2010-2011) school year?
- Does the timeline allow for certain basic elements to be revisited (job-embedded professional development, identifying and rewarding principals and teachers who have increased student achievement) to occur later in the process of implementing the model?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

5a. Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessment in reading and mathematics that the District has established to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG Grants. At a minimum, the goal for maintaining the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the prior year’s ISAT (Spring 2010) should be 95%. Given the significance of the reform model and the infusion of funds districts should set aggressive but realistic goals for increasing the percentage of below basic students to basic, and basic to proficient. If the targeted Tier I or Tier II school is a secondary school, the district should also include annual goals related to increasing graduation rate particularly among specific subgroups of students that have traditionally higher dropout rates. The district should also set specific goals for each at-risk subgroup (low-income, Hispanic, Native American, students with disabilities, English language learners).

ANNUAL GOALS READING

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic in Reading	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient in Reading	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced in Reading	% of Students maintaining either proficient or advanced scores as measured by ISAT Reading

ANNUAL GOALS MATH

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic in Math	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient in Math	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced in Math	% of Students maintaining either proficient or advanced scores as measured by ISAT Math

ANNUAL GOALS SCIENCE

Grade	% of Increase in Students moving from Below Basic to Basic in Science	% of Increase in Students moving from Basic to Proficient in Science	% of Increase in Students moving from Proficient to Advanced in Science	% of Students maintaining either proficient or advanced scores as measured by ISAT Science

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

5b. Describe how the District will use interim and/or formative assessments as well as other indicators (attendance, discipline referrals, referrals to special education, Title I, classroom grades, etc.) to determine if students are making progress toward the annual goals established by the District.

- Does the proposal include interim assessments for every content area measured on ISAT?
- If not what is the plan for creating assessments?
- Does the district have a comprehensive assessment plan (screening, progress monitoring, diagnostic, summative)?
- If the Tier I or II school is a secondary plan are college and career bound assessments part of the comprehensive assessment plan?
- Is there a timeline for collecting and analyzing the assessment data?
- How is the data shared with teachers?
- How frequently is it shared?
- In what manner is it shared (professional learning communities, grade level teams, emails, departmental meetings)?
- How is the information shared with parents?
- How are formative assessments used to improve instruction?
- How are students identified as “at-risk”?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

6. Describe how, as appropriate the District has consulted with relevant stakeholders (School Board Members, Personnel Associations, Building Leadership Teams, Parents, etc.) regarding the District’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

- Does the application include input from relevant stakeholders? For example:
 - A variety of two-way communication models (survey, focus groups) which were used to gather input during the application process
 - Describes how the input was utilized in the application process
- Does the proposal include a timeline for regular communication with stakeholders
- Does the proposal describe how stakeholder input will be sought and used during the implementation process

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

FOR DISTRICTS APPLYING TO SERVE TIER III SCHOOLS (NOTE THE IDAHO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EUDCATION MAY ONLY FUND TIER III SCHOOLS AFTER ALL TIER I AND II ARE FUNDED)

7a. Describe how the district will hold each Tier III school receiving SIG funds accounting for meeting the student achievement goals the school (and district) established. (Goals are subject to approval by the SDE).

- Does the proposal describe which data will be used to measure progress?
- Does the application include student achievement data (beyond ISAT) including interim and formative assessments
- Does the application include on observation-based assessments of instruction and alignment to professional development (if funds are requested)
- Has the District described technical assistance and other resources which will be utilized to train teachers and leaders to implement and analyze interim assessments and other indicators of progress.
- Does the application describe additional resources if any, which will be provided to implement interim assessments and/or interventions?
- Does the proposal describes process to reassess current and/or provide additional resources (human, fiscal) if the school is not meeting or on a positive trajectory to meet annual goals?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

7b. For each Tier III school the District commits to serve, identify the services the school will receive or the improvement activities the school will implement. These services may be provided by the District, or with the approval of the District, by the District and Student Achievement School Improvement Division of the SDE, or external providers. Include the timeline for providing these services and activities.

- Does the proposal request funds for professional development for teachers to support Native American, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners or other at-risk populations?
- Is the funding request aligned to the identified needs cited in the School Improvement Plan?
- Is the improvement effort sustainable beyond the SIG Grant?
- Does the proposal include participation in any of the state sponsored technical assistance initiatives such as:
 - Idaho Building Capacity
 - Superintendents Network
 - Focus Visits
 - Central Office Staff Network
 - Principals Academy of Leadership
 - Lighthouse Training for Board Members
 - Professional Development related to Online Strategic Planning Tool (WISE)
 - Response to Intervention
 - Positive Behavior Support

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

7c. Describe how the District will address ESEA requirements in each identified Tier III school in corrective action or restructuring based on the 2009-2010 state assessment data. In other words how does the SIG application impact the identified needs in the corrective action or restructuring plan?

- Does the application specifically address ESEA requirements for schools in corrective action or restructuring?
- Does the application name each of the Tier III schools and in its year of improvement?
- Are the identified schools the most in need of improvement within the district?

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

BUDGET

A district must include a proposed budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the district will expend in each year and for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve. (Successful grantees will receive full funding in year one of the SIG grant. Additional funding will be dependent on the success of the implementation and the continued support of federal funds)

The budget should include proposed funding amounts and a narrative explaining how the district will allocate SIG funds over a maximum 3-year period. A separate budget table should be created for each school the district intends to serve and the funding should be consistent with both the timeline provided by the LEA for implementation and support required activities. (Guidance on budgets are included in the Directions to LEAs, see page attachment 4)

Complete the following table:

- d. Grand total of proposed budget amounts for the district and each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school for a maximum of three years (through September 30, 2013).
- e. Total for each for the district (for a maximum of three years through September 30, 2013)
- f. Total for each year for each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school (for a maximum of 3 years through September 30, 2013). Descriptions should include name of each school, its Tier, and the total proposed budget for that school each year.

Building	Tier	Model	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
District						
School						
Totals			Total	Total	Total	Total

In addition to cumulative information provide individual proposed budget amounts and a narrative indicating how the district will allocate SIG funds through June 30, 2011, with separate detailed budgets for the district and each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the district is committing to serve.

The budget must provide sufficient funding for the following activities:

- Implement the selected intervention model (closure, restart, turnaround, transformation) in each Tier I and Tier II school
- Conduct district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the district's Tier I and Tier II schools
- Support improvement activities at the school or district level for each Tier III school identified in the district's application.

As appropriate, include state-level expenses associated with technical assistance and other support services required or requested and agreed upon by the SDE and district. Requested activities may be for implementing intervention models in Tier I or Tier II, improvement activities in Tier III schools, or associated district-level activities. Districts may also contact the SDE about contracting for either external providers or services.

Building Name	Activity	Budgeted Amount
		Total

Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standards	Exemplary Plan
0-2	3-4	5

Please enter comments here:

Amendments & Clarifications Based Upon USDoE Reviewer Feedback

Amendment 1 (6-16-2010):

Idaho Department of Education

Revisions and Responses to US Department of Education 1003(g) SIG Reviewer Comments

June 16, 2010

Table of Contents

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS	i
Revised August 6, 2010	i
Part I: SEA Requirements	1
Part II: LEA Requirements.....	16
Attachments.....	0
Step 1: Relevant Definitions	16
Step 2: Determine Number That Makes Up Each Tier	22
Step 3: Determine Method for Combined Proficiency Rates	23
Step 4: Determine Method for Lack of Progress	24
Step 5: Determine Weights for Achievement	25
Step 6: Determine Weights for Type of School	25
Step 7: Rank Lowest to Highest Achievement for Tier I	25
Step 8: Apply Lack of Progress to the Ranked Tier I List.....	26
Step 9: Count Up the Relevant Number for Tier I	27
Step 10: Identify Relevant Title I High Schools Based on Graduation Rate for Tier I	27
Step 11: Add Relevant Title I High Schools to Tier I Based on Graduation Rate....	28
Step 12: Rank Lowest to Highest Achievement for Tier II	28
Step 13: Apply Lack of Progress to the Ranked Tier II List.....	28

Step 14: Count Up the Relevant Number for Tier II	31
Step 15: Identify Relevant Title I Eligible High Schools Based on Graduation Rate for Tier II	31
Step 16: Add Relevant Title I Eligible High Schools to Tier II Based on Graduation Rate	31
INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS	33
PURPOSE of GRANT	33
CRITERIA FOR AWARDING SIGs TO DISTRICTS	34
REQUIRED INTERVENTIONS FOR TIER I AND II SCHOOLS	39
FUNDING	40
TIMELINE	42
WHO SHOULD APPLY?	43
WHAT WILL BE EXPECTED OF THE DISTRICT?	43
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE FROM SDE	45
Amendments & Clarifications Based Upon USDoE Reviewer Feedback	0
Response to USDoE SIG Review	4
Response to USDoE SIG Review	3
Exhibit A.	7
Exhibit B.	8

Response to USDoE SIG Review

REQUIREMENTS	USDoE REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
<p>1. The SEA provided a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the state, including each school’s name and NCES ID number.</p>	<p>Date: 5/25/2010. Attachment 1</p> <p>pgs. 1-8</p> <p>Meet requirements</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>2. The SEA indicated whether a school was identified as a Tier I or Tier II school because it has had a grad rate below 60 percent over a number of years.</p>	<p>Date: 5/25/2010 Attachment 2 pgs.12 and 14</p> <p>“Idaho has no high schools in the state with a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. 200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years. Thus, no high schools in Idaho were added to Tier 1 or Tier II.”</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>We believe this means we meet requirements.</p>
<p>3. The SEA indicated whether a school is a “newly eligible” schools.</p>	<p>Date: 5/25/2010 Attachment 3 pg. 22</p> <p>“ISDE did not choose to include the option of “newly eligible schools” that was authorized under the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010. Therefore, any such Title 1 eligible, but not funded, schools are not included in the data or analysis for the SIG fund.”</p>	<p>Idaho opted to not utilize the “newly eligible” criteria after much discussion among our leadership and based upon the final decision of our State Superintendent. Therefore, this category is not applicable to our LEA application process or our definition of persistently low achieving schools.</p>

REQUIREMENTS	USDoe REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
	<p>Reviewer: 3A</p> <p>I agree with the issues raised by the first reviewer. Idaho does not have Tier I high schools based on its graduation rates. Additionally, there is no “newly eligible” designation. (These comments are specific to the Part A eligible schools section) 6A</p>	<p>Concerning our graduation rate, Idaho does not currently have any high schools that qualify for Tier I status based upon graduation rate.</p>
<p>4. The SEA has described, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate whether an LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school</p>	<p>Date: 5/25/2010 General information on pg. 2</p> <p>Resources listed are provided by the SEA. As an example, Appendix A-I, B-I and C mentions the District Improvement Guide which is “offered as a resource to all school districts to support their work and implementing systemic improvement.” Focus Visit whose “purpose is to acquire evidence of the presence of best practice.” Indicator Framework which was “adapted in part from the New Jersey Collaborative Assessment & Planning for Achievement document and the Handbook on Restructuring and Substantial School Improvement from the Center on Innovation & Improvement, and have been modified on the Idaho Rapid Improvement Indicators.”</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>We believe this means we meet requirements.</p>
<p>5. The SEA has described, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will</p>		<p>N/A</p>

REQUIREMENTS	USDoe REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
<p>use to evaluate whether the LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use SIG 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.</p>	<p>Date: 5/25/2010 pgs. 2 & 3. Also on pg. 56 of the LEA application.</p> <p>Meet requirements</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	
<p>6. The SEA has described, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate whether 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.</p>	<p>Date: 5/25/2010 pg. 4</p> <p>The SEA portion of the application has very limited and non-detailed information between the budget and specific interventions.</p> <p>However, in the LEA application:</p> <p>pg. 54 & 55 (Attachment 5)</p> <p>Guidance for budgets is included in the Directions to LEAs: Attachment 4 (funding pgs. 40-43).</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>The Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Leadership Team that will be responsible for reviewing and approving applications is comprised of individuals who have known and provided assistance and monitoring to each of the 13 Tier I and II schools in the state. This first hand knowledge will enable budgetary decisions to be understood well contextually. Due to the state’s rural and remote nature, those LEAs that have indicated interest in applying for SIG funds have noted that they will be selecting the Transformation Model in each case. Therefore, our criteria for evaluating LEA budgets will specifically revolve around the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what degree do required and permissible activities require funding and has the LEA addressed funding needs for all of those activities? • Are the funding amounts identified for each activity appropriate and comparable to similar activities funded in other LEAs within the state? • Has the LEA identified any/all special considerations that would lead to

REQUIREMENTS	USDoe REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
		<p>needing more funding than is comparable in normal circumstances (e.g., attracting a highly qualified leader to a remote location)? Less funding (e.g., costing efficiencies found by collaborating with nearby rural LEAs)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the LEA differentiate between costs associated with district level activities and responsibilities and school level activities and responsibilities? • Does the budget address one time, extended, and ongoing expenditures, along with sustainability considerations, related to each of the required and permissible activities over the duration of the grant funding period? <p>Because of the contextual nature of each budget, the above questions will guide the SSOS Leadership Team in determining if each LEA's budget includes sufficient funds for both the intervention model chosen and the differences inherent to local context.</p>
<p>7. The SEA has described how it will assess the LEA's commitment to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.</p>	<p>Date: 5/25/2010 pg. 4 & 5</p> <p>Pg. 4: "The actions listed are ones that the district may have taken, in whole or part, prior to submitting its application for a SIG Grant, but most likely they will occur after receiving the grant."</p> <p>Pg. 5: "Specifically addresses each "required action" (see attachments 4,5,6 for details) on the</p>	<p>We believe this means we meet requirements.</p>

REQUIREMENTS	USDoe REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
	<p>selected reform model.” Attachments 4,5, & 6 include the LEA Instructions for SIG; LEA Application for SIG; and Scoring Guide for District Application</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	
<p>8. The SEA has described how it will assess the LEA’s commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.</p>	<p>Date: 5/25/2010 pg. 5</p> <p>Need further information regarding actions to recruit, screen and select external providers to ensure their quality.</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>It is our experience in Idaho that external providers are unlikely to be available in our most rural and remote areas. For example, many don’t seem to be interested in driving 4 hours into the mountains to assist with our remote schools. Thus, Idaho has an established set of approved external partners, such as the Center for School Improvement at BSU, the Intermountain Center for Education Effectiveness at ISU, and others outlined in Attachment 5 p. 59ff. If LEAs apply to utilize external providers that are not already approved under previous SIG 1003(g) funding, those applications will be evaluated on a case by case basis by the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Leadership Team. If found lacking, the SSOS Leadership Team will provide direct support and assistance to LEA leadership in the process of recruiting, screening, and selecting such providers, and then revising the application as appropriate.</p>
<p>9. The SEA has described how it will assess the LEA’s commitment to align other resources with the</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 5</p>	<p>N/A</p>

REQUIREMENTS	USDoe REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
interventions.	Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A	
10. The SEA has described how it will assess an LEA’s commitment to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.	5/25/2010 pg. 5 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A	N/A
11. The SEA has described how it will assess an LEA’s commitment to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.	5/25/2010 pg. 6 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A	N/A
12. The SEA has described how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement an intervention model in each of its Tier I schools.	5/25/2010 pg.7 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A	N/A
13. The SEA has explained what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA claims.	5/25/2010 pg. 7 Under Capacity section: Information not given. Reviewer: 3A	If the SEA determines that the LEA has more capacity than it claims in its application, the SEA will provide that feedback to the LEA in written form, followed by individual technical assistance in which the SEA and LEA will come to agreement on the

REQUIREMENTS	USDoE REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
	I agree with the primary reviewer in terms of the absence or lack of clarity in terms of what the SEA will do if the LEA has more capacity than it claims (These comments apply to the Capacity section). 6A	perceived capacity, and will require the LEA to adjust its application accordingly prior to providing any type of approval.
14. The SEA has described the SEA’s process and timeline for approving LEA applications.	5/25/2010 pgs. 8 & 9 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A	N/A
15. The SEA has described 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 SIG grant if one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on leading indicators.	5/25/2010 pgs. 9 & 10 Elements do include process for reviewing annual goals and process for determining whether to renew a grant with respect to a school that does not meet its goals. Reviewer: 3A	Though it seems we have met both of these requirements, the following additional information may clarify our process outlined on pages 9 and 10. The SEA will utilize the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Leadership Team to review progress toward annual goals for SIG funded schools. The SSOS Leadership Team will then provide recommendations to renew or discontinue funding based on this review to the Director of the SSoS, who oversees implementation and grant awards for all school improvement activities, including those under 1003(g). The Director of the SSOS will make final decisions for
16. The SEA has described 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 SIG grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.	5/25/2010 pg. 10 Reviewer: 3A	

REQUIREMENTS	USDoe REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
		renewing or discontinuing funding based on the recommendations of the leadership team. Decisions will then be submitted to the executive authority of the Deputy Superintendent of the Student Achievement and School Improvement Division, and LEAs will thereafter be notified.
<p>17. The SEA has described how it will monitor each LEA that receives a SIG 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.</p>	<p>/25/2010 pg. 9</p> <p>Process includes some of the following:</p> <p>“oversee the scheduling of Focus Visits in each of the LEAs and schools; schedule review of implementation progress; schedule phone and in-person interviews with key district and school leaders; review quarterly cash balance reports for each funded LEA.”</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>We believe this means we meet requirements.</p>
<p>18. The SEA has described how the SEA will prioritize SIG grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient SIG funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 10</p> <p>Allocations are prioritized</p> <p>Reviewer:3A</p>	<p>We believe this means we meet requirements.</p>
<p>19. The SEA has described the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 10</p> <p>Meet requirements</p>	<p>N/A</p>

REQUIREMENTS	USDoe REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
	Reviewer: 3A	
<p>20. If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, the SEA has identified those schools and indicated the intervention model it will implement in each school.</p>	<p>5/25/2010 Not mentioned</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>At this time, Idaho does not intend to take over any Tier I or II schools as part of the 1003(g) SIG. This indicator is thus not applicable to Idaho’s SIG application.</p>
<p>21. If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, the SEA has identified those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicated the intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and has provided evidence of the LEA’s approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.</p>	<p>5/25/2010 Not mentioned</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p> <p>The SEA has described the criteria for monitoring LEAs, reviewing district annual goals, factors to consider whether to review the LEA SIG award, and how to prioritize funds; however, how the factors will be evaluated is missing. The SEA’s description of whether it will take over schools is either unclear or not present in the application (These comments apply to the Part D Descriptive Information). 6A</p>	<p>While Idaho does expect Tier I and Tier II schools to participate in other statewide school support activities (Attachment 5, p. 59ff), the State does not intend to provide direct services specific to the school intervention models. This indicator is thus not applicable to Idaho’s SIG application.</p>
<p>22. Assurances: The SEA has provided an assurance that it will comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 11</p> <p>Meet requirements</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>The reviewer noted the “differentiated accountability pilot”. Idaho is not a part of this pilot program. This indicator is thus not applicable to Idaho’s SIG application.</p>

REQUIREMENTS	USDoe REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
<p>The SEA has provided an assurance that it will award each approved LEA a SIG 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.</p> <p>The SEA has provided an assurance that it will apportion its SIG 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 to extend the period of availability</p> <p>The SEA has provided an assurance that it will carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 SIG 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 SIG funds to serve every Tier I</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 11 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A</p> <p>5/25/2010 pg. 11 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A</p> <p>5/25/2010 pg. 11 Meet requirements</p>	

REQUIREMENTS	USDoE REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
<p>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.</p> <p>The SEA has provided an assurance that it will report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 11 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A</p> <p>5/25/2010 pg. 11 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A</p> <p>5/25/2010 pg. 11 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A</p>	

REQUIREMENTS	USDoE REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 11</p> <p>Meet requirements</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	
<p>23. The SEA has described 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.</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 12</p> <p>Meet requirements</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>24. The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 13</p> <p>Meet requirements</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>25. The SEA indicated that it has also consulted with other stakeholders</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 13</p>	<p>N/A</p>

REQUIREMENTS	USDoE REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
that have an interest in its application for SIG funds and has identified these other relevant stakeholders.	N/A Reviewer: 3A	
LEA APPLICATION		
26. The SEA has attached its LEA application form to its application to the Department.	5/25/2010 pgs. 52-66 (Attachment 5) Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A	N/A
27. The LEA application requires an LEA to identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and to identify the model the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve.	5/25/2010 pg. 54 (Attachment 5) Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A	N/A
28. The LEA application requires an LEA to demonstrate, for each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve, that: (1) the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and (2) the LEA has the capacity to use SIG 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	5/25/2010 pg. 56 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A	N/A
29. The LEA application requires the LEA to explain why it lacks the	5/25/2010 pg. 56	In the revised LEA application (attached

REQUIREMENTS	USDoE REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
<p>capacity to serve each Tier I school located within the LEA if the LEA is not applying to serve each such school.</p>	<p>The application states “Explain why the district is choosing not to serve a Tier 1 school with the SIG funds.” Need further information.</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>herein), this question (2b) has been reworded to state:</p> <p><i>2b. Explain why the district lacks the capacity to implement a school intervention model and is choosing not to serve each Tier I school with the SIG funds. Include the name of each Tier I school not served.</i></p>
<p>30. The LEA application requires the LEA to describe actions it has taken, or will take, to —</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements; • Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality; • Align other resources with the interventions; • Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and • Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. 	<p>5/25/2010 pgs. 56 & 57</p> <p>Application should prompt an LEA to provide detailed school-by-school information linked to specific interventions.</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	<p>There are very few LEAs in Idaho which have more than one Tier I or II school. Thus, in most cases, the application and intervention model will be solely for one school. However, the LEA application has been revised in question 3a to include a prompt for the LEA to provide detailed school-by-school information linked to specific interventions. The revised LEA application (attached herein) states:</p> <p><i>3a. For each Tier I and Tier II school the District is applying to serve explain the actions the District has taken (or will take) to design and implement the</i></p>

REQUIREMENTS	USDoe REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
		<i>intervention model consistent with final School Improvement Grant requirements. The District must provide detailed school-by-school information linked to specific interventions.</i>
<p>31. The LEA application requires the LEA to include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 57 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A</p>	N/A
<p>32. The LEA application requires the LEA to describe annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds.</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 57 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A</p>	N/A
<p>33. The LEA application requires the LEA to describe, for each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 59 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A</p>	N/A
<p>34. The LEA application requires the LEA to describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 59 Meet requirements</p>	N/A

REQUIREMENTS	USDoE REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
III schools that receive SIG funds	Reviewer: 3A	
35. The LEA application requires the LEA to describe its consultation, as appropriate, with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools	5/25/2010 pg. 59 Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A	N/A
36. The LEA application requires an LEA to include a budget that indicates the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve	5/25/2010 pg. 54 & 55 (Attachment 5) Guidance for budgets is included in the Directions to LEAs: Attachment 4 (funding pgs. 40-43). Reviewer: 3A	We believe this means we meet requirements.
37. The LEA application requires an LEA to provide a budget that indicates the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use each year to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve.	5/25/2010 pg. 54 & 55 (Attachment 5) Guidance for budgets is included in the Directions to LEAs: Attachment 4 (funding pgs. 40-43). Reviewer: 3A	We believe this means we meet requirements.
38. The LEA application requires an LEA to provide a budget that indicates the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use each year to conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools.	5/25/2010 pg. 55 (Attachment 5) Meet requirements Reviewer: 3A	N/A
39. The LEA application requires an LEA to provide a budget that indicates the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use each year to support	5/25/2010 pg. 55 (Attachment 5) Meet requirements	N/A

REQUIREMENTS	USDoE REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
<p>school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.</p>	<p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	
<p>40. The LEA application requires an LEA to provide a budget that covers the full period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver.</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 65 (Attachment 5)</p> <p>“The Idaho State Department of Education has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement plans. This waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in the State.”</p>	<p>We believe this means we meet requirements.</p>
<p>41. The LEA application requires an LEA to provide a budget that does not exceed \$2 million per year multiplied by the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve.</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 40</p> <p>“Anticipated Amount of Awards for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III School: Districts may apply for funding ranging from \$50,000 annually to \$2,000,000 annually for each Tier.” Sample allocation on pg. 42.</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p> <p>General requirements seem to be met. The SEA references the implementation of the “basic requirements” of the models for the 2010-2011 year. Budget information is present but seems to be scarce in the LEA application on p. 57 of the LEA application. 6A.</p>	<p>We believe this means we meet requirements.</p>
<p>42. ASSURANCES:</p>		<p>N/A</p>

REQUIREMENTS	USDoE REVIEWER COMMENTS	Idaho Response (6-16-10)
<p>The LEA application requires an LEA to provide an assurance 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</p> <p>The LEA application requires an LEA to provide an assurance that it will establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the 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</p> <p>The LEA application requires an LEA to provide an assurance that, if it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, it will include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization</p>	<p>5/25/2010 pg. 64</p> <p>Meet requirements</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p> <p>5/25/2010 pg. 64</p> <p>Meet requirements</p> <p>Reviewer: 3A</p>	

Amendment 2 (7-13-2010):

Idaho Department of Education

Revisions and Responses to US Department of Education 1003(g) SIG Reviewer Comments

July 13, 2010

Table of Contents

Response to USDoE SIG Review 3

Exhibit A. 7

Exhibit B. 8

NOTE:
All responses and revisions included in this document shall be considered an amendment to the 1003(g) SIG state application currently posted on the Idaho Department of Education website at http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/title_one/ and will be added upon final approval from the US Department of Education.

Response to USDoE SIG Review

USDoE REVIEWER COMMENTS/QUESTIONS	Idaho Response (7-13-10)
Question re: different defs. The definition for SFSF and SIG should be the same definition. You were approved for the SIG definition.	Thank you for the clarification. We were sure to use the same definition in the SFSF after we heard back on SIG.
P.3 under <u>restart model</u> , what does it mean when the SEA states that the LEA must “implement in 2010-2011 or beginning the process to convert...” Does this mean the school can be planning for the year?	<p>Yes, 2010-11 can be a planning year. Opening a new charter requires significant time commitments and legal procedures that are not able to be put in place prior to SY 2010-11 due to the valid concern that LEAs are still waiting for Idaho to be approved for the 2009-1003(g) SIG. Thus, any LEA that chooses the restart model must be able to demonstrate a timeline and progress toward the implementation of such a model during SY 2010-11 with expected implementation no later than the first day of SY 2011-12. (deleted 7-20-2010)</p> <p>No. Intervention models, including the Restart model, must be implemented in the 2010-2011 school year. If an LEA is unable to put necessary planning procedures in place for the Restart model for SY 2010-11, the LEA may either choose a different model or submit a new application for FY 2010 SIG funds in order to implement the Restart model.</p>
P.8- when describing how it fund schools, will the SEA use the scores from the rubric at all? Doesn't have to, but was sure what would happen if there wasn't enough \$ to fund all Tier I and II schools.	Yes, in the event that the SEA does not have enough funds to fund all Tier I and II schools, scores from the rubric will first be used to prioritize and fund those LEA applications which have Tier I and II schools that have the highest average scores. Any remaining funds will be used to fund LEA applications that solely have Tier III schools based upon both the highest average rubric scores and other data known to the SEA regarding the degree to which the LEA and its schools may need the support.
P. 8-9 – update timeline (also in LEA application)	Please see Exhibits A & B below. Updates have been made to the LEA Application.
P. 9 – It's unclear what the list of additional data is for. Does and LEA have to set goals against these additional metrics? How does this fit in?	Yes, LEAs will set goals in these areas when applicable. The additional data are used as evaluative tools that the SEA is able to use in order to compare outcomes across the state and other initiatives as well as guide technical assistance that the LEA and school may need. For example, the state has collected CEE survey data for other school improvement projects and will use it to supplement the work of the SIG. These areas are primarily for internal SEA use to help differentiate support services to the LEAs and schools.

<p>The renewal process is much more clear on p.41 – but doesn't match the SEA application.</p>	<p>So long as LEAs have met the obligations outlined in Attachment 4, page 41, they may utilize their 2009 SIG funding awards over the course of the entire period of availability allowed by the grant (e.g., until 2013). However, if LEAs do not meet their obligations, 2009 SIG funds will no longer be made available, and LEAs will not be able to renew their grant for continued access to the funding.</p>
<p>P. 39 – I am assuming that the “required interventions” are not part of the Tier III schools requirement. Formatting makes it appear that way.</p>	<p>This assumption is correct. The formatting has been adjusted to specify “REQUIRED INTERVENTIONS FOR TIER I AND II SCHOOLS” as a new heading for this section. That is, it is separate from the previous section titled “CRITERIA FOR AWARDED SIGs TO DISTRICTS” (beginning in Attachment 4, page 34) and separate from the following section titled “FUNDING” (beginning in Attachment 4, page 40).</p>
<p>P.47 –Think “provide additional incentives to attract and retain staff...” is required for Transformation model... not permissible.</p>	<p>Thank you. This error is noted and has been corrected. In Attachment 4, page 47, this item now reads as a required activity for the Transformation model.</p>
<p>P. 57 – Is the SEA saying that a minimum goals is that at least 95% of student currently proficient must STAY proficient? So goals could be lower than current scores and it would be acceptable for scores could actually drop???</p>	<p>No. This model requires movement in the “not proficient category” such that the combination of growth and maintenance of proficient exceeds previous outcomes. When schools simply look at outcomes from year to year, students may be dropping, but the data gets hidden in the students that have grown. For example, Joe may have scored proficient last year but not this year. Sally may have not been proficient last year, but she is this year. If the class size is equal, the two have simply switched places in the data set. At a larger scale, schools have typically not paid attention to maintaining the proficient students AND growing the non-proficient students at the same time.</p> <p>With that said, the state does not currently have a formal growth model as part of the accountability system. In lieu of this need, the School Improvement team has taught LEAs and schools how to evaluate two sides of instructional improvement – growth and outcome. Those students who are already counted as proficient or advanced on the ESEA test should be maintained from one year to the next at a proficient level. However, it is reasonable to believe that some of those students may have been on the low end of proficiency or may have had a “false positive” in a previous test administration. To account for statistical variation, we expect at minimum that 95% of the students who already were proficient to remain proficient (though higher goals</p>

	<p>can be set). Additionally, we expect the school to take those students who last tested basic or below basic to grow adequately. For example, a growth goal for those who have typically not been proficient may be 70%. In other words, it is a double sided goal that accounts for growth and outcome in lieu of a formal statewide growth model (e.g., 70% of those who are not proficient will grow to be proficient by the end of the year and at least 95% of those who originally scored proficient should remain that or better).</p>
<p>P.59 – Do all these additional State requirements really apply to school selecting restart or closure? Closure doesn’t make sense... and does the SEA have authority to require CMO or EMO to participate in State level PD or specific activities? This is an added requirement. One in which we have told other States that the LEAs could be approved without this requirements since it is not part of the SIG requirements.</p>	<p>We will be sure to clarify this with any LEA who may select either the restart or closure model. These additional requirements were written with the turnaround and transformation models in mind. The restart model, if chosen, will not be required to participate in these activities, and it is correctly assumed that closure would not make sense.</p> <p>To this point, there are no LEAs in Idaho that have expressed interest in either the restart or closure models. In more than 2/3 of our state, the LEAs serve less than 1000 students. Closing the only school in town simply isn’t an option. In writing the LEA application, the SEA thought it was safe to assume that LEAs would understand this table to refer to the turnaround and transformation models.</p>
<p>P64 –The Private school assurance should not apply</p>	<p>Thank you for the clarification.</p>
<p>P. 79 – says the school has to close by Aug 2010- this year can also be used to process the schools closing allowing schools to close any time before the end of the school year. The school would have to be closed by the beginning of the 2011-12 school year.</p>	<p>Thank you for the clarification. This will be noted specifically relating to any applications that are submitted in which the closure model is chosen. The application wording has been restated as follows on Attachment 6, page 79:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Has the district established a plan and timeline for school closure with closure to occur before the beginning of the 2011-12 school year?”
<p>P.87 – first reference to Science goals... are these required by the SEA? That’s fine... just reference it on p.9</p>	<p>These are required by the SEA where applicable. They are referenced on page 9 in the following statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The reports shall include (at a minimum) the prior spring’s ISAT data.” <p>ISAT data includes Science in grades 5, 7, and 10.</p>

Missing- Is the SEA going to take over any schools? Is the SEA going to provide any direct services?	No. The SEA will not be taking over any schools or provide direct services to schools in lieu of a state takeover. The choice and implementation of the intervention models in Tier I and II schools is at the discretion of the LEA.
---	---

Exhibit A.

This revises the initial timeline described on pages 8-9 of the SEA application.

B. Timeline

Recruitment of potential Technical Assistance Providers (related to the application process) was started March 1, 2010.

An initial list of external SIG reviewers was completed April 15, 2010.

Districts were notified of potential eligibility on April 23, 2010. (With the notice of potential eligibility was a draft of Directions for LEAs, Application for LEAs, Scoring Rubric).

Within one week of receiving approval by the U.S. Department of Education the Idaho SDE will:

- Select a date for the submission of District Applications.
- Schedule a two hour webinar and invite all districts with schools in Tiers I and II to participate.
- The webinar will go over:
 - i. The State's Application for 1003(g) funds.
 - ii. Date for "Statement of Interest" MOUs due from districts.
 - iii. Directions to LEAs.
 - iv. Application for LEAs.
 - v. Scoring Rubric used by reviewers.
 - vi. Method for receiving onsite technical assistance for the application process.
 - vii. Deadline for submission of Proposals.
 - viii. Post the Idaho Application to the SDE web site.
- Issue contracts for both external reviewers and technical assistance providers.
- Establish dates for proposal reviews (tentative dates have been set for July 19-23, 2010).
- Establish date for award announcements (tentative date has been set for July 30, 2010).

Allocated funds will be available to successful applicants immediately after award announcements.

Approved applications will be posted to SDE's web site within 48 hours of award announcements.

Districts and schools will begin conditions for implementing models August 2010.

Districts and schools will begin implementation of intervention models September 2010.

Exhibit B.

This revises the timeline described in Attachment 4, pages 42-43 of the LEA instructions.

TIMELINE

The timeline for the SIG Application process follows:

- **Announcement of the SIG Grant opportunity was sent on April 23, 2010** to District Superintendents with Tier I and Tier II Schools.
- Interested LEAs should send a **Statement of Interest to Steve Underwood**, sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov **as soon as possible or within 5 business days of notification of the state's final approval.**
- Interested LEAs that may be uncertain regarding the particular reform model may request a Focus Visit at anytime. **Scheduling requests should be sent to Jodie Mills, Systems Improvement Coordinator**, jmills@sde.idaho.gov.
- Information regarding the SIG applications will be provided through an IdahoLive session (webinar) within one week of notice of approval by U.S. Dept of Ed. In addition six regional distance sessions will be scheduled through Idaho Live (distance network). The schedule for regional distance sessions will be announced within one week of approval by the U.S. Dept of Ed.
- The Idaho School Improvement Grant (including Application and Instructions) will be published on our state web site along with any amendments submitted to USDoE within one week of the state's final approval.
- The final list of schools in each tier was published on the SDE website on May 1, 2010.
- Final District SIG Applications are due **electronically by 5:00 p.m., Friday, July 16, 2010.**
- **The application should be sent electronically to Steve Underwood at sunderwood@sde.idaho.gov.**
- SDE Review of District *SIG* Applications will be held **July 19-23, 2010.**
- Interviews with District *SIG* Potential Awardees will be held **July 26-27, 2010.**
- Successful District *SIG* Awardees will be notified by the Superintendent Luna on **July 30, 2010.**