

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: North Dakota Department of Public Instruction	Applicant's Mailing Address: 600 E Boulevard Avenue Dept. 201 Bismarck, ND 58505-0440
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Laurie Matzke Position and Office: Director, Title I Office Contact's Mailing Address: 600 E Boulevard Avenue Dept. 201 Bismarck ND 58505-0440 Telephone: 701-328-2284 Fax: 701-328-4770 Email address: lmatzke@nd.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Wayne G. Sanstead, State Superintendent	Telephone: 701-328-4570
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X 	Date: 6-22-2010
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS: An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. (A State's Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

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

Link to Definition:

The list of North Dakota Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools (Appendix A), as well as our definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools (Appendix B) is attached to the application and is also available at <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/Legislative/sig/index.shtm> on the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction (NDDPI) website.

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

Part 1

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

The NDDPI has created a scoring rubric to review LEA SIG applications received from North Dakota schools in Tiers I, II, and III. The North Dakota LEA SIG application and scoring rubric both address the following three action steps. The NDDPI will evaluate the LEA's application to ensure that the following three components are thoroughly outlined in enough detail to provide the state with a summary of their needs and outline how the selected intervention and budget will assist the LEA in meeting each school's goals and indicators.

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's

application and has selected an intervention for each school.

The NDDPI, in reviewing LEA applications for SIG funding, will require each applicant to overview their needs assessment data and document that the needs of each Tier I or Tier II school have been thoroughly reviewed. The LEA will need to identify the intervention model that has been selected for each school on the application. The NDDPI will review each application to ensure that the LEA has the capacity to implement the selected intervention model at each school.

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

Submitted as Appendix C of NDDPI's SIG application is a copy of the LEA SIG application and NDDPI scoring rubric (Appendix D). The application requires the LEA to (1) submit their projected three-year budget, (2) outline their year one budget, and (3) provide a budget narrative for year one.

The NDDPI will review each LEA SIG application to ensure that it has requested adequate resources to support each Tier I and Tier II school and their intervention model identified. The budgets and budget narrative will be analyzed to ensure that the LEA has the resources and capacity to fully implement the selected intervention in each selected school. By utilizing the nine NDDPI program staff to help review and critique the LEA SIG applications, the state has adequate staff to conduct thorough reviews of each application and provide technical assistance when needed.

The NDDPI staff will communicate with LEA staff to resolve all issues and ensure that approval of an LEA application is only granted to LEAs that have demonstrated the resources and support necessary to implement their selected intervention model.

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

Tier I and Tier II schools will be invited to apply for the SIG funds in March 2010, thus ensuring that these schools are given first priority. The NDDPI Title I staff will review each school's budget and budget narrative to ensure that the LEA has sufficient funds to implement their selected intervention model. After all quality applications from Tier I and Tier II schools that applied for a SIG receive funding, any remaining SIG funds will be made available to Tier III schools. The Tier I, II, and III schools all complete the same application to apply for SIG funding.

North Dakota's LEA SIG application is enclosed as Appendix C. Part G of the LEA SIG application requires the LEA to identify if they are requesting a waiver from the state to extend the period of availability of the school improvement funds.

Part 2

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

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

In North Dakota's LEA SIG application, each LEA must describe either the action steps they have completed or will complete to implement the intervention model they have selected. The NDDPI will review each LEA's narrative based on the scoring rubric to ensure they have provided sufficient detail describing how they will design and implement their intervention model at each school. The NDDPI will provide LEAs with specific criteria from the SIG guidance for the intervention model they have selected. The LEA will need to address how they will be able to meet all of the required components as part of the application process.

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

LEAs will have the option of utilizing external providers to help them implement their selected intervention. The NDDPI has established a list of consultants who can assist districts and schools with planning and implementing school improvement activities. These consultants are known as the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Consultant Team. Team members have expertise in a variety of school improvement areas to provide individualized assistance to schools. LEAs are also free to select an external provider of their choice. The NDDPI will require each LEA to describe, in detail, the process they used to recruit, screen, and select providers to ensure quality. NDDPI staff will review LEA's applications with the scoring rubric to ensure this component is addressed and that the LEA has identified the experience level and qualifications for external providers that they will utilize.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

The NDDPI will require each LEA to describe their process to align other resources with their selected intervention. LEAs have multiple funding sources available to them to support their selected intervention model. In addition to the SIG funds requested, LEAs have Title I funds, ARRA Title I funds, Title II A, and Title II D funds, as well as state and local funds, to help support school improvement initiatives. In addition, several of North Dakota's Tier I and Tier III schools are tribal schools and have additional BIE funding as well. NDDPI staff will review LEA responses and require them to address the various funding sources available to them to support their selected intervention model.

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

The NDDPI will require each LEA to identify any practices or policies that need to be modified in order to implement the interventions fully and effectively. If there are certain components of a model that need to be implemented later in the process, the LEA will be required to clarify and describe with a detailed timeline when and how each issue will be addressed. The NDDPI will require LEAs to provide a detailed timeline and the process they will use to modify any specific policies or practices identified. In North Dakota, district/school teacher evaluation methods currently do not take into consideration student achievement. So this issue, in particular, will need to be specifically addressed in every LEA application that serves its Tier I or Tier II

schools. NDDPI staff will review each LEA application to make sure that this issue, as well as other potential policies or practices that need to be modified, are addressed with enough specificity to demonstrate the ability to make the required changes to meet the requirements of a particular intervention.

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

The LEAs application requires a description of how they intend to sustain the reforms listed in their application after the funding period ends. LEAs will need to specifically demonstrate that they have researched their options regarding this issue and have a plan describing how they will sustain the reforms in the future.

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

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

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

NDDPI assures that we will evaluate whether an LEA lacks the capacity to implement, with fidelity, a school intervention model in each Tier I school. In the State of North Dakota, the NDDPI lacks authority for an SEA to take over a school. Our North Dakota Century Code (NDCC) does not grant authority for a school take over by the NDDPI. Furthermore, North Dakota law does not permit charter schools. The Turnaround Model would be extremely difficult to implement in North Dakota for two reasons. First, all of the schools in Tier I and Tier II are small, rural schools. They have extreme difficulty filling their teaching positions as it is. In particular, it is difficult to fill areas that the North Dakota Education Standards and Practices Board has declared as hard-to-fill positions, which currently includes all areas except elementary education and physical education. It would be nearly impossible for one of the schools to find educators to replace 50% of their current staff. Secondly, according to current state law, there are seven very specific areas that cite foundations for which a teacher can be dismissed for cause. Tying teacher performance to student achievement is not one of the seven criteria.

Therefore, schools in Tier I and Tier II will most likely have to consider the Transformation Model if they choose to apply for the SIG funding. Of greatest concern in this model will be the school's ability to develop a rigorous, transparent, and equitable teacher and leader evaluation systems using student growth as a significant factor. However, several Tier I schools have expressed willingness to take on this challenge.

The State of North Dakota held trainings with our Tier I and Tier II schools on January 22 and March 16, 2010. The purpose of these trainings was to outline the SIG requirements, overview the four intervention models, and disseminate the draft application and scoring rubric.

The guidance that we provided to these Tier I and Tier II schools clearly stated that the school leader and those attending the training must take the information provided back to their district and school for an intensive review. LEAs will need to submit documentation (i.e., board minutes, agendas) that show this issue has been reviewed and discussed at the local level. The LEA will need to clearly define what action the school board elects to take.

In addition, LEAs with a school in Tier I who choose not to apply for the SIG funding will need to submit their intent, in writing, along with documentation (i.e., board minutes, agendas) that show this issue has been reviewed and discussed at the local level. Also the LEA will need to describe why they believe they lack the capacity to implement one of the school intervention models. Those that indicate they lack sufficient capacity will be expected to justify their claim. An internal NDDPI team will review these claims for reasonability. Table A outlines the factors that will be reviewed to determine the reasonableness of their claim. If the internal NDDPI team determines that a district does have more capacity than they claim, we will work with the district to ensure they are aware of their options and our willingness to assist them in the SIG process. The SEA will inform the LEA that they are not eligible for SIG funding if they do not serve their Tier I school. In addition, if they have Tier III schools, they are not eligible to apply for SIG funds to serve them if they don't serve their Tier I school. If, as a part of the internal NDDPI team review, it is determined that the LEA did address the criteria in Table A and their board minutes reflect that the criteria in Table A were discussed and that they lack the capacity to apply for funding as a Tier I school, their local school board decision will be honored.

Table A: Review Criteria for Lack of Capacity

Districts make a decision in collaboration with administration, staff, and school board whether they have the capacity to serve any Tier I schools. If they believe they do not have capacity, they inform the NDDPI of their decision by a written response addressing the criteria in Table A. Their decision not to apply for funding for Tier I schools makes them ineligible to apply for SIG funds for any Tier III schools.

Capacity Factors

High quality staff is available with the capability to implement the selected intervention model successfully.

The ability of the LEA to serve the overall number of Tier I and/or Tier II schools identified on the application has been addressed.

A commitment by stakeholder groups to support the selected intervention model has been addressed.

- The teacher's union
- Staff
- Parents

Commitment of the school board to eliminate barriers and to facilitate full and effective implementation of the models.

A detailed and realistic timeline for getting the basic elements of the selected intervention model in place by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year has been addressed.

A strategic planning process to successfully support the selection and implementation of the intervention model.

The historical success of recruiting new principals with the credentials and capability to implement the model has been described.

The ability of the LEA to successfully align federal, state, and local funding sources with grant activities and to ensure sustainability of the reform measures.

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

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

North Dakota typically releases its AYP reports each spring. We anticipate the 2009-2010 AYP reports to be released in April 2010. Once the AYP data is final and made public, the state Title I office will proceed with school and district identifications for improvement for the 2010-2011 school year. In the spring of each school year, the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction (NDDPI) conducts a workshop for all schools identified for improvement. Our 2010 workshop has been scheduled for April 21, 2010. At this workshop, schools are provided with a timeline of required activities and information on implementing all required AYP provisions and improvement sanctions. Schools are informed of their responsibilities and provided with resources regarding parent notification, professional development, school choice, supplemental services, and other corrective actions sanctions and are given guidance on writing a school improvement plan. Additional funding opportunities are also addressed at this workshop.

The NDDPI held training for schools identified for Tier I and Tier II on January 22, 2010 and again on March 16, 2010. The purpose of the training was to inform these schools of their Tier I and II identification and provide an overview of the SIG process and final requirements. At this training, these schools were provided with the draft SIG LEA application for SIG funds. Detailed information will be provided on the four SIG intervention models, the SIG LEA application, the scoring rubric, and required reports to the NDDPI that will hold districts accountable for implementing the school level intervention model of their choice. The NDDPI will review and approve LEA applications for Tiers I and II schools in April/May 2010 so that these schools are clearly given first priority for the SIG funding.

If funds remain, Tier III schools will be provided with the SIG LEA application, guidance, scoring rubric, and reporting requirements at our April 21, 2010 workshop. These applications will be reviewed and approved in June 2010.

NDDPI’s intent is to gather information specific to each building to receive SIG funding. LEAs submit an application for each school they wish to serve. Some questions will be addressed by the district with similar responses in each application (i.e., questions 7, 8, 10). Some questions need to be addressed specific to the school building (i.e., questions 1, 4).

Process	Date (2010)
NDDPI sends initial letter of explanation of SIG to LEA superintendents	January
NDDPI provides audio conference training to Tier I and Tier II schools explaining SIG process	January 22
NDDPI submits initial application to USDE	February
NDDPI receives comments from USDE	March
NDDPI provides second audio conference training to Tier I and Tier I schools, distributes draft application and draft scoring rubric	March 16
NDDPI revises application and submits to USDE	April 14
NDDPI revises application and submits to USDE	April 15
NDDPI revises application and submits to USDE	April 22
NDDPI revises application and submits to USDE	May 6
NDDPI revises application and submits to USDE	June 2
NDDPI revises application and submits to USDE	June 22

LEA SIG applications (Tier I and Tier II) due to NDDPI	April
NDDPI reviews Tier I and Tier II applications	May – June
NDDPI provides technical assistance for revising applications as needed	May – June
NDDPI notifies LEAs about availability of Tier III applications	April
NDDPI provides training on completing SIG application for Tier III	May 21
NDDPI provides training on completing SIG application for Tier III	May 27
NDDPI awards Tier I and Tier II grants	June
NDDPI reviews and scores Tier III applications	June
NDDPI awards Tier III grants	July
Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools begin implementing approved reform models	July
LEA submits annual review for all SIG applications to determine eligibility for continued SIG funding	May – June 2011

NDDPI will first review and score Tier I and II applications as these schools have priority for funding. Tier III applications will be collected and reviewed if funds are available. The reviewers for all three applications (Tiers I, II, and III) will be NDDPI program staff who are well experienced as educators and are highly knowledgeable in school and district improvement.

Initial Review of Application

Upon receipt of an LEA's Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III application, Title I program staff will review the application to determine if all of the required elements are included and identify any areas that are not fully explained. If either of these occurs, the Title I staff will contact the LEA to request the needed element and/or provide technical assistance. If all required materials are included, the application will receive a full review.

Full Review by NDDPI Staff

A training session will be conducted prior to the full application review to discuss each element on the rubric, consider the examples given in the scoring ranges, and practice scoring with several applications in order to achieve a level of inter-rater reliability.

Each application submitted for SIG funding will be read and scored by three NDDPI program staff. Upon completion, the three scores will be averaged to determine a final score.

Once all applications have been read and scored, they will be ranked in priority order according to total points received. A determination can then be made as to how many applications can be approved based on the funding available.

Initiate Grant Award

NDDPI will notify LEAs as to the approved amount, obtain necessary signatures on the grant award, and provide information on reporting requirements.

- (2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in**

the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

North Dakota LEAs with schools in Tiers I, II, and III that submit an application for a school improvement grant and receive approval will receive a SIG award in the summer of 2010. The district will receive initial funding for the first year of their three-year funding cycle. In the spring of 2011, all SIG grantees will be required to submit an annual report which will be reviewed as a continuation grant in order to receive funds for the second year of their three-year funding cycle. The annual report will require the LEAs and schools outline their progress in the following areas:

- Implementation of the SIG intervention model
- Meeting their SIG goals
- Use of current funding
- Progress toward intervention sustainability

The NDDPI Title I unit consists of 13 staff members. There are nine program staff, three support staff, and a fiscal officer. All schools in Tiers I, II, and III will be assigned one of the nine Title I program staff as a contact person. Each of the nine state Title I program staff will be responsible for reviewing the annual report for the schools under their purview. The results of this review will determine the continuation of funds. The NDDPI will create a rubric for measuring the annual progress to ensure consistency in the review process. The rubric will critique whether or not the LEAs have demonstrated sufficient progress toward meeting their goals in order to receive continued funding. If an LEA cannot demonstrate progress in meeting the goals and indicators as outlined on the NDDPI rubric, or if the NDDPI determines that the LEA lacks the capacity to implement the goals and indicators, the SIG funding will be terminated and the funds will be redistributed to other Tier I, II, and III schools.

The same process of utilizing an annual report and rubric will be implemented to determine if LEAs will receive continued funding for the third year of the three-year funding cycle.

(3) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

In accordance with the SIG guidance, LEAs with schools in Tier I and Tier II will have first priority for SIG funding. If there are funds remaining, LEAs with schools in Tier III will be eligible to apply for funding. The same application and scoring rubric will be utilized to fund LEAs with Tier III schools. After one year of funding, LEAs with Tier III schools who received SIG funding will need to submit an annual report for each Tier III school outlining the progress made to their improvement goals outlined both in their SIG application and improvement plan. The annual report will be scored with a rubric which will determine whether or not the LEA and its Tier III schools have demonstrated sufficient progress toward meeting their goals. The rubric will take into consideration school level achievement data, their annual report to determine whether or not to renew their application for continued funding. If the rubric scores justify continuation of funds, additional budget information will be required for subsequent years. The same process of utilizing an annual report and rubric will be implemented to determine if LEAs and their Tier III schools will receive continued funding.

The Title I contact person will be responsible for providing technical assistance, answering questions, reviewing the SIG applications, reviewing reports, scoring rubrics, and all other responsibilities associated with the SIG for the schools under their purview.

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

The NDDPI will utilize various methods to monitor each LEA with a Tier I and/or Tier II school that receives SIG funds to ensure that it is implementing each school intervention model fully and effectively. First, as stated, each school in Tiers I, II, and III has been assigned a Title I contact person. This person is responsible for continued communication, technical assistance, and program oversight throughout the year for all schools under their purview. Best efforts are made to keep the assigned Title I contacts the same from year-to-year to encourage consistency and integrity. The Title I contact person will monitor the LEA and school progress, answer questions, ensure reports are submitted in a timely manner, and oversee the LEA's implementation of the SIG indicators and intervention model for each selected school.

Secondly, the NDDPI will monitor each LEA that receives a SIG through the required submission and review of reports and school level achievement data. The NDDPI will monitor an LEA's progress toward meeting their goals through the submission of progress reports submitted every six months. In addition, the NDDPI will annually monitor the expenditures of each SIG application through a detailed paper report. The reports and achievement data will clearly demonstrate whether or not the SIG grantees are meeting their goals and indicate which will determine continuous funding. Rubric documents will be used to measure the LEA's annual progress in Tier I and Tier II schools. These rubrics will assist NDDPI in ensuring consistency in the review process.

Finally, in North Dakota, we believe that the amount of oversight that each LEA will need will vary significantly across the state. Many districts, in particular larger school districts, have a stronger internal support system and greater access to resources to help them implement the SIG requirements in their Tier I and Tier II schools. However, smaller districts such as those with limited resources, substantial barriers, or districts considered "at risk", may need significant oversight to ensure that the SIG requirements are implemented with fidelity.

NDDPI will develop tiered levels of intervention to target our technical assistance, monitoring, and oversight to meet the needs of all participating LEAs while ensuring SIG final requirements are met.

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

The state of North Dakota has only eleven schools total in Tier I and Tier II combined. Preliminary conversations with Tier I and Tier II schools have led us to believe that we will have the capacity to fund each school in Tier I and Tier II that chooses to apply for SIG funding. NDDPI has created a rigorous scoring rubric which is directly aligned to the LEA SIG application. This scoring rubric is included in the state application for SIG funding. The scoring rubric is based on a points system and will be used to prioritize which LEAs will receive funding to support their Tier I and/or Tier II schools. Any remaining SIG funds will then be made available for schools in Tier III.

We anticipate the demand for funding will intensify in Tier III as the majority of our improvement schools fall in this category. Again, the scoring rubric, which is directly aligned to

the LEA SIG application, will be used to prioritize which LEAs will receive funding to support their Tier III schools. It is very realistic that not all Tier III schools will receive SIG funding. For these schools, the NDDPI will continue to offer technical assistance, monitoring, and oversight to ensure improvement regulations are met.

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

The NDDPI has created a rigorous scoring rubric directly aligned to the LEA SIG application (see Appendix D). Schools in Tiers I, II, and III will use the same application to apply for funding. Schools in Tiers I and II will receive priority for SIG funding. If funds are available, schools in Tier III will be invited to submit an application for SIG funds. The scoring rubric will be used within NDDPI to review the applications. Each school will receive a score based on the rubric. The scoring rubric will determine which schools receive funding. Using this method is fair and equitable and rewards those schools that are implementing strategies aligned with the SIG priorities. It is very realistic that not all Tier III schools will receive SIG funding. For these schools, the NDDPI will continue to offer technical assistance, monitoring, and oversight to ensure improvement regulations are met.

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

In the state of North Dakota, the NDDPI does not have legal authority to take over a school. Our NDCC does not grant authority for a school take over by the NDDPI. Therefore, the State of North Dakota will not provide services directly to any schools.

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.¹

In the state of North Dakota, the NDDPI does not have legal authority to take over a school. Our NDCC does not grant authority for a school take over by the NDDPI. Furthermore, NDCC does not grant authority for the establishment of charter schools. Neither the SEA nor an LEA may grant a charter. Therefore, the SEA does not intend to provide direct services to any school in the absence of a takeover.

¹ If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

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

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following:

- Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.
- Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the State receives FY 2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the State).
- Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- 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 (or use of an EMO) 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. Not applicable as North Dakota state law prohibits EMOs, state take-overs, and charter schools.
- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; amount of the grant; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

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

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

The NDDPI will reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of our School Improvement Grant (\$381,576.00) for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses. The activities to be supported with these funds fall into the categories outlined below. The NDDPI does have both sufficient funds and sufficient staff to carry out the many activities that are listed in this section. As a rural state, we must offer a variety of mechanisms to connect with the field. We collaborate and work as a team to ensure we meet schools' needs as best as possible.

■ Peer Review Team Expenditures

The NDDPI has established cadres of distinguished educators to assist the state department in reviewing Title I school and district improvement plans and applications for our state approved supplemental educational services (SES) provider list. The state department contracts with distinguished educators to review and score improvement plans and SES applications. SEA SIG funds will be utilized to pay for these expenditures.

■ Statewide Technical Assistance

The NDDPI Title I unit has multiple ways that we provide statewide technical assistance and share effective strategies for schools and districts identified for improvement. The following summarizes our key initiatives:

○ Extensive Website

The state Title I office has an extensive website developed for schools and district identified for improvement. This site contains a variety of resources including a link to all district and school Adequate Yearly Progress reports, information on reports due throughout the year, information, and application forms on additional funds available for schools in improvement, sample letters and sample reports, and resources and handouts from prior workshops. Log on to <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/progress/index.shtm> to access this information.

○ Assigned NDDPI Liaison

Every school and district identified for improvement is assigned a Title I program staff member to answer questions, review plans and applications, and provide technical assistance. These liaisons keep in close contact with their assigned schools by gathering information, answering questions on program improvement issues, acting as a guidance coach, and tracking a school's needs and efforts in a very comprehensive manner.

○ Monthly Research Report

The state Title I office generates and distributes a monthly report which summarizes newly released research/resources on educational issues relevant to North Dakota schools. The monthly Research/Resource Report (RRR) is disseminated electronically to all principals, administrators, and Title I teachers and staff in schools identified for improvement.

○ Sharing of Effective Strategies

The NDDPI frequently contracts with exemplary educators within the state or educational entities

to create resources for North Dakota schools and districts. We believe it is critical to highlight what has been proven to be effective in other schools and districts across North Dakota.

- The NDDPI requested assistance from the North Central Comprehensive Center (NCCC) in highlighting and documenting seven schools in the state of North Dakota that have made substantial improvement in their student achievement scores. Interviews with seven school administrators were conducted by the NCCC to gather information on the specific strategies each school employed to improve student achievement. A summary capturing the most important processes and initiatives was created for each school. All seven summaries were compiled into one document and shared statewide to disseminate effective practices.
 - The state Title I office created a “What Works” resource guide for schools and districts to provide educators with strategies, interventions, and components used in effective educational programs. This document contains 22 one-page profiles. Each of these profiles provides an overview, research summary, and resource section on educational topics being used across the nation to improve education and raise academic achievement. The resources within this document are provided to assist schools and districts in their school improvement efforts.
 - The North Dakota State Parental Information Resource Center (NDPIRC) and state Title I office contracted with state educators to create a Parent Involvement Master Literacy Bag, as well as a Parental Involvement Toolkit, for all North Dakota schools.
- Department Sponsored Conferences
The NDDPI sponsors two extensive conferences each year. Each spring, a conference for schools and districts in improvement is held to disseminate key information regarding the school improvement requirements and to share effective strategies for making AYP. In the fall, a statewide conference is held for educators to promote effective research-based strategies designed to raise achievement. Numerous other trainings, via conference call or Interactive Video Network, are offered each year to share and disseminate information statewide.
 - Audio Conference Trainings
To further expand the number of training opportunities available to Title I personnel, the state Title I office periodically conducts conference calls on relevant Title I issues. This form of training is very beneficial because the trainings are short (one hour), easy to access, and participants don’t have to be away from their building. The training that the NDDPI held for the Tier I and Tier II schools was held through an audio conference.

SEA SIG funds will be used to provide statewide technical assistance for these key initiatives.

■ Title I School Support Team

A statewide School Support Team has been developed for North Dakota. Members of the School Support Team are comprised of distinguished educators regionally located throughout North Dakota. Members of the School Support Team are required to stay educated and current on the Title I programs and issues. The members provide in-depth technical assistance to schools identified for improvement, particularly those in the corrective action and restructuring phases.

North Dakota’s School Support Team works closely with the North Central Comprehensive Center to receive additional support and training in order to more effectively assist schools and districts identified for improvement.

In addition, the state Title I office recently established a list of consultants who can assist districts and

schools with planning and implementing school improvement activities. These consultants are known as the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) Consultant Team. Team members must have expertise in a variety of school improvement areas to provide individualized assistance to schools.

SEA SIG funds will be used to provide training and support to our SST and SSOS teams.

■ North Dakota Moving to Improve Learning for Everyone (NDMILE)

NDMILE is a web-based system that will be implemented by the NDDPI for schools to use to inform, coach, sustain, track, and report improvement activities. The NDMILE has indicators of evidence-based practices at the district and school and classroom levels to improve student learning. It is also customized so that the SEA or LEA can populate or enhance the system with its own indicators of effective practice or use those embedded in the tool. NDMILE is a tool that will guide improvement teams through a continuous cycle of assessment, planning, implementation, and progress tracking. Focus will be clear, responsibilities assigned, and efforts synchronized.

Schools participating in NDMILE will utilize the indicators that were selected for North Dakota. Schools will assess each indicator and determine the value the indicator has for improving student performance. Implementation plans will be developed and progress toward meeting goals for each indicator can be monitored through the tool.

North Dakota is one of several states that is partnering with the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII) to use a tailored version of CII's indicator-based systems and trainings as a key component of our comprehensive system of support for schools in improvement. SEA SIG funds will be used to hire a cadre of coaches to work with North Dakota Title I schools participating in the NDMILE.

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

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

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

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

The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including:

- The North Dakota Education Association
- The North Dakota Council of Educational Leaders
- The North Dakota Parental Information Resource Center

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

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

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I and Tier II schools.

- Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.
- Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

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

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

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

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

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

North Dakota has developed an LEA application form and scoring rubric that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application contains all of the information set forth in the School Improvement Grant SEA application. The LEA School Improvement Grant application and scoring rubric is attached to the state School Improvement Grant application.

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

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

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.
- "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.

North Dakota Department of Public Instruction
 Dr. Wayne G. Sanstead, State Superintendent
 600 E. Boulevard Ave., Dept. 201
 Bismarck, ND 58505-0440

North Dakota Tier I , Tier II, and Tier III Schools

<u>LEA NAME, NCES ID #</u>							
LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹
Fort Totten 30	Four Winds High School	3807170-00227	X				
Fort Yates 4	Fort Yates High School	3807200	X				
White Shield 85	White Shield High School	3819680-00808	X				
Mandaree 36	Mandaree High School	3811850-00006	X			X	
Solen 3	Solen High School	3816980-00587	X				
Warwick 29	Warwick High School	3819260-00672	X				
United 7	Des Lacs-Burlington High School	3818730-00647		X			
Kensal 19	Kensal High School	3810260-00330		X			
Pingree-Buchanan 10	Pingree-Buchanan High School	3815150-00534		X			
Sawyer 16	Sawyer High School	3816470-00570		X			
North Border 100	Walhalla High School	3800054-00670		X			
United 7	Burlington-Des Lacs Elementary School	3818730-00646			X		
Solen 3	Cannon Ball Elementary School	3816980-00585			X		
Central Cass	Central Cass	3804090-			X		

 An SEA must identify newly eligible schools on its list only if it chooses to take advantage of this option. North Dakota has chosen not to take advantage of this option.

Appendix A

17	Middle School	00163					
Dakota Prairie 1	Dakota Prairie High School	3800040-00649			X		
Bismarck 1	Dorothy Moses Elementary School	3800014-00048			X		
Dunseith 1	Dunseith Elementary School	3805460-00155			X		
Dunseith 1	Dunseith High School	3805460-00157			X		
West Fargo 6	Eastwood Elementary School	3819410-00677			X		
New Town 1	Edwin Loe Elementary School	3813920-00495			X		
Eight Mile 6	Eight Mile Elementary School	3806010-00171			X		
Eight Mile 6	Eight Mile High School	3806010-00172			X		
Minot 1	Erik Ramstad Middle School	3813030-00436			X		
Mandan 1	Ft. Lincoln Elementary School	3811820-00081			X		
Fort Yates 4	Ft. Yates Elementary	3807200			X		
Fort Yates 4	Ft. Yates Middle School	3807200-00744			X		
Grafton 3	Grafton Central Middle School	3808060-00247			X		
Bismarck 1	Jeannette Myhre Elementary School	3800014-00052			X		
Minot 1	Jim Hill Middle School	3813030-00439			X		
Fargo 1	Kennedy Elementary School	3806780-00206			X		
Killdeer 16	Killdeer Elementary School	3810270-00331			X		
West Fargo 6	L.E. Berger Elementary School	3819410-00815			X		

Appendix A

Larimore 44	Larimore Elementary School	3810860-00354			X		
Fargo 1	Lincoln Elementary School	3806780-00201			X		
Lisbon 19	Lisbon Middle School	3811430-00375			X		
Mandan 1	Mary Stark Elementary School	3811820-00390			X		
Minnewauken 5	Minnewauken Elementary School	3812990-00430			X		
Montefiore 1	Montefiore Elementary School	3813200-00456			X		
Grand Forks 1	Nathan Twining Elementary-Middle School	3808130-00814			X		
Nedrose 4	Nedrose Elementary School	3813660-00474			X		
New Rockford-Sheyenne 2	New Rockford-Sheyenne Elementary School	3800059-00490			X		
Oberon 16	Oberon Elementary School	3814520-00515			X		
Parshall 3	Parshall Elementary School	3814940-00527			X		
Bismarck 1	Riverside Elementary School	3800014-00057			X		
Bismarck 1	Robert Place Miller Elementary School	3800014-00727			X		
Roosevelt 18	Roosevelt Elementary School	3816090-00560			X		
Minot 1	Roosevelt Elementary School	3813030-00448			X		
Selfridge 8	Selfridge Elementary School	3816510-00573			X		

Appendix A

Selfridge 8	Selfridge High School	3816510-00574			X		
West Fargo 6	South Elementary School	3819410-00682			X		
South Prairie 70	South Prairie Elementary School	3817170-00594			X		
St. John 3	St. John High School	3817460-00600			X		
Kidder County 1	Steele-Dawson Elementary School	3800389-00611			X		
Minot 1	Sunnyside Elementary School	3813030-00449			X		
Surrey 41	Surrey Elementary School	3817910-00618			X		
Belcourt 7	Turtle Mountain Elem School	3802530-00750			X		
Belcourt 7	Turtle Mountain High School	3802530-00752			X		
Belcourt 7	Turtle Mountain Middle School	3802530-00751			X		
Twin Buttes 37	Twin Buttes Elementary School	3818600-00757			X		
Grand Forks 1	Valley Middle School	3808130-00265			X		
Bismarck 1	Wachter Middle School	3800014-00061			X		
Warwick 29	Warwick Elementary School	3819260-00671			X		
Mandaree 36	Mandaree Elementary School	3811850-00747			X		
White Shield 85	White Shield Elementary School	3819680-00807			X		
Grand Forks 1	Winship Elementary School	3808130-00269			X		

**North Dakota Department of Public Instruction
Dr. Wayne G. Sanstead, State Superintendent
600 E. Boulevard Ave., Dept. 201
Bismarck, ND 58505-0440**

North Dakota Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Descriptor (d)(1): Provide the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) that the State uses to identify such schools.

The NDDPI provides assurance that it has defined “persistently lowest-achieving schools” and that the NDDPI uses this definition to identify such schools for the purposes of public reporting.

The NDDPI has defined persistently lowest-achieving schools as specified in the *Guidance on School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, dated December 18, 2009.

The NDDPI identifies “persistently lowest-achieving schools” as follows:

- (a) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that –
 - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent (or five) of 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 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years;

And

- (b) 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 C.F.R. §200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

A school that falls within the definition of (a) above is a “Tier I” school and a school that falls within the definition of (b) above is a “Tier II” school for purposes of using State Improvement Grant funds under ESEA section 1003(g). The NDDPI provides assurance that it will identify persistently lowest-achieving schools on an annual basis.

To identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, the NDDPI provides assurance that it takes into consideration both: (a) the academic achievement of the “all students” group in a school in

Appendix B

terms of proficiency on the State's assessments under ESEA Section 1111(b)(3) in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and (b) the school's lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group. The "all students" group is understood to include all students who participate in the North Dakota State Assessment in all applicable grades (grades 3-8 and 11) and among all subgroups, including ethnicity, limited English proficiency, economic disadvantage, and special education.

The NDDPI provides assurance that it uses the North Dakota State Assessment (NDSA) in reading/language arts and mathematics required under Section 1111(b)(3) in the determination of persistently lowest-achieving schools statewide. The NDSA is understood to include the State's general assessments, including its alternate assessments based on alternate and modified achievement standards. The NDDPI applies the definition of proficiency defined through the State's approved academic achievement standards setting process.

For the purpose of determining Tier I schools, the NDDPI generated a ranking of our 60 schools currently identified for improvement using a composite reading/mathematics score for a three-year period (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09). Lack of progress is defined as those schools not making AYP specific to the "all students" group. In addition, the NDDPI reviewed its graduation rates for a three-year period (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09) and added to Tier I any high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent for three consecutive years. The data showing the ranking of our Tier I schools can be accessed at <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/Legislative/sig/index.shtm> on the NDDPI website.

For the purpose of determining Tier II schools, the NDDPI generated a ranking our North Dakota high schools that are eligible for, but not receiving, Title I funds using a composite reading/mathematics score for a three-year period (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09). Lack of progress is defined as those schools not making AYP specific to the "all students" group. In addition, the NDDPI reviewed its graduation rates for a three-year period (2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09) and added to Tier II any high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent for three consecutive years. The data showing the ranking of our Tier II schools can be accessed at <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/Legislative/sig/index.shtm> on the NDDPI website.

The list of North Dakota schools identified for Tier I and Tier II can be accessed at <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/Legislative/sig/index.shtm> on the NDDPI website.

The NDDPI provides assurance that it defines a secondary school as specified within North Dakota Century Code and further assures that a secondary school does not include any education beyond grand 12. A secondary school is understood to be eligible to receive Title I funds under ESEA Section 1113(a) or 1113(b). The NDDPI will follow its approved ranking protocols to determine which secondary schools are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds.

The NDDPI provides assurance that it conducts the identification of persistently lowest-achieving schools in a manner consistent with the multi-step guidance provided by ED.

The NDDPI provides assurance that it will publicly post this information on the State's SFSF website and on the NDDPI Title I website on or about February 1, 2010. The NDDPI foresees no obstacles to meeting this deadline.



TITLE I APPLICATION FOR ADDITIONAL PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT FUNDING

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Title I

SFN 52823 (rev. 6-2010)

RETURN TO:
Department of Public Instruction
Title I Office
600 E Boulevard Avenue, Dept. 201
Bismarck, ND 58505-0440

Part A – General Information

Application Funding:

1003 (a)

1003(g) (SIG)

Name of Applicant – Local Educational Agency			
Mailing Address	City	State	Zip Code
Name of District Authorized Representative	Telephone Number	Fax Number	
Authorized Representative Email Address			
Name of Contact Person for Program Improvement	Telephone Number	Fax Number	
Contact Person's Email Address			

Part B – Certification and Assurances

The applicant hereby assures the Superintendent of Public Instruction that:

1. Parents of participating children, school staff, the school district, and the state have jointly agreed to the selection of providers of technical assistance and the best use of funds for the effective implementation of the program improvement plan.
2. If this application is approved, program improvement funds will be expended in compliance with the applicable federal laws and regulations and the NDDPI "General Requirements for Federal Programs" manual dated February 1998.
3. The LEA will use its School Improvement Grant (SIG) to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the SIG final requirements.
4. The LEA 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 SIG 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.
5. If the LEA implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, it must 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 SIG final requirements.
6. The LEA will report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the SIG final requirements.

The signature of the Authorized Representative below indicates the awareness and agreement with the Certification and Assurances listed in this application.

Signature of District Authorized Representative	Date
---	------

Part C – State Approval (For Department Use Only)

Funding Period	Signature of Authorized SEA Official	Date Approved
Year One Amount Approved	Total Amount Approved	

Continuation of SIG funds into years two and three are subject to submission, review, rubric score of annual reports, and achievement data.

Part D – Schools to be Served

The district must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve. The district must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the district commits to serve and identify the model that the district will use in each Tier I and Tier II school. A district that has a Tier I or Tier II school and does not apply for SIG funds to serve Tier I and Tier II schools may not apply for SIG funds to serve any Tier III schools.

School Name	NCES ID #	Tiers			Intervention Models <i>(Tiers I and II schools only)</i>			
		Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Turn-around	Restart	Closure	*Transfor-mation
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Part E – Descriptive Information

- Describe the district’s needs assessment process that demonstrates the analyzation of needs for each school and the selected interventions at each school.
(Tiers I, II and III)

2. Describe the district's capacity to use these funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each of the schools identified in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected. Refer to criteria listed in Table A as to the areas that need to be addressed. (*Tiers I, II and III*)

Table A: Review Criteria for Capacity
Capacity Factors
High quality staff is available with the capability to implement the selected intervention model successfully.
The ability of the LEA to serve the overall number of Tier I and/or Tier II schools identified on the application has been addressed.
A commitment by stakeholder groups to support the selected intervention model has been addressed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher's union • Staff • Parents
Commitment of the school board to eliminate barriers and to facilitate full and effective implementation of the models.
A detailed and realistic timeline for getting the basic elements of the selected intervention model in place by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year has been addressed.
A strategic planning process to successfully support the selection and implementation of the intervention model.
The historical success of recruiting new principals with the credentials and capability to implement the model has been described.
The ability of the LEA to successfully align federal, state, and local funding sources with grant activities and to ensure sustainability of the reform measures.

3. If the district is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why there is a lack of capacity to serve each Tier I school. Refer to criteria listed in Table A as to the areas that need to be addressed. (*Tier I only*)

Table A: Review Criteria for Lack of Capacity
Capacity Factors
High quality staff is available with the capability to implement the selected intervention model successfully.
The ability of the LEA to serve the overall number of Tier I and/or Tier II schools identified on the application has been addressed.
A commitment by stakeholder groups to support the selected intervention model has been addressed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher's union • Staff • Parents
Commitment of the school board to eliminate barriers and to facilitate full and effective implementation of the models.
A detailed and realistic timeline for getting the basic elements of the selected intervention model in place by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year has been addressed.
A strategic planning process to successfully support the selection and implementation of the intervention model.
The historical success of recruiting new principals with the credentials and capability to implement the model has been described.
The ability of the LEA to successfully align federal, state, and local funding sources with grant activities and to ensure sustainability of the reform measures.

School Year:
 2010-2011
 2011-2012
 2012-2013

Part F-1 – Budget

The district must provide a budget that indicates the amount of funds it will need to implement the interventions in this application. Districts with Tier I and Tier II schools will duplicate this page as necessary as they need to submit a budget for each year of the three years in the grant. An LEA must submit an LEA budget as well as a separate budget for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. The LEA application requires an LEA to provide a budget that does not exceed \$2 million dollars per year per each Tier I, II, and III school that the LEA commits to serve.

School Name			
Object Code Number	Object Code Description	Requested Budget	For Department Use Only
			Final Approved Budget
110	Professional Salaries		
120	Non-professional Salaries		
200	Benefits		
300	Purchased Professional & Technical Services		
430	Maintenance		
500	Other Purchased Services/Travel		
600	Materials/Supplies		
730	Equipment		
800	Dues/Memberships/Registration Fees		
900	Indirect Costs		
Total	<i>Total must match total on Part F-2</i>		

600 – These funds are specifically for high quality interventions and activities supported through a thorough needs assessment. Supplies/materials will only be considered if they are necessary to implement the application plan.

730 – Equipment cannot be purchased with these funds unless supported through a needs assessment.

Part F-2 – Budget Narrative Year One

For each line item in Part F-1, please provide a detailed description of the expenditures listed in F-1. If necessary, identify the corresponding schools. Duplicate this page as necessary.

Object Code Number	Description	Amount
Total	<i>Total must match total on Part F-1</i>	

Part G – Waivers (Tiers I and II only)

The district must check each waiver that it will implement. If the district 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.

Select each waiver the district will implement as well as each school to which the waiver is applicable

- Extending the period of availability of program improvement funds.
Schools:
- “Starting over” in the program improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
Schools:
- 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.
Schools:

**NORTH DAKOTA STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Rating and Scoring Rubric
Title I Additional Program Improvement Funding**

Applicant's Name	<input type="checkbox"/> Tier I <input type="checkbox"/> Tier II <input type="checkbox"/> Tier III	Reviewer
------------------	--	----------

Summary Page

Part A – General Information	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Part B – Certification and Assurances	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Part C – State Approval (<i>For Department Use Only</i>)	Not Applicable
Part D – Schools to be Served	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Part E – Descriptive Information	Points Awarded
Part F – Budget	Points Awarded
Part G – Waivers	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Total Points	Total Points Awarded

Sections of the scoring rubric indicate scoring “0” when the section does not apply to a particular Tier. This score will not count against a district when reviewing for funding.

	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III
Maximum Points Possible	96	96	112
Minimum Points Needed to be Considered for Award	55	55	65

Any application that receives a score of “0” points in any category is ineligible to receive funding.

Part A – General Information	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Part B – Certification and Assurances	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included
Part C – State Approval (<i>For Department Use Only</i>)	Not Applicable
Part D – Schools to be Served	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not Included

Part E – Descriptive Information

- Describe the district’s needs assessment process that demonstrates the analyzation of needs for each school and the selected interventions at each school.
(*Tiers I, II, and III*)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The application provided a detailed overview of the needs of the school, students, and community it will serve. The description of the school attendance area was detailed, providing sufficient information for setting up the needs assessment. The description also included charts and/or graphs displaying the results of the data analysis.</p> <p>The district included information from all four measures of data—student achievement data, school programs/process data, student/teacher/parent perceptions data, and demographic data.</p>	<p>The application provided a brief description of the school attendance area including the school neighborhood and economic factors affecting the school. The description was of sufficient extent to help guide the comprehensive needs assessment.</p> <p>The summary of the needs assessments demonstrated that the school included an analysis of data on all students attending the school and that this data was disaggregated and cross analyzed to determine students’ needs.</p>	<p>The application did not provide a detailed description of its school, its students, and/or its community.</p> <p>The needs assessment did not disaggregate data.</p>

Points Possible: 8 Points Awarded:

Comments:

Part E – Descriptive Information

2. Describe the district’s capacity to use these funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each of the schools identified in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
(Tiers I, II, and III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
The various funding sources were specifically outlined.	Funding sources were addressed and provide enough support to fully and effectively implement interventions.	Funding sources were not aligned and/or did not support the full and effective implementation of interventions.
The various funding sources are aligned in order to fully and effectively implement interventions.	The required activities of the school intervention models were aligned to SIG final requirements.	The required activities of the school intervention models did not align to SIG final requirements.
The required activities of the school intervention models were aligned to SIG final requirements.		
Application includes evaluation of capacity outlined in Table A.	Application includes evaluation of capacity outlined in Table A.	Application includes evaluation of capacity outlined in Table A.
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

3. If the district is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why there is a lack of capacity to serve each Tier I school.
(Tier I)

The district explained why they lack the capacity to serve each of its Tier I schools using criteria outlined in Table A (no points).	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not Acceptable
---	--

4. Describe the design and implementation plans for the interventions identified at each school. Please note, if in Tiers I or II, the interventions must meet SIG final requirements.
(Tiers I, II, and III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
Interventions were described in detail and focused on helping the school’s students meet the state’s standards.	Interventions were briefly described and focused on helping the school’s students meet the state’s standards.	Interventions were not described and did not address the school’s plans to meet the state’s standards.
This section provided an excellent overview of the main components of the interventions being proposed.	This section provided a general overview of the main components of the interventions being proposed.	This section does not provide an overview of the main components of the interventions being proposed.
For Tier I or II schools, the intervention met SIG final requirements.	For Tier I or II schools, the intervention met SIG final requirements.	For Tier I or II schools, the interventions do not meet SIG final requirements.
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

Part E – Descriptive Information

5. Explain the process used to recruit, screen, and select external providers to ensure quality, if applicable.
(Tiers I, II, and III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
The district has identified in detail the experience level and qualifications of external providers to ensure quality.	The district briefly identified the experience level and qualifications of external providers to ensure quality.	The district has not identified the experience level or qualifications of external providers to ensure quality.
The external provider's qualifications were a key consideration in the recruitment, screening, and selection process.	The external provider's qualifications were somewhat considered in the recruitment, screening, and selection process.	The external provider's qualifications were not considered in the recruitment, screening, and selection process.
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

6. Illustrate the alignment between the interventions outlined and other resources in the school and district.
(Tiers I, II, and III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
Interventions and other resources were outlined with specific detail. They were aligned in order to fully and effectively implement interventions.	Interventions and other resources were briefly outlined and provide enough support to fully and effectively implement interventions.	Interventions and other resources were not aligned and/or did not support the full and effective implementation of interventions.
The LEA outlined multiple specific federal and state resources that can be aligned with SIG (i.e., Title I, Title II, Special Education, BIE, general funds, state funds, outside grants, etc.).	The LEA outlined a few specific federal and state resources that can be aligned with SIG (i.e., Title I, Title II, Special Education, BIE, general funds, state funds, outside grants, etc.).	No other federal and state resources were outlined to help support interventions.
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

7. How has the district modified its practices and/or policies to enable each school to implement the interventions fully and effectively?
(Tiers I, II, and III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
Applicant thoroughly addressed the current barriers faced by the Tier I, II, or III schools. Modifications to practices/policies were described in detail.	Applicant briefly addressed the current barriers faced by the Tier I, II, or III schools. Modifications to practices/policies were described briefly.	Applicant did not address the current barriers faced by the Tier I, II, or III school.
A timeline was included in the description.	A specific timeline was not included, but the narrative outlined the sequence of events.	
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

Appendix D

8. How does the district plan to sustain the interventions after the funding period ends?
(Tiers I, II, and III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The district directed resources to short-term, one-time expenditures that will have a long-term payoff for students and educators.</p> <p>For activities that depend on recurring funding, it included a plan for improving systemic efficacy and sustaining systems and programs after funding ends.</p>	<p>The district included activities that will depend on recurring funding, but also included a plan for improving systemic efficacy and sustaining systems and programs after funding ends.</p>	<p>The district did not include a realistic plan for sustaining the interventions after funding ends; no portion of expenditures were directed toward transition costs or improving efficacy of existing systems.</p>
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

9. Identify the services each Tier III school will receive or the activities each Tier III school will implement.
(Tier III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The services the school will receive and the activities the school will implement were described in detail and focused on helping the school's students meet the state's standards. Specific programs, professional development, or activities are fully defined in detail.</p> <p>This section provided an excellent overview of the main components of the interventions being proposed.</p>	<p>The services the school will receive and the activities the school will implement were briefly described and focused on helping the school's students meet the state's standards. Application provides moderate detail on proposed programs, professional development, or activities to be implemented.</p> <p>This section provided a general overview of the main components of the interventions being proposed.</p>	<p>The services the school will receive and the activities the school will implement were not described and did not address the school's plans to meet the state's standards.</p> <p>This section does not provide an overview of the main components of the interventions being proposed.</p>
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
<p>Score "0" for Tier I and Tier II.</p> <p>Comments:</p>		

Appendix D

10. Outline the goals the district will use to monitor each school's student achievement. The goals must reflect reading/language arts and mathematics specific to the North Dakota State Assessment. *(Tiers I, II, and III)*

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The district's goals were connected to priority needs, the needs assessment, and portrayed a clear and detailed analysis of the North Dakota State Assessment in the areas of reading/language arts and mathematics.</p> <p>The proposal includes realistic and measureable goals and objectives for each school to be served.</p> <p>The district's application included a rigorous plan for tracking and evaluating the success and cost-effectiveness of each proposed Tier III intervention.</p>	<p>The district's goals were connected to priority needs, the needs assessment, and portrayed a brief analysis of the North Dakota State Assessment in the areas of reading/language arts and mathematics.</p> <p>The proposal lacks realistic and measureable goals and objectives for each school to be served.</p> <p>The district's application included an adequate plan for tracking and evaluating the success and cost-effectiveness of each proposed Tier III intervention.</p>	<p>Goals were not clearly related to the needs assessment and/or to the priority need areas.</p> <p>Application did not include a plan for measuring and tracking effectiveness and results of proposed Tier III intervention.</p>
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

11. Describe the goals the district has established in order to hold its Tier III schools accountable to receive these funds. *(Tier III)*

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The proposal clearly defines the goals the LEA has set to hold the Tier III school accountable.</p> <p>The application specifically describes the activities for each Tier III school served.</p> <p>A timeline for implementation and accountability is included.</p>	<p>The proposal moderately defines the goals the LEA has set to hold the Tier III school accountable.</p> <p>A vague description of services was included for each Tier III school served.</p> <p>A limited timeline was included or a timeline of events was referenced in the narrative.</p>	<p>The proposal does not define the goals the LEA has set to hold the Tier III school accountable.</p> <p>No detailed description of services was included for each Tier III school served.</p> <p>No timeline was included.</p>
Points Possible: 8 Score "0" for Tier I and Tier II.		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

Appendix D

12. Describe the districts consultation with stakeholders regarding the application and implementation of the proposed interventions.
(Tiers I, II, and III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
The district consulted with numerous stakeholders regarding the application and implementation of the proposed interventions. The application clearly outlined how stakeholders were informed of their role and responsibility for sustained improvement.	The district consulted with some stakeholders regarding the application and implementation of the proposed interventions. The application minimally outlined how stakeholders were informed of their role and responsibility for sustained improvement.	The district did not consult with stakeholder groups regarding the application and implementation of the proposed interventions or shared responsibility for change.
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

13. Describe the district's (and each school in Tier I, II, or III) timeline outlining the steps it will take to implement the selected interventions. If necessary, identify the corresponding school and intervention.
(Tiers I, II, and III)

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
The actions the LEA will take to implement the interventions were addressed and thoroughly described in the timeline. The district identified schools and interventions when applicable. The timeline demonstrates that all of the model's elements are/will be implemented at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.	The actions the LEA will take to implement the interventions were addressed and briefly described in the timeline. The district identified schools and interventions when applicable. The timeline demonstrates that some of the model's elements are/will be implemented at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.	The actions the LEA will take to implement the interventions were not addressed or lacked a description in the timeline. The district did not identify schools and/or interventions when applicable. The timeline demonstrates that none of the model's elements are/will be implemented at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

Part F-1 – Budget (Tiers I, II, and III)

F-1 The district must provide a budget that indicates the amount of funds it will need to implement the interventions in this application. Districts with Tier I and Tier II schools will duplicate this page as necessary as they need to submit a budget for each year of the three years in the grant. An LEA must submit an LEA budget as well as a separate budget for each Tier I, II, or III school the LEA commits to serve.

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The district submitted a line-itemed budget.</p> <p>Budgets submitted for multiple three-year period for Tiers I and II.</p> <p>Reflects sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of selected model (Tier I and II) or School Improvement Act (Tier III).</p> <p>The multi-year budget does not exceed \$2 million per year per school.</p>	<p>The district submitted a line-itemed budget.</p> <p>Budgets submitted for multiple three-year period for Tiers I and II.</p>	<p>The district did not submit a line-itemed budget.</p> <p>Budgets amounts were omitted or not clearly indicated.</p>
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

F-2 For each line item in Part F-1, please provide a detailed description of the expenditures listed in F-1. If necessary, identify the corresponding schools. Duplicate this page as necessary.

Proficient (5-8 Points)	Basic (1-4 Points)	Incomplete (0 Points)
<p>The budget narrative clearly reflected the proposed interventions and activities as supported through the needs assessment.</p> <p>The budget demonstrated a commitment to utilizing federal dollars to support student achievement.</p> <p>The budget narrative aligns with the submitted budget, represents the contents of the proposal, and clearly focuses on the intervention (Tiers I and II) or School Improvement Act (Tier III).</p>	<p>The budget narrative briefly reflected the proposed interventions and activities.</p> <p>The budget demonstrated a commitment to utilizing federal dollars to support student achievement.</p> <p>The budget narrative aligns with the submitted budget, represents the contents of the proposal, and moderately focuses on the intervention (Tiers I and II) or School Improvement Act (Tier III).</p>	<p>The budget narrative did not reflect the proposed interventions and activities.</p>
Points Possible: 8		Points Awarded:
Comments:		

Part G – Waivers

- Included
- Not Included