


Section 1 – State Application – AMENDMENT June 10, 2010

APPLICATION COVER SHEET SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Nebraska Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: P.O. Box 94987 Lincoln, NE 68509-4987
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Marilyn J. Peterson Position and Office: Federal Programs and Data Systems Administrator Contact's Mailing Address: P.O. Box 94987 Lincoln, NE 68509-4987 Telephone: 402-471-3504 Fax: 402-471-1117 Email address: marilyn.peterson@nebraska.gov and roger.breed@nebraska.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Roger D. Breed	Telephone: 402-471-5020
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X  on behalf of Roger D. Breed Scott H. Swisher, Deputy Commissioner	Date: 6-10-2010
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 A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Nebraska's definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools follows. The definition and process of identifying persistently lowest-achieving schools has been posted on the Department of Education websites for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and ESEA Title I. The list of identified persistently lowest-achieving schools was posted after approval of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Application Phase II.

Nebraska has been approved for a waiver for the use of minimum number for identifying persistently lowest-achieving schools. Nebraska has also been approved for a waiver to include secondary schools in Tier II with a graduation rate of less than 75% in the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools. The waiver requests are included in Part H of this application.

Nebraska will not be exercising the option provided by the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010, to identify newly eligible schools for SIG funds for the initial year of this grant. The identification of the persistently lowest-achieving schools in Nebraska is based on the results of an assessment system that is in transition. In Spring 2010, a single statewide reading test (Nebraska State Accountability or NeSA) will replace the previous locally developed classroom-based assessments. The statewide math tests will begin in Spring of 2011. Nebraska will also be using the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate beginning in the 2010-11 school year. When the impact of changing assessment systems is clearer in the Spring of 2011, Nebraska may elect to identify newly eligible schools for SIG funding using the option provided by the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010.

Nebraska's definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools is:

Tier I Schools means the five (5) lowest-achieving Title I schools identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring plus any Title I served secondary school with a graduation rate of less than 75% over the three latest years that was not captured in the above five schools.

Tier II Schools shall mean the 15 (which is equal to 5%) lowest ranked secondary schools where the "all students" group meets the minimum n-size for AYP that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds plus any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that has a graduation rate of less than 75% over the three latest years and was not captured in the above 15 schools.

Tier III Schools means any Title I school identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I School and any school that is ranked as low as the Tier I and Tier II schools but has no groups of at least 30 students.

Persistently lowest-achieving schools (PLAS) Identification Procedure

Performance Rank

For the initial year (2008-09 AYP data) for all schools, add the numbers of students at the proficient level in Reading to the number of students at the proficient level in Math, then divide by the total number of students enrolled a full academic year (FAY as defined for AYP) in Reading and Math to get a percent proficient. Rank the schools by this percent proficient for a performance rank.

Progress Over Time Rank

For the latest three years (initial years are 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09), add the number of students at the proficient level in Reading and Math, then divide by the number of students enrolled a full academic year (FAY) for both Reading and Math for all three years to find a percent proficient. Rank the schools by this percent proficient for a progress over time rank.

Final Rank to Determine the Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

The performance rank is doubled before adding to the progress over time rank. Schools are then ranked to determine a final rank and the five or 5% (whichever is greater) schools are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in each Tier.

Graduation Rate

Using the AYP graduation data for all high schools in the state for the last three years (initially, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08), calculate a PLAS graduation rate using the AYP formula.

Definitions for Nebraska

School shall mean the school as used for the elementary, middle and high school designations for AYP. This does not include Rule 10 (Accreditation) Special Purpose Schools or preschools. Students being served in programs are reported in the school where they would be attending.

Secondary school shall mean any middle, junior high or senior high.

Number of years shall mean three years.

Graduation rate means the AYP Graduation Rate data from all secondary schools that is averaged for the three latest years. The initial year of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools will use 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 data.

Performance Rank shall mean the total number of students in the “all students” group at the proficient level in both Reading and Math divided by the total number of students enrolled a Full Academic Year (FAY as defined for AYP) in Reading and Math to determine a percent proficient for each school.

Progress Over Time Rank shall mean the total number of students in the “all students” group at the proficient level in Reading and Math for the three latest years divided by the total number of students enrolled a Full Academic Year (FAY) in Reading and Math for the three latest years to determine a percent proficient.

Weighting shall mean the performance rank will be weighted (multiplied by two) and added to the progress over time rank.

Final Rank shall mean the combination of performance rank and the progress over time rank.

The attached district application contains this set of definitions and process. The list of persistently lowest-achieving schools will be submitted using the format below when the process for identification is approved in the State Fiscal Stabilization Funds Application Phase II.

Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools						
District Name	School Name	NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate
Crawford Public Schools	Crawford Elementary	310552000177	X			
Lincoln Public Schools	Elliott Elementary	317284001147	X			
Madison Public Schools	Madison Elementary	317323001205	X			
Minatare Public Schools	Minatare Elementary	317380001262	X			
Santee Public Schools	Santee Elementary	317640001571	X			
Santee Public Schools	Santee High School	317640001572	X			X
Umo ^{ho} Nation Public Schools	Umo ^{ho} Nation High School	311956000377	X			X
Walthill Public School	Walthill High School	317830001690	X			X
Winnebago Public Schools	Winnebago High School	317881001738	X			X
Ainsworth Community Schools	Ainsworth Middle School	310279000202		X		
Alliance Public Schools	Alliance Middle School	310291000012		X		
Alliance Public Schools	Alliance High School	310291000011		X		
Bellevue Public Schools	Bellevue East High School	310381001501		X		
Cross County Public Schools	Cross County High School	310013001182		X		
David City Public Schools	David City Secondary School	310000200192				
East Butler Public Schools	High School at Brainard	310000300918		X		
Hay Springs Public Schools	Hays Springs Middle School	317161002193		X		
Lincoln Public Schools	Lincoln High School	317284001160		X		
Lincoln Public Schools	Lincoln Northeast High School	317284001161		X		
Lincoln Public Schools	Lincoln North Star High School	317284001032		X		

Pierce Public Schools	Pierce Jr/Sr High School	317551001495		X		
Ravenna Public School	Ravenna Senior High School	317596001549		X		
Sidney Public Schools	Sidney High School	317671001601		X		
Wahoo Public Schools	Wahoo High School	317821001682		X		
Omaha Public Schools	Benson Magnet High School	317482001354		X		X
Omaha Public Schools	Central High School	317482001363		X		X
Omaha Public Schools	Omaha North Magnet High School	317482001416		X		X
Omaha Public Schools	Omaha South Magnet High School	317482001433		X		X
Banner County Public Schools	Banner County High School	310006701044			X	
Brady Public Schools	Brady High School	310429000099			X	
Chase County Schools	Chase County Elementary School	310016301773			X	
Columbus Public Schools	Centennial Elementary School	310534001139			X	
Columbus Public Schools	Emerson Elementary School	310534000161			X	
Conestoga Public Schools	Conestoga Elementary	317420001818			X	
Dundy County Public Schools	Benkelman Elementary School	310007701886			X	
Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	Gordon-Rushville Middle School	310017001850			X	
Hay Springs Public Schools	Hays Springs High School	317161001059			X	
Lincoln Public Schools	Belmont Elementary	317284001138			X	
Lincoln Public Schools	C Culler Middle School	317284001141			X	
Lincoln Public Schools	Everett Elementary School	317284001168			X	
Lincoln Public Schools	Prescott Elementary School	317284001171			X	
Lincoln Public Schools	Saratoga Elementary School	317284001178			X	
Lincoln Public Schools	West Lincoln Elementary Schools	317284001181			X	
Leyton Public	Leyton High School	310007200188			X	

Schools						
Loup City Public Schools	Loup City High School	317309001195			X	
Morrill Public Schools	Morrill High School	310009701274			X	
North Platte Public Schools	Madison Middle School	310002201327			X	
Omaha Public Schools	Indian Hill Elementary School	317482001388			X	
Pierce Public School	Pierce Elementary School	317551001494			X	
Shelby Public Schools	Shelby High School	317659001594			X	
St. Edward public Schools	St. Edward High School	317698001622			X	
Walthill Public Schools	Walthill Elementary School	317830001689			X	

PART B. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Nebraska will convene a panel of district and NDE staff with experience and expertise in Title I and school improvement activities to review all applications. Each application will be reviewed and rated by two panelists. The scoring checklist is included as an appendix to the district application. Each school's application will be reviewed and rated individually. Districts may submit an application that includes more than one school and may include schools from any or all of the three Tiers. To ensure that the schools with the highest need are selected, the following process will be used to determine the applications to recommend to the State Board of Education for approval.

After the panel has reviewed and rated all applications, the score from Section 1. District information will be added to the score received by the school for Section 2. School Information. For applications containing multiple schools, the district's score will be added to each school.

The schools will be rank ordered by the total scores. The highest ranking Tier I and Tier II schools will determine the finalists, considering the amount of funds requested and the amount of funds available. Based on SIG Guidance, the NDE could decide to award fewer funds than the District requested for each school the District commits to serve; or the NDE could decide to award funds for only some of the schools the LEA commits to serve. For example, NDE could approve a District's application with respect to all of its Tier I schools, but only a portion of its Tier II and Tier III schools. NDE might also decide to award fewer funds than the District requested if the NDE determines, for example, that the District has not properly analyzed the needs of its schools or identified appropriate services for the schools. Budget adjustments will only be within the amounts permitted by the requirements.

Schools that are finalists must participate in a team interview with NDE staff either on-site or via polycom. This interview is an opportunity for NDE staff to validate application responses and evaluate school staff commitment and capacity before making the recommendations for final approval.

Part 1.

The district application has been designed to ensure that districts are taking the appropriate actions needed prior to submitting an application. The district application has two sections. Section 1 is completed with district level information to provide the reviewer with evidence of pre-planning and capacity. Section 2 of the application is to be completed for each school included in the district's application. Section 2 requires detailed information in an Analysis of Need, Action Plans and Budgets that will provide further evidence of district support and capacity.

- (1) For the Analysis of Need in Section 1 – District Level Information, the district must report data for the reporting metrics to ensure a comprehensive analysis as well as to provide baseline data for the State. In addition, each school's application (Section 2), requires each of the following areas to be addressed: (a) Student Achievement and Leading Indicators; (b) Services/Programs Profile; (c) Staff Profile; (d) Instructional Practices Profile; (e) System Profile; and (f) a description of the process used and the stakeholders involved. The analysis of need in the area of student achievement requires the district and school to use a feature called the Profile found on Nebraska's State of the Schools Report for the last two years of achievement data. A sample of a school's Profile is attached as Appendix C to the State Application. The State of the Schools Report is found at: <http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/Main/Home.aspx>
- (2) Action Plans (Section 2 of the district application) have been designed for each requirement of each of the four intervention models plus an Action Plan for Tier III schools not implementing one of the four models. The specificity being required on the Action Plans and Budgets should demonstrate whether the district and school have given sufficient thought and analysis to determine whether they have the capacity and resources to implement the model selected.
- (3) To determine the capacity of a school and district to appropriately use the School Improvement Funds being requested and to provide support to every school included, the application requires a separate budget for each school that identifies proposed expenditures for each requirement of the intervention model selected for each of the three years of funding. In addition, there is an option for districts to request funds for district support that is not covered in the school level budgets. Tier III schools that are currently Title I schools identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring will budget by the activity or activities in their improvement plan and must indicate how the activities funded through Section 1003(g) support activities approved in their application for Section 1003(a) funds. Tier III schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds can apply for these funds to implement a variation of the Transformation model (called Tier III Transformation Model). This will enable reviewers to determine if all of the required components of a model have been addressed. Given the large amount of funding possible for a school, the detailed budgeting being required in the district application will allow reviewers to determine if the plan and requests are reasonable for the proposed activities, size of the school, etc. Also see Part C. Capacity below.

Part 2

Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirement:

The district's commitment to design and implement interventions consistent with the requirements will be evaluated by the reviewers based on the specificity and appropriateness of the responses provided in the Action Plans and Budgets. Each requirement of the selected intervention model has an Action Plan that asks the applicant to identify the activity(s), key steps, proposed start and implementation dates,

person(s) responsible, monitoring and evaluation activities, and costs for the three years. Budget forms are also designed by the requirements of each intervention model. The Reviewers Rating and Checklist, included as an appendix to the district application, requires the reviewers to rate school's proposal for each requirement of the Intervention Model selected.

Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality:

The selection of an external provider, if the districts elect to do so, is one of the criteria rated on the District Section of the Reviewers Rating and Checklist. The district's process must be described in question B.4., of the application. If a district elects to have an external provider, the district must identify the provider(s) by name or company; the reasons or rationale for selecting this provider; the specific services to be provided; the reasons for selecting this particular provider; the specific services to be provided; the qualifications, including expertise and experience of the provider; and the procurement method to be used for securing and selecting the provider(s). At the present time, Nebraska does not have legislation that allows a charter school. Districts do have the authority to close and establish new schools.

Align other resources with the intervention:

The district's proposal to align other resources in support of the intervention model selected will be rated as one of the criteria in the Reviewer Rating and Checklist. In addition to a specific question (B.5. of the District application) that asks districts to identify specific other resources including funds and services that will support and align with the intervention model, the needs identified in the Analysis of Need and the activities described on the Action Plans should enable reviewers to determine if the existing programs and services are being considered and aligned.

Nebraska is requiring each district receiving a ESEA Section 1003(g) grant to have an Intervention Project Manager. The Intervention Project Manager will be a full- or part-time district employee (or contracted employee with the district) depending on the size and needs of the school. The position will be at the school level and will be a required expenditure for each district receiving a grant. The responsibilities of the Intervention Project Manager will include working with the school principal and district administrators to assist with coordinating implementation activities, conduct ongoing evaluation of progress, ensure appropriate collection and management of data for reporting progress on the goals established for student achievement and leading indicators, and coordinate and report progress to the NDE through monthly meetings.

Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively:

In Section 2 of the application, the school must conduct an Analysis of Need. One of the areas they must analyze is called Systems Profile. This area was included specifically to identify practices or policies within the district or school that may need to be modified in order to implement the selected intervention model. The list from the Analysis of Need is to be used to develop activities for the Action Plans for the selected intervention model.

Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends:

Reviewers of the applications should be able to determine the likelihood of the district and school being able to sustain the reforms from the timelines included in the Action Plans and the support provided by the district to help institutionalize the changes within the school(s). Nebraska intends to use progress on implementing the interventions (meeting the timelines) as one of the criteria for continued funding in years two and three.

PART C. CAPACITY

If a district does not apply for a Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant(SIG), the State assumes that it has analyzed the grant requirements and determined that it lacks the capacity to implement fully and effectively any one of the four intervention models. All districts with PLAS are invited to meetings held across the state plus multiple conference calls for technical assistance and responding to questions to ensure that districts understand the process for applying and the requirements of the SIG. If the State questions whether a district has more capacity than it claims, the State will conduct on-site or electronic interviews to determine capacity and provide technical assistance to the district to encourage it to apply for funds in the next round of funding assuming the school is still identified as being a PLAS.

If a district has more than one Tier I school and claims to lack the capacity to serve any Tier I school, it must respond to a specific question B.3 in the district section of the application. Each district having a Tier I, II or III school will be required to complete and submit a Letter of Intent. It is included in Appendix A of this application. The Letter of Intent will be preprinted with names of eligible schools and will be used to identify the districts that commit to apply for an ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant.

The district application will be evaluated based on evidence that might include the following factors that would contribute to capacity:

- a) Prior improvement efforts including successful implementation of programs or services (District question B.2.);
- b) Ability to bring together internal and external stakeholders in the planning process (District question B.9.) and as evidenced in the Action Plans, including parents/community/teachers union, etc.;
- c) District level support of both staff and resources to support implementation efforts (District question B. 1) and as evidenced through district staff involvement in the School Level Analysis of Need and Action Plans;
- d) District plans to sustain intervention after the funding period is over (District question B. 7.); and
- e) Number of schools included in the application.

PART D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

- (1) Assuming that Nebraska's application is approved by May 1, 2010, this would be the timeline.
 - a. May 1, 2010 Application forms sent to all eligible districts
 - b. May 15, 2010 Intent to Apply letters from districts are due (or two weeks after notice)
 - c. May 22, 2010 Application Writing conference – mandatory for all districts intending to apply (or three weeks after notice)
 - d. June 24 , 2010 District Application due
 - e. July 8, 2010 State Board Approval

- (2) The purpose of these funds is to raise substantially the achievement of students in the persistently lowest-achieving schools so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. The grant also requires progress on new leading

indicators. The application requires districts to establish goals for both. The analysis of needs is designed to assist districts in establishing goals.

The analysis of needs requires the use of the Profile from the State of the Schools Report. The Profile is a feature that includes results of all of the State’s assessments and AYP results in one report. The analysis of needs also requires districts to report base-line data on the leading indicators for each school for the components for which data is currently available and defined.

The establishment of goals for raising student achievement in Reading and Math during the 3-year availability of these funds is complicated by the fact that the State is transitioning from locally developed classroom-based assessments to a single Statewide test starting in the Spring of 2010. The existing State AYP goals for the percent of students at the proficient level will change in the summer of 2010 with the first operational test of NeSA-Reading and NeSA-Alternate Assessment Reading. Nebraska will be setting new State AYP goals based on the standard setting process in June and July, 2010 for Reading and a similar process and timeline for Math in 2011.

Districts applying for ESEA Section 1003(g) funds will need to amend their applications to submit goals for increasing the student performance in Reading after baseline data is established for each school and group using NeSA-R and NeSA-AAR. Amendments will be due by October 1, 2010. Districts will establish goals for Math for the 2010-11 school year using existing assessment results.

The State will annually determine whether a school is making progress on meeting the goals established by the district for all schools receiving these funds. NDE expects the district consider the state’s goals, listed below, when setting its own rigorous goals.

- Student Achievement in Reading – goals that are established for the “all students” group and each group and submitted by October 2010 using the results of the new Statewide assessment in Reading (NeSA-R and NeSA-AAR) as baseline. Progress on these goals will be available by Spring 2011. The goals for demonstrating progress should be as much as the Statewide average gain for the “all students” group and for each group. Progress will be made if the majority of the groups meet or exceed the statewide average gain for that group unless the statewide average is less than zero in which case, the gain should be at least zero.

- Student Achievement in Math - The goals for demonstrating progress should be as much as the Statewide average gain for the “all students” group and for each group. Progress will be made if the majority of the groups meet or exceed the statewide average gain for that group unless the statewide average is less than zero in which case, the gain should be at least zero.

Statewide Average Gain – Math (2008-09 AYP Data)	
Group	Percentage points
All Students	1.37
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.80

Asian or Pacific Islander	-.01
White, Not Hispanic	1.26
Black, Not Hispanic	3.39
Hispanic	1.49
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	2.03
Special Education Students	3.12
English Language Learners	2.33

- Transition to NeSA. As the State transitions to the new statewide tests, the goals for progress in Reading and Math will need to transition also since it will take two years of data to determine an average statewide gain for subgroups. Reading will not have an average statewide gain for each subgroup in 2009-10. The goal for each subgroup will be to meet or exceed the statewide average percent proficient for that subgroup. In 2010-11, the average statewide gain for each subgroup will be available for NeSA-R. Math will not have an average statewide gain for each subgroup in 2010-11. The goal for each subgroup will be to meet or exceed the statewide average percent proficient for that subgroup. In 2011-12, the average statewide gain for each subgroup will be available for NeSA-M.
- Student Achievement as indicated by an improvement in a school's AYP status as shown by the Reading and Math goals above or by having more "MET" AYP decisions than the previous year.
- Student Achievement for secondary schools will be a measurable increase on an annual basis in the graduation rate and the college enrollment rates.
- Where applicable, student achievement in increasing the percentage of limited English proficient students will be an annual increase in the percent of students taking the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) that perform at Levels 4 and 5.
- The school must show an annual measurable improvement from the baseline data on the leading indicators which includes dropout rate, student attendance, the number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (high school only), discipline incidents, and truancy. Starting with the 2010-11 data, an annual measurable improvement on teacher attendance rates and the teacher performance on the district's evaluation.

In addition, the NDE will annually consider the progress the school is making on meeting the timelines in implementing their Action Plans and the timely use of Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant funds when determining if a school should receive continued funding.

- (3) To provide ongoing coordination and monitoring of the implementation of the Action Plans, each school must have an Intervention Project Manager. The Intervention Project Manager will be a full- or part-time district employee (or contracted employee with the district) depending on the size and needs of the school. The position will be at the school level and will be a required expenditure for each school receiving a grant. The responsibilities of the Intervention Project Manager include working with the school principal and district administrators to assist with coordinating implementation activities, conducting ongoing evaluation of progress, ensuring appropriate collection and management of data for reporting progress on the goals established for student achievement and leading indicators, and coordinating and reporting progress to the NDE through monthly meetings.

NDE will use some of the 5% reservation to employ an additional staff person for the Title I Office. One of the responsibilities of this person will be to develop a monitoring checklist of all requirements and guide and to conduct a compliance visit in every school receiving a ESEA Section 1003(g) grant at least once in each year of the grant funding. The on-site monitoring shall include a review of the progress in implementing the Action Plans for the intervention model. In addition, special compliance monitoring may be conducted for recipients of these funds if progress on goals and implementation is not on schedule as proposed. The NDE SIG Director will have monthly meetings with the Intervention Project Manager of each PLAS to monitor progress and identify and coordinate technical assistance as needed.

The district application approval process, described in Part B of this application, defines the process for approving the applications of individual schools. This means a district application may have multiple school applications and only some of the school applications will be recommended for funding. Given the amount of funds available for Nebraska and the number of schools that are eligible, it is likely that there will be insufficient funds for all Tier I and II schools.

- (5) When the State has determined that all eligible Tier I and Tier II schools that have the capacity and have applied are funded, the State will consider applications from districts for Tier III schools. The State will give highest priority to applications for Tier III schools that:
- a. Propose to amend their Accountability Plan (improvement plan and application for Section 1003(a) funds) to implement one of the four intervention models,
 - b. Clearly demonstrate how additional Section 1003(g) funds will help them implement the school improvement activities that were approved in their Accountability Plans, or
 - c. Have been identified as being in school improvement for the most number of years.
- (6) The State does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools.
- (7) The State does not intend to provide direct services to any Tier I or Tier II schools.

PART E. ASSURANCES

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

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

- X Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- X Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.
- X Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with 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).
- X 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.
- X Monitor each LEA's implementation of the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- X 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.
- X Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; amount of the grant; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- X Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

PART F. RESERVATIONS

The funds reserved for administration, evaluation and technical assistance will be used annually for:

- a) Supporting an annual networking conference of schools receiving these grants to highlight and share successful activities and to jointly problem solve common issues and concerns. (\$20,000)
- b) Monthly training and coordination meetings with the Intervention Project Managers (\$20,000)
- c) Providing an Intervention Project Manager within the Title I Office in the Nebraska Department of Education (\$100,000 annually for salaries, benefits, travel, etc.)
- d) School Intervention Specialists will be contracted to provide specific technical assistance as identified by the PLAS. The initial School Intervention Specialist will work with all PLAS that receive a SIG to provide assistance with the requirement to have and implement teacher evaluation systems that include student achievement outcomes. A survey conducted of all districts for SFSF reporting found that none of the districts with PLAS could already meet this

requirement. School Intervention Specialists will be assigned to each PLAS to identify specific needs and coordinate or provide the assistance. (\$80,000)

- e) Annual evaluation (contracted) of the implementation process in all schools (\$50,000)

PART G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

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

Nebraska’s definition of and process for identifying persistently lowest-achieving schools was reviewed with the Committee of Practitioners on January 25, 2010. The Committee also discussed all of the major components of the ESEA Section 1003(g) state and district applications including goals and reporting requirements. The requirements and components of this application were also reviewed with the Committee of Practitioners on March 16, 2010.

PART H. WAIVERS

1. Waivers For Extending Availability of Funds, Schoolwide Projects and AYP Status

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

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

- X Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- X Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.
- X Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a 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.

Public notice of the requests for these waivers and a request for comments was distributed through the NDE Bulletin (weekly) that is sent to all Nebraska Superintendents, ESU Administrators and Title I Program Directors. These waivers were posted for 10 days on the NDE ARRA website at: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School_Improvement_Grants.html. No comments were received.

2. Waiver for Use of Minimum Number for PLAS Identification

Nebraska is requesting a waiver of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” contained in section I.A.3 of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program (74 FR 65618 (Dec. 10, 2009)) and the use of that definition in section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those final requirements, as amended (75 FR 3375 (Dec. 21, 2010)). Specifically, Nebraska requests permission to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed [who were enrolled in the school for a full academic year as that term is defined in Nebraska’s Accountability Workbook] is less than 30. Nebraska has used the minimum group size of 30 for making AYP decisions based on the advice of the Buros Center for Testing at the University of Nebraska and also because the NCES (National Center for Educational Statistics) use of 30 as an appropriate minimum group size. In sum, Nebraska needs this waiver in order to ensure that the identification of a school is both valid and reliable based on a minimum number of students and does not reveal personally identifiable information about individual students in the school.

Nebraska believes that this waiver will ensure the validity and reliability of Nebraska’s identification of schools as well as protect the privacy of individual students in very small schools. For Nebraska’s identified Tier I and Tier II schools, the SIG program will improve the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students. Specifically, implementing one of the four school intervention models in our Tier I and Tier II schools will help us turn around our State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools in order to improve instruction and raise student achievement substantially in those schools. By identifying schools below the “minimum n” as Tier III schools, Nebraska will enable its LEAs to serve, as appropriate, these schools with SIG funds.

Nebraska assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” Nebraska will submit (when the USDE has approved the definition of PLAS), and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier

that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. Nebraska will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, Nebraska will include, in its list of Tier III schools, any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools, so that LEAs may choose to serve those schools with SIG funds consistent with the final requirements.

Nebraska assures that it provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a SIG grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on this request and has attached a copy of that notice. To expedite its waiver request, Nebraska will submit subsequently copies of any comments it receives from LEAs. Nebraska 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.

NOTE: Nebraska received approval of this waiver request on March 26, 2010.

The following schools were added to Tier III as a result of this waiver.

Brady Public Schools, Brady High School
Morrill Public Schools, Morrill High School
Loup City Public Schools, Loup City High School
St. Edward Public Schools, St. Edward High School
Shelby Public Schools, Shelby High School
Leyton Public Schools, Leyton High School
Banner County Public Schools, Banner County High School
Hay Springs Public Schools, Hay Springs High School

3. Waiver for Graduation Rate for PLAS Identification

Nebraska requests a waiver under Section 9401 of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) for one of the criteria used for identifying schools as persistently lowest-achieving schools as defined for the State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (SFSF), the School Improvement Grants under Section 1003(g) of the ESEA, and the Race To The Top Grants and used for the identification of Tier I and Tier II schools in the School Improvement Grants. The definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools in the above guidance includes “a high school that has a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60% over a number of years”. Nebraska is requesting to extend this definition to also include high schools that have a graduation rate of less than 75% over a number of years.

Although Nebraska will have graduation rates as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) as required by 2010-11, that data is not available now when the persistently lowest-achieving schools must be identified for the applications for the above listed grants. The only graduation rate data available now at the building level uses a variation of the NCES formula that was approved to use for AYP calculations. That formula adds English Language Learners who complete with a regular diploma in 5 years, and students with disabilities who complete in high school with a regular diploma in their 5th, 6th or 7th year. This AYP formula produces higher graduation rates than the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 34 CFR 200.19(b) will in 2010-11.

By including the high schools that have a graduation rate of less than 75% over a period of time in the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools, Nebraska anticipates being able to provide Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants.

NOTE: Nebraska received approval of this waiver request on March 26, 2010.

The following high schools were added to Tier II as a result of this waiver:

- Omaha Public Schools, Benson Magnet
- Omaha Public Schools, Omaha North
- Omaha Public Schools, Central High
- Winnebago Public Schools, Winnebago High School

Appendix A.

**1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Intent to Apply
Due to NDE Title I Office by _____**

District Name: (Pre-printed) _____ Co. Dist. No. (Pre-printed) _____

Only schools that have been identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools (PLAS) are eligible to apply for the ESEA Section 1003(g) funds. Nebraska's definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools is as follows:

Tier I Schools means the five (5) lowest-achieving Title I schools identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring plus any Title I served secondary school with a graduation rate of less than 75% over the three latest years that was not captured in the above five schools.

Tier II Schools shall mean the 15 (which is equal to 5%) lowest ranked secondary schools where the “all students” group meets the minimum n-size for AYP that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds plus any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that has a graduation rate of less than 75% over the three latest years and was not captured in the above 15 schools.

Tier III Schools means any Title I school identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I School and any school that is ranked as low as the Tier I and Tier II schools but has no groups of at least 30 students.

Tier I and Tier II Schools must adopt one of the four approved models as outlined in the 1003(g) School Improvement Guidance – Turnaround, restart, school closure, or transformation model. Tier III Schools may adopt one of the four models **or** may use funds to support, expand, continue, or complete the plan approved in the Title I Accountability application. Funds for Tier III Schools will be awarded only after all Tier I and Tier II schools that are eligible, and have the capacity, receive funds.

Tier I Schools Eligible for 1003(g) SIG funds:

School Name will be pre-printed here.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will NOT apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.

School Name will be pre-printed here.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will NOT apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.

Tier II Schools Eligible for 1003(g) SIG funds:

School Name will be pre-printed here.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will NOT apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.

School Name will be pre-printed here.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will NOT apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.

Tier III Schools Eligible for 1003(g) SIG funds:

School Name will be pre-printed here.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will NOT apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.

School Name will be pre-printed here.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.
<input type="checkbox"/> Our District will NOT apply for SIG funds for the school listed above.

Printed Name of Authorized Representative

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

This Letter of Intent must be submitted to the NDE Title I office by _____ by emailing to diane.stuehmer@nebraska.gov or faxing to 402-471-0117 (Attention to Diane Stuehmer).

Appendix B.

Waiver Requests for Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

The following waivers and requests for comments were posted for 10 days on the NDE homepage at http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School_Improvement_Grants.html No comments were received within the time allotted for public response.

Title I Waivers for School Improvement Grants

NDE is applying for waivers from the U. S. Department of Education to 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 application process requires public notice and an opportunity for members of the public to comment. Comments may be made on one or all three proposed waivers. A summary of the waivers that NDE will be requesting are listed below. The USDE Guidance on School Improvement Grants and the ARRA School Improvement Grant Application can be found at the following link: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School_Improvement_Grants.html

Comments are encouraged and should be submitted via email to Randy.McIntyre@nebraska.gov by 5:00 p.m. (Central) on January 25, 2010.

NDE 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 persistently lowest-achieving 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 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 school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

Any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section I.A.7 of the final requirements.

An LEA will be allowed 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 waivers(s) in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

Waiver for Use of Minimum Number for PLAS Identification

NDE is applying for a waiver of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” contained in section I.A.3 of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program (74 FR 65618 (Dec. 10, 2009)) and the use of that definition in section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those final requirements, as amended (75 FR 3375 (Dec. 21, 2010)). **Specifically, NDE is requesting permission for Nebraska to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed [who were enrolled in the school for a full academic year as that term is defined in Nebraska’s Accountability Workbook] is less than 30.** NDE believes this waiver is needed in order to ensure that the identification of a school is both valid and reliable based on a minimum number of students and does not reveal personally identifiable information about individual students in the school. The application process requires public notice and an opportunity for members of the public to comment. The USDE Guidance on School Improvement Grants and the ARRA School Improvement Grant Application can be found at the following link: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School_Improvement_Grants.html

Comments are encouraged and should be submitted via email to Randy.McIntyre@nebraska.gov by 5:00 p.m. (Central) on February 22, 2010.

NDE believes this waiver will ensure the validity and reliability of Nebraska’s identification of schools as well as protect the privacy of individual students in very small schools. For Nebraska’s identified Tier I and Tier II schools, the SIG program will improve the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students. Specifically, implementing one of the four school intervention models in our Tier I and Tier II schools will help us turn around our Nebraska’s persistently lowest-achieving schools in order to improve instruction and raise student achievement substantially in those schools. By identifying schools below the “minimum n” as Tier III schools, Nebraska will enable its LEAs to serve, as appropriate, these schools with SIG funds.

Nebraska assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” Nebraska will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. Nebraska will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, Nebraska will include, in its list of Tier III schools, any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools, so that LEAs may choose to serve those schools with SIG funds consistent with the final requirements.

NOTE: Nebraska received approval of this request.

Appendix C.

Sample School Profile from the State of the Schools Report

School Profile

2008 - 2009

School Characteristics			
School Data	State Statistics	District Statistics	School Statistics
Poverty Percentage	38.35%	39.73%	52.73%
English Language Learners Percentage	6.31%	7.73%	10.96%
School Mobility Rate	12.02%	15.45%	28.29%

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Reading	
Grades	12
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	86.93%
Special Education Students	69.05%
English Language Learners	53.57%
Gender	
Male	84.51%
Female	88.57%
Race / Ethnicity	
American Indian / Alaska Native	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	75.00%
White, Not Hispanic	90.83%
Black, Not Hispanic	84.21%
Hispanic	77.14%
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	80.52%
Migrants	*

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Mathematics	
Grades	12
All Students (including ELL and Special Education)	77.05%
Special Education Students	55.00%
English Language Learners	60.00%
Gender	
Male	76.99%
Female	77.09%
Race / Ethnicity	
American Indian / Alaska Native	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	100.00%
White, Not Hispanic	76.77%
Black, Not Hispanic	69.05%
Hispanic	80.00%
Free / Reduced Priced Meals	65.22%

<u>Migrants</u>	*
-----------------	---

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Science			
Grades	10	11	12
<u>All Students (including ELL and Special Education)</u>	70.66%	71.99%	81.14%
<u>Special Education Students</u>	32.35%	44.19%	71.43%
<u>English Language Learners</u>	25.00%	63.64%	50.00%
Gender			
<u>Male</u>	73.30%	75.38%	85.26%
<u>Female</u>	68.00%	69.08%	78.20%
Race / Ethnicity			
<u>American Indian / Alaska Native</u>	*	*	*
<u>Asian or Pacific Islander</u>	69.23%	93.33%	93.33%
<u>White, Not Hispanic</u>	77.87%	79.55%	85.16%
<u>Black, Not Hispanic</u>	42.55%	52.54%	73.33%
<u>Hispanic</u>	62.96%	57.69%	56.52%
<u>Free / Reduced Priced Meals</u>	50.00%	62.59%	69.41%
<u>Migrants</u>	*	*	*

Percentage of Students Meeting Standards - Writing	
	11
<u>All Students (including ELL and Special Education)</u>	76.18%
<u>Special Education Students</u>	48.89%
<u>English Language Learners</u>	57.50%
Gender	
<u>Male</u>	69.87%
<u>Female</u>	82.21%
Race / Ethnicity	
<u>American Indian / Alaska Native</u>	*
<u>Asian or Pacific Islander</u>	85.71%
<u>White, Not Hispanic</u>	78.02%
<u>Black, Not Hispanic</u>	66.18%
<u>Hispanic</u>	80.56%
<u>Free / Reduced Priced Meals</u>	69.64%
<u>Migrants</u>	*

- * Data was masked to protect the identity of students using one of the following criteria:
- 1) Fewer than 10 students were reported in the grade or standard.
 - 2) All students were reported in a single performance category.

SECTION 2 DISTRICT APPLICATIONS

NOTE: This application contains Action Plans and Budgets for each intervention model. A district would only submit the Action Plans and Budgets for the model(s) proposed for their school(s).

District applications are a WORD file with an EXCEL file for the budget forms.

ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants (SIG)

District Name: _____

County-District Number: _____

Introduction

School Improvement Grants, authorized under Section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEA = Nebraska Department of Education or NDE), to local educational agencies (LEA = districts) for use in eligible schools that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students. Under the final requirements, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January 2010, these school improvement funds are to be used to implement identified Intervention Models in the persistently lowest-achieving schools identified as:

Tier I Schools means the five (5) lowest-achieving Title I schools identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring plus any Title I served secondary school with a graduation rate of less than 75% over the three latest years that was not captured in the above five schools.

Tier II Schools shall mean the 15 (which is equal to 5%) lowest ranked secondary schools where the “all students” group meets the minimum n-size for AYP that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds plus any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that has a graduation rate of less than 75% over the three latest years and was not captured in the above 15 schools.

Tier III Schools means any Title I school identified to be in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I School and any school that is ranked as low as the Tier I and Tier II schools but has no groups of at least 30 students.

The procedure used to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools, including the definitions used, is found in Appendix A of this application.

If a district has a Tier I school, it must apply to serve that school or explain how it lacks the capacity to serve it. If a district has a Tier I and Tier II school(s), it may elect to serve schools in both Tiers, but if it elects to serve only the Tier II school(s) and not the Tier I school(s), it must explain how it lacks the capacity to serve the Tier I school(s). If a district has Tier I and Tier III schools, it may not elect to serve only Tier III schools. Districts may submit applications that contain Tier III schools but all Tier I and Tier II schools in the state must be served, or demonstrate that districts lack the capacity to serve them, prior to any Tier III school being approved for funds.

Nebraska has received a waiver from section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA. This waiver allows 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. Nebraska has also received a waiver of the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit Title I schools to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

To ensure commitment and support, the Cover Page of the district application must be signed by the President of the School Board and the Superintendent or Authorized Representative.

The guidance from the U. S. Department of Education for ESEA Section 1003(g) grants provides the information needed for understanding the requirements, the four intervention models and should be studied prior to completing this application. The guidance is on NDE’s American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and the Title I homepage at:

http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School_Improvement_Grants.html or
<http://www.nde.state.ne.us/federalprograms/titlei/index.htm>.

All district applications that are approved will be posted at the above cited locations within 30 days of being approved. Additional information on the ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants is also available on the U. S. Department of Education website at:

<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>.

Use of Funds

In the Tier I and Tier II schools a district chooses to serve, the district must use these funds to implement one of these four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. Section 2 of this application contains the description of the four intervention models taken from the U. S. Department of Education. This description identifies all the requirements to be implemented and some permissible activities for each of the four models. These are the only activities that can be funded with the ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants in Tier I and Tier II schools. Tier III schools that are Title I schools currently identified to be in school improvement, corrective action or restructuring can apply to use ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to implement one of these models or for other school improvement activities designed to support, expand, continue or complete school improvement activities approved in the school’s Title I Accountability Funds application. Tier III schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds can apply for these funds to implement a variation of the Transformation intervention model. This variation of the Transformation model allows, but does not require, a school to replace the principal or the staff (Sections A and C of part (1)(i) of the model as defined in this application. This is also indicated on the Action Plans.

Districts must demonstrate capacity to implement the selected intervention model in the first year and fully implement within the three years of funding of these grants.

In addition to the requirements of each intervention model, Nebraska is requiring each school receiving ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to have a full-or part-time Intervention Project Manager. The intervention models are designed to turnaround a school and the requirements are numerous and specific. A school making a commitment to take on the major changes involved must have a person devoted solely to managing and coordinating the process. The Intervention Project Manager must be experienced and qualified to lead the effort and must be an employee of the district or on contract to the district. The responsibilities of this person include: working with the school principal and district administrators to

assisting with coordinating implementation activities, conducting ongoing evaluations of progress, ensuring appropriate collection and management of data for reporting progress on the goals established for student achievement and leading indicators, and coordinating and report progress to the NDE. The costs of the Intervention Project Manager are to be included on the budgets for each school.

Available Funds

For the three year grants that begin in 2010-11, Nebraska received \$14,753,171 from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and \$2,684,135 from ESEA for these Section 1003(g) funds. The ARRA funds are a one-time allocation to the State. Depending on future appropriations from Congress, the State should continue to receive similar ESEA amounts in future years. Both the ARRA and ESEA funds available now must follow the requirements of this application which includes a waiver for use over three years – 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2012-13. Districts receiving ARRA funds must complete all reporting requirements of that Act.

A district may apply for the amount of funds needed to fully and effectively implement one of the four intervention models in a Tier I or Tier II school not to exceed two (2) million dollars a year for three years per school. There is a minimum of \$50,000 per year per school that can be awarded to the Districts from the State. Applications must contain a budget for each of the three years identifying the costs of implementing an intervention model in each school. The NDE will award grants based on the proposals by school(s) within a district. This means a district could apply for funds for more than one school but may not be funded for all the schools included in the application. The amount requested may also be reduced based on funds availability. Districts with Tier III schools can apply for the same or a lesser amount of funds per school. However, the State cannot award a grant to a district for a Tier III school unless and until all Tier I and Tier II schools in the State, that are eligible and have the capacity, receive funds.

Continued Funding

While the application will be approved for the full three years, it must be reviewed and approved for continued funding each year. There are three considerations for approval for continued funding in years two and three that will be applied on a school level basis: (1) demonstrating progress in student achievement and leading indicators, (2) being on target, or close to, meeting the timelines identified in the Action Plans and (3) spending the approved funds in a timely fashion. Each year's budget must reflect the amount of funds needed in that year. Budget forms are found in a separate EXCEL file at: http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School_Improvement_Grants.html or <http://www.nde.state.ne.us/federalprograms/titlei/index.htm>.

Supplement, not supplant

ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Funds are supplemental funds (see page 29 of USDE guidance) and as such must be in addition to the regular state and local funding provided to the school. Schools that are not currently Title I schoolwide projects must become a schoolwide project in order to implement one of the intervention models. A waiver that allows this is included in the application. The waiver also allows the planning for this application to replace the required year of planning for a schoolwide project.

Letter of Intent to Apply

After notification of eligibility for an ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant, a district must submit the Intent to Apply letter by May 15, 2010 notifying the Title I Office whether or not it will apply for every Tier I school or for a grant for a Tier II or Tier III school(s). The Intent to Apply letter must identify the school(s) the district intends to serve with the SIG funds. Letters of Intent must be signed by the authorized representative and submitted to Diane Stuehmer, Title I Director, electronically at diane.stuehmer@nebraska.gov or faxed to 402-471-0117.

Application Writing Assistance

NDE will provide a one-day application writing conference. The date and location will be announced once the Letters of Intent are all submitted. All districts that intend to apply must attend this workshop.

Districts are encouraged to review the Reviewers Rating and Checklist designed for application reviewers to ensure that all components are addressed. The Reviewers Rating and Checklist is found in Appendix B of this application.

Application Approval Process

Nebraska will convene a panel of district and NDE staff with experience and expertise in Title I and school improvement activities to review all applications. Each application will be reviewed and rated by two panelists. The scoring checklist is included as an appendix to the district application. Each school's application will be reviewed and rated individually. Districts may submit an application that includes more than one school and may include schools from any or all of the three Tiers. To ensure that the schools with the highest need are selected, the following process will be used to determine the applications to recommend to the State Board of Education for approval.

After the panel has reviewed and rated all applications, the score from Section 1 District information will be added to the score received by the school for Section 2 School Information for a "total score". For applications containing multiple schools, the district's score will be added to the score of each school for a "total score" for each school. The schools will be rank ordered by the total scores. The highest ranking Tier I and Tier II schools will determine the finalists, considering the amount of funds requested and the amount of funds available. NDE reserves the right to adjust budget requests, if needed, to increase the number of finalists or to ensure more equitable distribution relative to size of school or geographic location.

Schools that are finalists must participate in a team interview with NDE staff either on-site or via polycom. This interview is an opportunity for NDE staff to validate application responses and evaluate school staff commitment and capacity before making the recommendations for final approval.

Applications Timelines

Applications are due by midnight (Central Daylight Savings Time) on June 24, 2010 and should be submitted electronically to: diane.stuehmer@nebraska.gov. In addition, the district must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the district's authorized representative and the president of the school board to the address listed below.

Diane Stuehmer, Title I Director
Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South

PO BOX 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509

Application Contents

The ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant application consists of

- Introduction
- Cover Page
- Section 1 – District Level Information
- Section 2 – School Level Information
- Appendix A – Definition of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools
- Appendix B – Checklist for Reviewers
- Appendix C – Sample Budget Forms. The link to all Budget Forms is found at:
http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School_Improvement_Grants.html or
<http://www.nde.state.ne.us/federalprograms/titlei/index.htm>.

A completed application includes:

- A cover page signed by the president of the school board and the authorized representative of the district.
- Section 1. District Information
- Section 2. School Information (A Section 2 completed for each school in the application)
- Budget pages (EXCEL spreadsheet) for each school for each year of the grant
- A copy of each school's Profiles from the State of the Schools Report for 2007-08 and 2008-09.

ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

District Name:	District Mailing Address:
County/District Number:	
District Contact for the School Improvement Grant	
Name:	
Position and Office:	
Contact's Mailing Address:	
Telephone:	
Fax:	
Email address:	
President of the School Board (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the President of the School Board X _____	Date:
Authorized Representative of the District (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the Authorized Representative: X _____	Date:
The district, 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 district receives through this application.	

SECTION 1. DISTRICT INFORMATION

PART A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

A. 1. Complete the information in the table for each school in the district included in this application. From the eligibility letter, identify whether each school is in Tier I, II or III. **When Section 2 of this application is completed, indicate the intervention model to be implemented for each Tier I and Tier II school. Add rows as needed.**

School Name	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Intervention Model (Tier I and Tier II Only)			
				Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation

A.2. If the district has determined that a Tier I or Tier II school has implemented, in whole or in part, one of the intervention models within the last two years, the district must list that school here. Districts must also complete the Action Plans and Budgets required in Part B of this application to provide evidence to demonstrate that this school has met, or is in the process of meeting, each of the requirements of that model and will have the model fully implemented within the period of availability of these funds.

PART B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION DISTRICT LEVEL

Analysis of Need and Capacity

ESEA Section 1003(g) requires an analysis of need at the district level and a determination of district's capacity to provide support to use these funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II School in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected. Districts are encouraged to look at existing sources of information while conducting the Analysis of Need for each school and the district. These might include profiles developed through a North Central/AdvancED Accreditation or Rule 10 Continuous Improvement accreditation process, Title I Accountability plan development, schoolwide plans, or other improvement processes or plans.

The district must design and implement intervention activities consistent with the final requirements of the models for all Tier I and Tier II schools. ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant funds can only be used to implement one of four intervention models in any Tier I or Tier II school. Each intervention model has specific requirements that must be implemented. In Section 2 Descriptive Information School Level, Action Plans and Budget forms have been designed to ensure that all the requirements of the model selected are addressed for Tier I and Tier II schools. Action Plans and Budget forms have also been designed for Tier III schools. Section 2 of this application must be completed for each school.

- B.1. Describe the district's contribution to assist schools in their analysis of need and selection of an intervention model. A district may request funds for district level support of the efforts of their schools in implementing one of the intervention models. Requests for these funds must be included in a district level budget (Part C) and are considered part of the limitations on funding (\$50,000 to \$2,000,000 per school per year). The description should clearly indicate how district contributions and support are separate and distinct from the school's efforts and activities.
- B.2. Describe factors that indicate the district has the capacity to use the school improvement funds to support each Tier I and Tier II school identified for intervention. Such factors must include: sufficient human and fiscal resources, past history of successful reform initiatives, credentials of staff, ability to recruit and employ a new principal and new teachers, support of parents, community and the teachers union.
- B.3. If the district is not applying to serve each Tier I school in the district, provide an explanation as to why it lacks the capacity to do so. Lack of capacity must address the same factors listed above: sufficient human and fiscal resources, past history of successful reform initiatives, credentials of staff, ability to recruit and employ a new principal and new teachers, support of parents, community and the teachers union. A district with both Tier I and Tier III schools may not elect to serve only Tier III schools.
- B.4. ESEA Section 1003(g) funds are intended to turn around a low-performing school. Major changes required in such a turn around may require external assistance from a person(s) or a company(s). External assistance might be desirable to assist with specific activities to meet the requirements of the intervention model selected. If a district elects to have an external provider, the district must identify the provider(s) by name or company; the reasons or rationale for selecting this provider; the specific services to be provided; the reasons for selecting this particular provider; the specific services to be provided; the qualifications, including expertise and experience of the provider; and the procurement method used for securing and selecting the provider(s). Note: The Intervention Project Manager is not considered an external provider since he/she must be an employee of or on contract with the district and work full- or part-time in the school.
- B.5. Since each Tier I or Tier II school receiving ESEA Section 1003(g) funds will be a schoolwide project, all programs and services provided in the school should be aligned to the selected intervention model. The school level Analysis of Need section of this application should involve staff from the various programs and services in the school. Describe the steps the district will take to ensure that other programs and resources are aligned to support the school in implementing an intervention model. Identify the specific programs and sources of funds.
- B.6. If the selected intervention model includes increasing school time, changing governance at the school level, etc., the district may need to modify existing practices or policies to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. Describe the steps the district will take, if necessary, to modify policies and practices.
- B.7. Describe the steps the district is prepared to take to sustain the intervention model(s) in the selected school(s) after the ESEA Section 1003(g) funds are no longer available. The response might include how the district will institutionalize changes made to meet requirements, adopt

changes throughout other schools, or support the school or school(s) throughout the process to fully implement the selected intervention model(s).

- B.8. The district must establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both Reading and Mathematics and the leading indicators in order to monitor schools that receive these school improvement funds. The chart below provides the minimum goal for each student achievement and leading indicator. The district may decide to accept these minimum goals or set higher goals. If Tier III schools are included in this application, the district will be held accountable for meeting the annual measurable goals established in the Title I Accountability Plan for Section 1003(a) funds or these goals if using the variation of the Transformation model.

NOTE: Districts applying for ESEA Section 1003(g) funds will need to submit goals for increasing the student performance in Reading by October of 2010 after baseline data is established for each school and group using NeSA-R (Reading) and NeSA-AAR (alternate assessment Reading). Districts will establish goals for Math for the 2010-11 school year using existing assessment results. The statewide averages for Math gains are provided below the Goals chart.

Transition to NeSA. As the State transitions to the new statewide tests, the goals will progress in Reading and Math will need to transition also since it will take two years of data to determine an average statewide gain for subgroups. Reading will not have an average statewide gain for each subgroup in 2009-10. The goal for each subgroup will be to meet or exceed the statewide average percent proficient for that subgroup. In 2010-11, the average statewide gain for each subgroup will be available for NeSA-R. Math will not have an average statewide gain for each subgroup in 2010-11. The goal for each subgroup will be to meet or exceed the statewide average percent proficient for that subgroup. In 2011-12, the average statewide gain for each subgroup will be available for NeSA-M. If the district goal will be the same as the State goal, complete the district column with “Same”.

Area	State Goal	District Goal
Reading	The gains for “all students” group and for each subgroup must meet or exceed the statewide average gain (unless the statewide average is zero then the gain must be greater than zero). Progress is MET if a majority of the groups demonstrate an increase.	
Math	The gains for “all students” group and for each subgroup must meet or exceed the statewide average gain (unless the statewide average is zero then the gain must be greater than zero). Progress is MET if a majority of the groups demonstrate an increase.	

AYP Status (includes both Reading and Math)	Fewer NOT MET AYP decisions	
Graduation rate (high schools only)	Measurable increase from the previous year	
College enrollment rate (high schools only)	Measurable increase from the previous year	
English proficiency	Increase in percentage of English Language Learners that reach Levels 4 or 5 on ELDA (if applicable)	
Leading Indicators (includes dropout rate, student attendance, number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (high school only), discipline incidents, truancy)	Measurable improvement from previous year (or baseline for initial year of grant)	
Teacher attendance and teacher performance	Measurable improvement from previous year (or baseline data for initial year of grant)	

Statewide Average Gain – Math (2008-09 AYP Data)	
Group	Percentage points
All Students	1.37
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	-.01
White, Not Hispanic	1.26
Black, Not Hispanic	3.39
Hispanic	1.49
Students eligible for free and reduced lunch	2.03

Special Education Students	3.12
English Language Learners	2.33

B.9. Describe the process used by the district to assist its schools in developing this application. Include the district level staff, by position, that were involved in developing this application and who will be involved in supporting the implementation of the intervention models.

PART C. DISTRICT BUDGET

A district budget is needed only if the district is requesting funds for district support for the school(s) to assist in implementing one of the models as identified in question B.1. above. District costs are allowable but cannot cause the entire application to exceed the established funding limitations (\$50,000 to \$2,000,000) per school and must clearly be district level activities and necessary to assist the school(s) to implement one of the models.

C.1 Describe the proposed activities and how the activities will assist the school(s) to implement, fully and effectively, one of the intervention models within the time period of this grant.

C.2 Complete the District Budget (EXCEL Spreadsheet will contain all budget pages, for all three years, including a summary budget for the entire application. Appendix C contains a sample budget page for the district.) The link to all Budget Forms is found at:

http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School_Improvement_Grants.html or <http://www.nde.state.ne.us/federalprograms/titlei/index.htm>.

PART D. ASSURANCES

The district assures that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the district commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the NDE) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) 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
- (4) Report to the NDE the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

PART E. WAIVERS

Check each waiver that the district will implement.

- “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.

Section 2. SCHOOL LEVEL INFORMATION

Complete a Section 2 for each school included in the application.

PART A. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION SCHOOL LEVEL

Each school must conduct and complete the Analysis of Need (A.1.). That information should be used to select an intervention model. Action Plans (A.2.) and Budget forms are designed for each intervention model. Applicants should duplicate forms as needed and delete unnecessary forms before submitting.

School Level Information for Tier III Schools

- Tier III schools that are Title I schools in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring have the option to use these funds to support, expand, continue or complete the plan approved for the school's Title I Accountability funds under Section 1003(a). These schools must complete the Action Plan (A.3.).
- Tier III schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds can only apply to use these funds for a variation of the Transformation intervention model. The school must meet all of the requirements EXCEPT requirements A1 and C1. The Action Plans note this option for these Tier III schools.

In addition to the requirements of each intervention model, Nebraska is requiring each school receiving ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to have a full-or part-time Intervention Project Manager. The intervention models are designed to turnaround a school and the requirements are numerous and specific. A school making a commitment to take on the major changes involved must have a person devoted solely to managing and coordinating the process. The Intervention Project Manager must be experienced and qualified to lead the effort and must be an employee of the district or on contract to the district. The responsibilities of this person include: working with the school principal and district administrators to assisting with coordinating implementation activities, conducting ongoing evaluations of progress, ensuring appropriate collection and management of data for reporting progress on the goals established for student achievement and leading indicators, and coordinating and report progress to the NDE. The costs of the Intervention Project Manager are to be included on the budgets for each school.

Prior to completing the school Level Information, it is important to read the Guidance provided by the U. S. Department of Education. The guidance for ESEA Section 1003(g) grants provides the information needed for understanding the requirements, the four intervention models and is on NDE's American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and the Title I homepage at:

http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School_Improvement_Grants.html or
<http://www.nde.state.ne.us/federalprograms/titlei/index.htm>.

A.1. Analysis of Need

Information gained from a thorough analysis of need is used to identify the most appropriate intervention model and activities for each requirement. The analysis of need includes (a) Student Achievement and Leading Indicators; (b) Services/Programs Profile; (c) Staff Profile; (d)

Curriculum/Instructional Practices Profile; (e) System Profile; and (f) a description of the stakeholders involved and the process used. Schools are encouraged to use information on identified needs from other sources like data retreats, school improvement processes, schoolwide project plans, and plans developed for the Title I Accountability Funds application, if available.

Student Achievement and Leading Indicators

This analysis must include information on the following student achievement and leading indicators for each school included in the application. Annual reporting is required of each district receiving an ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grant on both. The data submitted in this application will be the baseline data for measuring progress in each of the three years of the grant.

The analysis of need for student achievement includes the Profile for each school from the Nebraska State of the Schools Report for 2007-08 and 2008-09. The Profile for each school for both years must be attached to this application. The State of the Schools Report is at:

<http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/Main/Home.aspx>

Complete the table below using 2008-09 data. Provide an explanation if any data is not available.

Reporting Metrics for the School Improvement Grants	
Student Achievement not captured on the Profile from the State of the Schools Report	
(1) Percentage of limited English proficient students (of all ELL students that were tested) who attained a Level 4 or 5 on the ELDA	
(2) Graduation rate (AYP graduation rate for high schools only)	
(3) College enrollment rate (high schools only)	
Leading Indicators	
(4) Number of minutes within the school year	
(5) Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework, early-college high schools or dual enrollment classes (high schools only)	
(6) Dropout rate (total for high schools only)	
(7) Student attendance rate	
(8) Discipline incidents (suspensions, expulsions as reported to NDE)	
(9) Truants (although this is a required Metric, districts do not need to report baseline data at this time)	
(10) Distribution of teachers by performance level on district's teacher evaluation system (will be collected in Spring 2011)	
(11) Teacher attendance rate (although this is a required Metric, districts do not need to report baseline data at this time)	

- (a) Student Achievement and Leading Indicators - List identified areas of need. Compare the identified areas of need to the intervention models and the required activities for each model. How will the intervention model selected help the school to meet the needs identified from the Student Achievement and Leading Indicators Profile? Provide an explanation for any missing data (excluding numbers 9 – 11).
- (b) Programs/Services Profile – This profile identifies programs/services that support academic achievement for struggling students and might include summer school, tutoring programs,

before and after school services; parent and family engagement; community partners, social workers, etc. List identified areas of need. Compare the identified areas of need to the intervention models and the required activities for each model. How will the intervention model selected help the school to meet the needs identified from the Programs/Services profile?

- (c) Staff Profile – An analysis of need might include a profile of teachers in the school (years of experience, education attained, etc.); professional development provided; teacher evaluation system; etc. List identified areas of need. Compare the identified areas of need to the intervention models and the required activities for each model. How will the intervention model selected help the school to meet the needs identified from the Staff Profile?
- (d) Curriculum/Instructional Practices Profile – An analysis of instructional practices might include alignment of curriculum to new content standards; vertical alignment of instructional approaches; use of formative and summative assessment data to inform instruction; differentiated curriculum, etc. List identified areas of need. Compare the identified areas of need to the intervention models and the required activities for each model. How will the intervention model selected help the school to meet the needs identified in the Instructional Practices Profile?
- (e) System Profile – Indicators of system support might include alignment of school improvement efforts and plans (NCA, Rule 10, Accountability Grants, Schoolwide Plans, etc.); extending the length of instructional time, school day, etc.; governance flexibility at the school level; etc. List identified areas of need. Compare the identified areas of need to the intervention models and the required activities for each model. How will the intervention model selected help the school to meet the needs identified in the System Profile?
- (f) Describe the process used, the participants involved, and the involvement of stakeholders in analyzing the needs of this school and selecting the intervention model.

A.2. Action Plans

When the analysis of need is completed, the school must select one of the four intervention models, based on the identified needs, and develop plans to implement the model, fully and effectively, within the three years of this grant. It is critical to read and understand the requirements of each model before making this decision. The guidance from the U. S. Department of Education provides information, explanations, and the definitions of the four models provided below.

Four School Intervention Models (from USDE Guidance)

(a) *Turnaround model:*

(1) *A turnaround model is one in which a district must--*

- (i) *Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;*
- (ii) *Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,*

- (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and
 - (B) Select new staff;
 - (iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
 - (iv) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
 - (v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
 - (vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
 - (vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
 - (viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
 - (ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.
- (2) A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as--
- (i) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or
 - (ii) A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).

(b) Restart model: A restart model is one in which a district converts a 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. (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.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

(c) School closure: School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

(d) Transformation model: A transformation model is one in which an LEA implements each of the following strategies:

(1) Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.

- (i) Required activities. The LEA must--
 - (A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
 - (B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--

- (1) *Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; and*
 - (2) *Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;*
 - (C) *Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;*
 - (D) *Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and*
 - (E) *Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.*
- (ii) Permissible activities. *An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness, such as--*
- (A) *Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;*
 - (B) *Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or*
 - (C) *Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.*

(2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.

(i) Required activities. *The LEA must--*

- (A) *Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and*
- (B) *Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.*

(ii) Permissible activities. *An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--*

- (A) *Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;*
- (B) *Implementing a schoolwide "response-to-intervention" model;*
- (C) *Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;*
- (D) *Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and*
- (E) *In secondary schools--*

- (1) *Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement; International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;*
- (2) *Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;*
- (3) *Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or*
- (4) *Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.*

(3) Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

- (A) *Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and*
- (B) *Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.*

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--

- (A) *Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;*
- (B) *Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;*
- (C) *Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or*
- (D) *Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.*

(4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

- (A) *Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and*
- (B) *Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).*

(ii) Permissible activities. The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--

- (A) *Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or*
- (B) *Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.*

Completing the Action Plans

Since all requirements of the intervention model selected must be implemented, Action Plans have been designed to ensure that each requirement is addressed. Each requirement in the intervention model selected for this school has an Action Plan. Add tables for permissible activities if implementing more than one for each requirement. Delete the Action Plans for the other intervention models.

Activity – Not all requirements will need a “new” activity. If the school has already started implementing an activity, **within the last two years**, that meets the intervention requirement, it should be described. Instead of new Start and Implementation dates, it should be noted that it is or was already being implemented. Existing activities may or may not have costs from this School Improvement Grant. See question G-1 of the U. S. Department of Education Guidance.

The Key Steps must identify the short- and long-term steps needed to implement the intervention model. Major “Activities” should have sufficient detail in the Key Steps to allow a reviewer to determine whether the school has given serious consideration to the pieces that need to be accomplished in order to implement the intervention.

The Action Plans contain a Start Date and an Implementation Date. The Start Date should identify when the school will begin the activity. The Implementation Date is the expected date when the intervention will be operational. NOTE: The three year availability of these funds, contingent upon an annual review and approval for continued funding, means that activities can span the entire three years. However, it is expected that schools will begin meeting the requirements as soon as possible. The Action Plans must indicate the school will be able to implement the intervention model in the first year and to fully implement within the three years of funding.

In addition to asking schools to identify, by position, the person(s) responsible for each activity, the Action Plans ask for a description of how the school will monitor progress and evaluate the process of implementation. Each school is required to have an Intervention Project Manager who would, most likely, be the person to monitor and report progress on implementation activities.

Each Action Plan contains a field for an estimated cost over the three years. This was included to ensure that costs are being considered as plans are being developed. The estimated cost over the three years will not be cross-matched to the final figures on the budget pages. It is intended to help schools identify costs by requirement since the budget forms require costs to be separated and identified by each requirement of the intervention model selected.

Turnaround Intervention Model - 1	
Requirement(i): Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Turnaround Intervention Model - 2	
Requirement(ii): Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students, (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and (B) Select new staff	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Turnaround Intervention Model - 3	
Requirement (iii): Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	

Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Turnaround Intervention Model - 4	
Requirement (iv): Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Turnaround Intervention Model - 5	
Requirement (v): Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new “turnaround office” in the district or State, hire a “turnaround leader” who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the district or State to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Turnaround Intervention Model - 6	
Requirement (vi): Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based	

and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Turnaround Intervention Model - 7	
Requirement (vii): Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Turnaround Intervention Model - 8	
Requirement (viii): Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the USDE Guidance)	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

Turnaround Intervention Model - 9

Requirement (ix): Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students

Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

Turnaround Intervention Model Permissible Activities – Copy and complete as many as needed.

Permissible activity:

Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

Restart Intervention Model - 1

Requirement: Convert a school or close and reopen 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

Activity	
Key steps	

Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

School Closure Intervention Model - 1	
Requirement: Close a school and enroll the students who attended that school in other schools in the district that are higher achieving	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

Transformation Intervention Model - 1	
Requirement (1A): Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness (A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model NOTE: This requirement is an option for Tier III schools.	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

Transformation Intervention Model - 2

Requirement (1B): Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness
 (B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--
 (1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; and
 (2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement

Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

Transformation Intervention Model - 3

Requirement (1C): Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness
 (C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so
NOTE: This requirement is an option for Tier III schools.

Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

Transformation Intervention Model - 4

Requirement (1D): Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness

(D) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Transformation Intervention Model - 5	
Requirement (1E): Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness (E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Transformation Intervention Model - 6	
Requirement (2A): Comprehensive Instructional reform strategies (A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards	
Activity	
Key steps	

Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Transformation Intervention Model - 7	
Requirement (2B): Comprehensive Instructional reform strategies (B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Transformation Intervention Model - 8	
Requirement(3A): Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools (A) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the USDE guidance)	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Transformation Intervention Model - 9	
Requirement(3B): Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools	

(B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

Transformation Intervention Model - 10

Requirement(4A): Providing operational flexibility and sustained support
 (A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates

Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

Transformation Intervention Model - 11

Requirement(4B): Providing operational flexibility and sustained support
 (B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO)

Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	

Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	
Transformation Intervention Model - Copy and complete as many as needed.	
Permissible Activities	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

A.3. Action Plans for Tier III Schools

A Tier III school that is a Title I school in school improvement, corrective action or restructuring has an option to use the ESEA Section 1003(g) funds to support, expand, continue or complete the plan approved for the school’s Title I Accountability Funds under Section 1003(a). If using this option, an Action Plan must be completed for each activity that the school is requesting funds.

The activities must be described with sufficient specificity for reviewers to see the connection to identified needs and the potential to produce outcomes that meet the purpose of these funds – to increase achievement and assist schools to exit the AYP improvement status.

Tier III – Improvement Activities (Copy and complete as many as needed)	
Activity	
Key steps	
Start Date	
Full implementation date	
Person(s) responsible	
Monitor and evaluate	
Cost for three years	

PART B. BUDGETS

Budget forms have been designed to assist the school in budgeting, by intervention model, for each of the three years of fun availability. Total amounts for each object code are calculated for each year and also transferred automatically to the three year Summary Budget and District Summary Budget form.

Budget forms are found in a separate EXCEL file at:
[http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School Improvement Grants.html](http://www.nde.state.ne.us/ARRA/School_Improvement_Grants.html) or
<http://www.nde.state.ne.us/federalprograms/titlei/index.htm>.

Appendix A.

Process and Definitions used in identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools

Definitions for Nebraska

School shall mean the school as used for the elementary, middle and high school designations for AYP. This does not include Rule 10 (Accreditation) Special Purpose Schools or preschools. Students being served in programs are reported in the school where they would be attending.

Secondary school shall mean any middle, junior high or senior high.

Number of years shall mean three years.

Graduation rate means the AYP Graduation Rate data from all secondary schools that is averaged for the three latest years. The initial year of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools will use 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 data.

Performance Rank shall mean the total number of students in the “all students” group at the proficient level in both Reading and Math divided by the total number of students enrolled a Full Academic Year (FAY as defined for AYP) in Reading and Math to determine a percent proficient for each school.

Progress Over Time Rank shall mean the total number of students in the “all students” group at the proficient level in Reading and Math for the three latest years divided by the total number of students enrolled a Full Academic Year (FAY) in Reading and Math for the three latest years to determine a percent proficient.

Weighting shall mean the performance rank will be weighted (multiplied by two) and added to the progress over time rank.

Final Rank shall mean the combination of performance rank and the progress over time rank.

Persistently lowest-achieving schools (PLAS) Identification Procedure

Performance Rank

For the initial year (2008-09 AYP data) for all schools, add the numbers of students at the proficient level in Reading to the number of students at the proficient level in Math, then divide by the total number of students enrolled a full academic year (FAY as defined for AYP) in Reading and Math to get a percent proficient. Rank the schools by this percent proficient for a performance rank.

Progress Over Time Rank

For the latest three years (initial years are 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09), add the number of students at the proficient level in Reading and Math, then divide by the number of students enrolled a full academic year (FAY) for both Reading and Math for

all three years to find a percent proficient. Rank the schools by this percent proficient for a progress over time rank.

Final Rank to Determine the Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

The performance rank is doubled before adding to the progress over time rank. Schools are then ranked to determine a final rank and the five or 5% (whichever is greater) schools are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in each Tier.

Graduation Rate

Using the AYP graduation data for all high schools in the state for the last three years (initially, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08), calculate a PLAS graduation rate using the AYP formula.

Appendix B

ESEA Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

REVIEWERS RATING AND CHECKLIST

District Name: _____

County/district Number: _____

Reviewer: _____

Reviewer: _____

Date: _____

Section 1. District Level Information		Yes	No	NA	Limited 1-5 points	Moderate 6-10 points	Strong 11-15 points
	Cover page signed by School Board President and Authorized Representative						
Part A. Schools To Be Served							
A.1.	List of schools with a Tier identified for each						
A.2.	Optional – Tier I or Tier II school from list already started						
Part B. Descriptive Information District Level							
B.1.	District Contribution						
B.2.	District Capacity						
B.3.	Lack of capacity to serve a Tier I school						
B.4.	External Providers						
B.5.	Alignment of Programs and Services						
B.6.	Modify Practices and Policies						
B.7.	Sustain Interventions after availability of funds						
B.8.	Annual Goals						
B.9.	District support for planning and intervention						
Part C. Budget							
C.1.	Optional description of proposed activities						

C.2.	Optional Budget page for district						
D.	Assurances						
E.	Waivers checked as appropriate						
TOTAL POINTS							
Comments:							

Complete Section 2 for each school included in the application.

Name of School _____ Tier _____ Intervention Model _____

Section 2 – School Level Information		Yes	No	NA	Limited 1-5 points	Moderate 6-10 points	Strong 11-15 points
Part A. Descriptive Information School Level							
A.1. Analysis of Need							
a)	Student Achievement and Leading Indicators						
b)	Programs/Services Profile						
c)	Staff Profile						
d)	Curriculum/Instructional Practices						
e)	System Profile						
f)	Process						
A.2. Action Plans Complete by Intervention Model							
A.3. Action Plan for Tier III							
Part B. Budget							
	3 years for each model						
	Summary Budget						

Checklist for TURNAROUND INTERVENTION MODEL *AI = Already started or implemented	Yes	No	AI*	Limited 1-5 points	Moderate 6-10 points	Strong 11-15 points
Required Activities						
(a)(1)(i) replace the principal and grant operational flexibility						
(a)(1)(ii) measure effectiveness using locally adopted competencies						
(a)(1)(ii)(A) screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50%						
(a)(1)(ii)(B) select new staff						
(a)(1)(iii) increased opportunities for promotion & career growth, flexible working conditions, etc.						
(a)(1)(iv) ongoing professional development that is job embedded & aligned with school's comprehensive instructional program.						
(a)(1)(v) new governance structure						
(a)(1)(vi) data driven instructional program that is research based and vertically aligned						
(a)(1)(vii) continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction						
(a)(1)(viii) establish schedules and implement strategies to increase learning time						
(a)(1)(ix) services & supports for students (i.e. social-emotional and community-oriented)						
Permissible Activities:						
(a)(2)(i) any required and/or permissible activities under the Transformation model						
(a)(2)(i)(A) additional compensation						
(a)(2)(i)(B) system for measuring changes						
(a)(2)(i)(C) consent to accept teacher						
(a)(2)(ii) new school model						
AVERAGE POINTS FOR REQUIREMENTS						

Checklist for RESTART INTERVENTION MODEL	Yes	No	AI*	Limited	Moderate	Strong
---	-----	----	-----	---------	----------	--------

*AI = Already started or implemented				1-5 points	6-10 points	11-15 points
<u>Required Activities</u>						
(b) Convert school or reopen as a charter						

Checklist for SCHOOL CLOSURE INTERVENTION MODEL	Yes	No	AI*	Limited 1-5 points	Moderate 6-10 points	Strong 11-15 points
*AI = Already started or implemented						
<u>Required Activities</u>						
(c) School Closure						

Checklist for TRANSFORMATION INTERVENTION MODEL	Yes	No	AI*	Limited 1-5 points	Moderate 6-10 points	Strong 11-15 points
*AI = Already started or implemented						
<u>Required Activities</u>						
(d)(1)(i)(A) replace principal						
(d)(1)(i)(B) evaluation systems for teachers & principals						
(d)(1)(i)(C) reward school leaders						
(d)(1)(i)(D) ongoing professional development						
(d)(1)(i)(E) recruit/retain staff with necessary skills						
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>						
(d)(1)(ii)(A) attract/retain staff with necessary skills						
(d)(1)(ii)(B) institute a system for measuring changes						
(d)(1)(ii)(C) mutual consent for hiring teachers						
<u>Required Activities</u>						
(d)(2)(i)(A) use of data for implementing program						
(d)(2)(i)(B) continuous use of student data						
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>						
(d)(2)(ii)(A) conducting periodic reviews						
(d)(2)(ii)(B) implementing schoolwide RTI model						
(d)(2)(ii)(C) provide additional supports/prof. Development						
(d)(2)(ii)(D) technology based supports/interventions						
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(1) increase rigor in secondary schools						
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(2) student transition						
(d)(2)(ii)(E)(3) increase graduation rates						

(d)(2)(ii)(E)(4) early-warning systems for at-risk students						
Required Activities						
(d)(3)(i)(A) strategies to increase learning time						
(d)(3)(i)(B) ongoing family/community engagement						
Permissible Activities:						
(d)(3)(ii)(A) partnering to create safe school environments						
(d)(3)(ii)(B) restructuring the school day						
(d)(3)(ii)(C) improve school climate and discipline						
(d)(3)(ii)(D) full-day kdg or pre-kdg						
Required Activities						
(d)(4)(i)(A) flexibility to increase graduation rates						
(d)(4)(i)(B) ongoing, intensive TA/support						
Permissible Activities:						
(d)(4)(ii)(A) new governance arrangement						
(d)(4)(ii)(B) budget weighted based on student needs						
AVERAGE POINTS FOR REQUIREMENTS						

Checklist for Tier III Schools with Title I Accountability Plans *AI = Already started or implemented Briefly list activities from the Action Plans	Yes	No	AI*	Limited 1-5 points	Moderate 6-10 points	Strong 11-15 points
AVERAGE POINTS						

Appendix C

Sample Budget Page for District Expenditures (optional)

NDE County District No.: 0

District Name: 0

DISTRICT-WIDE ACTIVITIES FOR YEAR 1 (2010-11)

Activity	100 Salaries	200 Employee Benefits	300 Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	400 Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	500 Computer Hardware / Equipment	600 Travel Professional Development	Total for Listed Activity
(1)							\$0
(2)							\$0
(3)							\$0
(4)							\$0
(5)							\$0
(6)							\$0
Totals by Object Code	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Sample Budget Pages for Turnaround Model

TURN AROUND MODEL BUDGET FOR YEAR 1 (2010-11)

NDE County District No.: 0
 District Name: 0
 NDE School No.:
 School Name:

Activity	100	200	300	400	500	600	
(See Instructions for Full Descriptions of Required and Permissible Activities)	Salaries	Employee Benefits	Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	Computer Hardware / Equipment	Travel Professional Development	Total for Listed Activity
Intervention Project Manager (Required)							\$0
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(a)(1)(i) operational flexibility							\$0
(a)(1)(ii) measure effectiveness							\$0
(a)(1)(iii) increased opportunities							\$0
(a)(1)(iv) ongoing prof. development							\$0
(a)(1)(v) new governance							\$0
(a)(1)(vi) data driven instructional program							\$0
(a)(1)(vii) continuous use of student data							\$0
(a)(1)(viii) increased learning time							\$0
(a)(1)(ix) services & supports for students							\$0
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(a)(2)(i)(A) additional compensation							\$0
(a)(2)(i)(B) system for measuring changes							\$0
(a)(2)(i)(C) consent to accept teacher							\$0
(a)(2)(ii) new school model							\$0
Totals by Object Code	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

TURN AROUND MODEL BUDGET FOR YEAR 2 (2011-12)

NDE County District No.: 0
 District Name: 0
 NDE School No.: 0
 School Name: 0

Activity	100 Salaries	200 Employee Benefits	300 Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	400 Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	500 Computer Hardware / Equipment	600 Travel Professional Development	Total for Listed Activity
(See Instructions for Full Descriptions of Required and Permissible Activities)							
Intervention Project Manager (Required)							\$0
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(1)(i) operational flexibility							\$0
(1)(ii) measure effectiveness							\$0
(1)(iii) increased opportunities							\$0
(1)(iv) ongoing prof. development							\$0
(1)(v) new governance							\$0
(1)(vi) data driven instructional program							\$0
(1)(vii) continuous use of student data							\$0
(1)(viii) increased learning time							\$0
(1)(ix) services & supports for students							\$0
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(2)(i)(A) additional compensation							\$0
(2)(i)(B) system for measuring changes							\$0
(2)(i)(C) consent to accept teacher							\$0
(2)(ii) new school model							\$0
Totals by Object Code	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

TURN AROUND MODEL BUDGET FOR YEAR 3 (2012-13)

NDE County District No.: 0
 District Name: 0
 NDE School No.: 0
 School Name: 0

Activity (See Instructions for Full Descriptions of Required and Permissible Activities)	100 Salaries	200 Employee Benefits	300 Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	400 Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	500 Computer Hardware / Equipment	600 Travel Professional Development	Total for Listed Activity
Intervention Project Manager (Required)							\$0
<u>Required Activities</u>							
(1)(i) operational flexibility							\$0
(1)(ii) measure effectiveness							\$0
(1)(iii) increased opportunities							\$0
(1)(iv) ongoing prof. development							\$0
(1)(v) new governance							\$0
(1)(vi) data driven instructional program							\$0
(1)(vii) continuous use of student data							\$0
(1)(viii) increased learning time							\$0
(1)(ix) services & supports for students							\$0
<u>Permissible Activities:</u>							
(2)(i)(A) additional compensation							\$0
(2)(i)(B) system for measuring changes							\$0
(2)(i)(C) consent to accept teacher							\$0
(2)(ii) new school model							\$0
Totals by Object Code	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

DO NOT ENTER INFORMATION IN THE BUDGET BELOW. IT IS DESIGNED TO TOTAL THE BUDGET FROM ALL 3 YEARS.

TURN AROUND MODEL COMBINED BUDGET FOR YEARS 1, 2, & 3 (2010-13)

NDE County District No.: 0
 District Name: 0
 NDE School No.: 0
 School Name: 0

Activity (See Instructions for Full Descriptions of Required and Permissible Activities)	100 Salaries	200 Employee Benefits	300 Purchased Service / Lease Agreement	400 Supplies & Materials / Computer Software	500 Computer Hardware / Equipment	600 Travel Professional Development	Total for Listed Activity
Intervention Project Manager (Required)	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
Required Activities							
(1)(i) operational flexibility	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(1)(ii) measure effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(1)(iii) increased opportunities	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(1)(iv) ongoing prof. development	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(1)(v) new governance	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(1)(vi) data driven instructional program	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(1)(vii) continuous use of student data	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(1)(viii) increased learning time	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(1)(ix) services & supports for students	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
Permissible Activities:							
(2)(i)(A) additional compensation	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(2)(i)(B) system for measuring changes	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(2)(i)(C) consent to accept teacher	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
(2)(ii) new school model	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
Totals by Object Code	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0