

APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: <b>Nevada Department of Education</b>	Applicant's Mailing Address: <b>700 East Fifth Street Carson City NV 89701-5096</b>
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant  Name: <b>Kathy St. Clair</b>  Position and Office: <b>State Title I Director, Nevada Department of Education</b>  Contact's Mailing Address: <b>Nevada Department of Education 700 East Fifth Street, Suite 110 Carson City NV 89701-5096</b>  Telephone: <b>775-687-9185</b>  Fax: <b>775-687-9120</b>  Email address: <b>kstclair@doe.nv.gov</b>	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): <b>Dr. Keith Rheault</b>	Telephone: <b>775-687-9217</b>
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X 	Date: <b>04/06/10</b>
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.	

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

Legal Name of Applicant: <b>Nevada Department of Education</b>	Applicant's Mailing Address: <b>700 East Fifth Street Carson City NV 89701-5096</b>
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant  Name: <b>Kathy St. Clair</b> .  Position and Office: <b>State Title I Director Nevada Department of Education</b>  Contact's Mailing Address: <b>Nevada Department of Education 700 East Fifth Street, Suite 110 Carson City NV 89701-5096</b>  Telephone: <b>775-687-9185</b>  Fax: <b>775-687-9120</b>  Email address: <b>kstclair@doe.nv.gov</b>	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): <b>Dr. Keith Rheault</b>	Telephone: <b>775-687-9217</b>
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X_____	Date:
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

## **PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS**

### **A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS:**

Please find attached the lists, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State with the required data provided for each Tier I and Tier II school (Attachment A). **PLEASE NOTE:** Nevada chose not to exercise the option of expanding the schools identified in its lists of Tiers provided through the interim final requirements released in January 2010.

The following is the process that the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) used to develop its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”:

#### **First Criteria For Identification:**

The proficiency criterion was based upon the percent proficient, or the percent of the tested student body that scored in the proficient range in math and English/Language Arts (ELA) in 2008-09 on the State’s CRTs. For K-8 schools, this included students in grades 3-8. For high schools, this included students' best scores on High School Proficiency Examination results in their high school career through the spring of their 11th-grade year. Proficiency was determined for math and ELA for each school. Schools were assigned two ranks on the bases of math percent proficient and ELA percent proficient, respectively. For this criterion, the K-8 schools and high schools were ranked independently due to differences in student participation requirements and opportunities to test (i.e., high school retests).

#### **Second Criteria For Identification:**

Growth was based upon whether schools had made progress on those assessments. Growth was determined as the change in a school’s percent proficient in math and ELA across the most recent four-year period for each school. For example, a school’s math and ELA changes in percent proficient from 2005-06 to 2006-07, from 2006-07 to 2007-08, and from 2007-08 to 2008-09 were computed. These changes were summed to determine each school's total growth over the four-year period. Schools were assigned two ranks on the bases of math growth and ELA growth, respectively. For this criterion, the K-8 schools and high schools were ranked independently due to differences in student participation requirements and opportunities to test (i.e., high school retests).

**Nevada Department of Education**  
**Revised: March 23, 2010**

**Combination of Criteria For Identification:**

A total of four ranks (i.e., math proficiency, ELA proficiency, math growth, ELA growth, respectively) were computed for each school. The ranks were summed to derive a total rank value for each school; each of the four ranks was weighted equally.

Including all schools (i.e., K-8 and High School) in the final ranking, the total rank values were used to identify the lowest five percent of schools.

**Identification of Tiered Lists of Schools:**

Schools were then sorted for being Title I eligible and served, and for being identified as In Need of Improvement (INOI) at any level (school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring). The lowest five percent of the resulting list of 133 schools (or seven schools) were then identified as the basis of the Tier I list. To this Tier I list were added four Title I eligible and served high schools INOI with graduation rates of less than 60% over the past four years, resulting in a total of eleven Title I eligible and served schools identified as Tier I. The remaining 122 Title I eligible and served INOI schools comprise the Tier III list.

Remaining schools were then sorted for being Title I eligible and not served, for being identified as INOI, and for being secondary schools. (Under Nevada statute both middle and high schools are considered secondary schools.) There are 15 schools in Nevada that meet the criteria. Five schools then formed the basis of the Tier II list (five schools is greater than five percent of fifteen). To this Tier II list were added three Title I eligible and not served high schools INOI with graduation rates of less than 60% over the past four years, resulting in a total of eight Title I eligible and not served secondary schools identified as Tier II.

**B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

**Part 1**

**Requirement 1. The SEA has described, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate whether an LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school:** The LEA application must demonstrate that the LEA has conducted a comprehensive needs assessment for each school to be served as either a Tier I or Tier II school, and that it has chosen an intervention for that school that is aligned with the results of the comprehensive needs assessment. Although NDE will not require a district to use a specific tool for conducting its needs analysis, it will be expected that the LEA employ one of several tools that are widely used throughout the state in conducting needs analyses for school improvement planning purposes. Those tools include the SAGE Data Analysis Guide, the Nevada Comprehensive Audit Tool for Schools (NCCAT-S), or the state-approved restructuring plan template which includes a section designed to assist a school/district in conducting a comprehensive needs assessment. Any of these tools, when completed with fidelity and attention to detail, will provide the necessary content for an approvable needs assessment by an LEA for the purposes of the SIG grant. The key to a successful application in this area will be the LEA's inclusion of detailed; databased evidence that clearly reflects the schools prioritized needs.

**Requirement 2. The SEA has described with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate whether the LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.** NDE will utilize Dean Fixsen's Implementation Drivers as established through the work of the National Implementation Research Network to evaluate an LEA's expressed capacity. Specifically, NDE will look for documentation that the LEA has capacity to implement change in the following key areas:

- **Staff recruitment and selection**--A strong application will demonstrate that the district is committed to reviewing and if necessary, revising job descriptions and/or hiring practices for staff members at the targeted schools; reviewing, and if necessary, modifying the methodology that has been used to recruit and select staff. Furthermore, the district demonstrates that it has the capacity to remove principals who have a history of low achievement (i.e., students have not on the whole, experienced growth in the test scores during the administrator's tenure at the school). The LEA also must demonstrate that preliminary conversations have been held with stakeholders such as union representatives regarding changes in recruitment and hiring practices.

## Nevada Department of Education

Revised: March 23, 2010

- Staff training--The LEA must present a strong and detailed description of how staff training will be used at the school(s) to be served in order to ensure fidelity of implementation of the chosen intervention model. Specifically, the LEA must demonstrate that it has well-established policies and procedures which are consistently implemented so that most or all professional development is planned in response to data-based needs; is delivered in accordance with established principals of adult learning (e.g., job-embedded, not one-shot; is evaluated and the results used for school improvement; and is individualized based on a given staff members' needs or on the needs of the majority of the staff at a school site).
- Consultation and coaching--The LEA provides a detailed and focused discussion of how consultation and coaching will be implemented in the school to be served. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates that it has an effective coaching system in place for principals and teachers in which coaching is provided in authentic settings and is delivered according to well-established procedures including methods for determining who needs coaching, in what content areas, from whom, and of determining if behavior change is occurring in the person(s) being coached including why the coaching is effective, or if not, then why not.
- Staff evaluation--The LEA presents a detailed description of how staff evaluation processes will reflect those skills taught through staff training and coaching opportunities. The LEA has well-established policies and procedures in place to evaluate the degree to which skills taught through staff training and coaching come to fruition in improved student performance. When data reveal that individuals' skills are insufficient, systems of support are consistently and routinely accessed for all individuals who have demonstrated insufficient mastery of content (i.e., low student performance as assessed through multiple measures). Preliminary conversations have been held with stakeholders such as union representatives, regarding changes in recruitment and hiring practices.
- Program evaluation--An approvable application will demonstrate how the LEA will evaluate the overall performance of the organization over time in implementing the intervention model that has been chosen for the school. The LEA will demonstrate that it has a comprehensive evaluation system in place to assess the degree to which system supports exist to sustain and scale up successful practices in schools. The LEA demonstrates that it has well-established policies and procedures to evaluate why schools achieve the results they do. This system pays particular attention to the fidelity with which implementation of a given variable occurs. Results continually help drive on-going implementation and progress.
- Facilitative administrative supports--In its application, the LEA demonstrates that it has a sufficient number of personnel at the district level to support the number of schools targeted in the LEA's application. District staff members' roles must be clearly defined relative to the ways in which they will offer support to targeted schools. There is a plan to assess the

**Nevada Department of Education**  
**Revised: March 23, 2010**

ways in which targeted district support is assisting schools to improve, and to use those data accordingly (e.g., to leverage supports and/or apply consequences in response to such analyses; to change the way(s) in which support is provided, if necessary).

- Systems interventions--The LEA has provided evidence that there is a detailed plan for how the LEA will evaluate the degree to which a targeted school is achieving preliminary success with the intervention model that is being implemented at the school and how, when necessary, the LEA will intervene when the model it has chosen for a school needs to be adjusted or realigned in order to ensure fidelity and sustainability of the intervention. Possible interventions might include tapping into and aligning external support systems to improve operating conditions, ensuring sufficient financial resources and flexibility, and providing additional organizational support and expertise.

**Requirement 3: The SEA has described, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate whether the LEA’s budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds.** In an approvable application, the LEA will provide a detailed budget narrative that describes how the requested funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve; to conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools, and to support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application. Additionally, the budget summary pages in an approvable application will reflect an appropriate and clear breakdown and identification of administrative, support, and instructional expenses, and all calculations must be correct. Finally, all calculations in the supplemental budget pages must be correct and the narrative extensions in the supplemental budget pages must link to the descriptions found in the overall budget narrative, demonstrating a clear tie between proposed expenditures and the school intervention model chosen.

**Part 2**

**Requirement 1: The SEA has described how it will assess the LEA’s commitment to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.** In order to meet this requirement, an approvable LEA application must make a strong case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model for a particular school and how it will implement all the requirements of that intervention model; each requirement of the chosen model must be included in the LEA’s description of how it will implement that model. For instance, if an LEA chooses to implement the **turnaround model**, it must demonstrate that it has addressed the following aspects of the model: a) a detailed process whereby the principal will be replaced and the new principal will be given sufficient operating flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement; b) a detailed description of the measure used to

**Nevada Department of Education**  
**Revised: March 23, 2010**

determine the effectiveness of staff, and a description of how it will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent of existing staff; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will use such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth and more flexible work conditions in order to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school; d) a compelling description of how it will provide staff with on-going, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program; e) a detailed description of how the LEA will implement a new governance structure for the school; f) a clearly delineated description of how the LEA will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and both horizontally and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards; g) a full description of how the LEA will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction; h) a well-defined plan for how the turnaround school will establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and i) strong evidence of the LEA's commitment to provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

For an LEA that chooses the **Restart Model**, the LEA describes in detail how it will reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. The details of that review process must be clearly delineated in the application.

If an LEA chooses the **School Closure Model**, it must describe in detail how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. 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.

For LEAs that choose the **Transformation Model**, all the following components of the Transformation Model must be addressed in the LEA application including an in-depth consideration of how the LEA will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness, which must provide detail about all of the following activities: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation Model will be replaced; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors and that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a fully developed description of how the LEA will provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program

**Nevada Department of Education**  
**Revised: March 23, 2010**

and is 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) the LEA provides an in-depth description of how it will 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. Additionally, the LEA must provide detailed evidence of how it will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and both horizontally and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state standards and of how it will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students. The LEA must also demonstrate how it will increase learning time and create community-oriented schools.

**Requirement 2: The SEA has described how it will assess the LEA's commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.** If an LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its chosen intervention model, the LEA must present strong evidence as to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality. A fundable application must include the following strong evidence:

- A detailed discussion of the recruitment process the LEA will undertake to identify potential external providers;
- A detailed description of what roles the LEA will play in the implementation of the model(s) and of what specific services the external provider will be expected to offer;
- A copy of the LEA's application for external providers;
- A detailed description of the process that the LEA would utilize to evaluate these applications;
- A discussion of how final selections of external providers will be made;
- A detailed process for the monitoring and evaluation of the work of the external provider(s) by the LEA.

**Requirement 3: The SEA has described how it will assess the LEA's commitment to align other resources with the interventions.** The LEA must present a well-developed narrative describing how it will align other resources that are available to the school and the district with the SIG funding in order to carry out the chosen intervention model. A fundable application narrative for this requirement must include:

- A workable plan for aligning resources to implement the components of a given intervention model;
- Budget estimates of potential funding over the life of the grant. For example, the application discusses how the LEA will combine existing funding resources, such as Title I, Part A

## Nevada Department of Education

Revised: March 23, 2010

Basic funds, Title I (1003a), Title II, Title III, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC (if applicable), Early Childhood Education state funding (if applicable), state general funding, etc., with the SIG funding.

**Requirement 4: The SEA has described how it will assess an LEA's commitment to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.**

In an approvable application, the LEA must provide a specific and detailed discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively. This discussion should include consideration of such issues as modifying typical district hiring practices, allowing for additional flexibility in the use of funding, and for implementing an instructional program that is custom tailored for the students who attend the school.

**Requirement 5: The SEA has described how it will assess an LEA's commitment to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.**

The LEA must provide a convincing and detailed discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. For instance, the LEA should specify how activities or personnel that will no longer be funded through the grant monies will continue to be implemented through other sources of funds after the grant period is over. A fundable application must include the following in terms of sustainability:

- A detailed discussion of how other federal, state, and local revenues, such as Title I, Part A Basic funds, Title I (1003a), Title II, Title III, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC (if applicable), Early Childhood Education state funding (if applicable), state general funding, etc., will be used to carry out the activities of the chosen model after the grant period is over;
- A description of how any district wide infrastructures developed utilizing SIG funds, such as a Turnaround Office, will continue to operate after the grant period is over in order to sustain the reform initiatives.

**C. CAPACITY:**

**Requirement 1: NDE plans to use the following criteria to determine whether an LEA lacks sufficient capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to fully and effectively implement the required activities for the school intervention model selected for each Tier I school included in its application:**

In addition to the budgetary considerations around the number of Tier I and Tier II schools to be served by the LEA and the size of such schools, NDE will utilize the rubric within the LEA SIG application to assess the LEA's demonstrated capacity to serve these schools at the level of intensity required by the SIG process. The Rubric for determining capacity is built around Dean Fixsen's Implementation Drivers as established through the work of the National Implementation Research Network.

In an application that claims lack of capacity to implement one of the required interventions in each of its Tier I schools, the LEA must demonstrate its barriers to provide support in the following areas which Dean Fixsen identified as pre-requisites to successful implementation of evidence-based practices:

- Staff recruitment and selection – Examples of barriers include: the LEA has no policies or procedures in place for reviewing and if necessary revising job descriptions and/or hiring practices for staff members at targeted schools; the LEA has not held preliminary conversations with stakeholders, such as union representatives, regarding changes in recruitment and hiring practices; the LEA does not have the willingness to remove principals who have a history of low achievement.
- Staff training - Examples of barriers include: the LEA has no policies and procedures to ensure that professional development is responsive to data-based needs and is delivered in accordance with established principles of adult learning (e.g., job-embedded, not one-shot; is evaluated and the results used for school improvement; and is individualized based on a given staff members' needs or on the needs of the majority of the staff at a school site).
- Consultation and coaching - Examples of barriers include: the LEA does not have an effective coaching system in place for both principals and teachers; the LEA has no procedures in place for determining who needs coaching, in what content areas, and from whom; the LEA has no evaluation systems in place to determine if the coaching is effective, or if not, then why not.
- Staff evaluation - Examples of barriers include: the LEA does not have practices and procedures in place to evaluate the degree to which skills taught through staff training and coaching lead to improved student performance; the LEA has no

## Nevada Department of Education

Revised: March 23, 2010

system in place to continuously and routinely address any identified insufficiencies when data reveal that practitioners' skills are insufficient.

- Program evaluation - Examples of barriers include: the LEA does not have a comprehensive evaluation system in place to assess the degree to which system supports exist to sustain and scale up successful practices in schools; the LEA pays little or no attention to the fidelity with which implementation of a given variable occurs.
- Facilitative administrative supports - Examples of barriers include: the LEA does not demonstrate that it has a sufficient number of LEA level personnel to support the number of schools targeted in the LEA's application; LEA staff members' roles are not clearly defined relative to the support they will offer to targeted schools; the LEA does not or cannot describe the process it will use to assess the ways in which targeted LEA support is assisting schools to improve.
- Systems interventions - Examples of barriers include: the LEA does not provide a plan for how it will evaluate the degree to which a targeted school is achieving preliminary success with the selected intervention model; the LEA does not describe if or how it will intervene if a model it has chosen for a school needs to be adjusted or realigned to ensure fidelity and sustainability of the intervention.

**Requirement 2: If the NDE determines through its initial screening of an LEA's application that an LEA has more capacity than it claims, NDE will engage an LEA in this situation in conversations, through its required structured interview format, to elicit more convincing evidence around its claim of lack of capacity to serve each Tier I school. Such evidence might include the limited number of identified LEA personnel to support the schools identified for interventions, or lack of a coherent infrastructure dedicated to support the identified schools. These conversations could also include collaboration around identification of additional internal or external resources that could be used to support the selected intervention(s) for the school(s).**

**D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:**

**Requirement 1: The SEA’s process and timeline for approving LEA applications:**

NDE will open up the application process for eligible LEAs once notification is received from USDOE that NDE’s SIG application has been approved. The LEA SIG application will be distributed to eligible LEAs electronically and will also be available on the NDE website [www.doe.nv.gov/Recovery/SIG.htm](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Recovery/SIG.htm) once it has been approved by USDOE.

In order for NDE to evaluate an LEA’s application for SIG funds, NDE will conduct a two-part process for evaluating each LEA SIG application:

1. A paper review of each LEA application by at least two NDE staff members utilizing the rubrics described in this application to establish which LEA applications are complete and provide all of the required information, and to assess which applications meet the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) and NDE funding priorities;
2. A structured interview process in which each LEA that meets the funding priority threshold will be asked questions directly related to its application, with special emphasis on the demonstration of capacity to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and/or Tier II school identified in its application.

NDE anticipates the LEA application timeline to be as follows (\* dates are tentative dependent on USDOE approval of NDE’s application):

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ACTIVITY</b>
March 2010 *	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDE opens up LEA SIG application process once USDOE approval is received;</li> <li>• USDOE awards SIG funds to NDE once NDE’s SIG application has been approved.</li> </ul>
March and April, 2010	NDE continues to provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs through development and dissemination of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), videoconferencing, conference calls, and on an individual basis as needed.
April 30, 2010 *	LEA SIG applications due to NDE.
May 3 – 7, 2010 *	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDE’s initial “paper” review of LEA SIG applications;</li> <li>• Scheduling of and preparing for LEA SIG interviews to take place the following week.</li> </ul>

**Nevada Department of Education**  
**Revised: March 23, 2010**

May 10 – 14, 2010 *	NDE provides LEAs opportunity to provide further clarification or to discuss potential revisions to its application through its structured interview process, including potential budget adjustments.
May 2010 through August 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEAs with approved applications must begin or continue preliminary implementation of the intervention(s) chosen for its Tier I and Tier II schools to enable implementation of the intervention(s) at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year;</li> <li>• LEAs with approved LEA-level SIG activities must begin or continue implementation of these activities to enable implementation of the intervention(s) at its Tier I and Tier II schools at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.</li> </ul>
August 2010	NDE begins its bimonthly onsite monitoring visits to the LEAs and their respective Tier I and/or Tier II schools.

**Requirement 2: The SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s SIG if one or more schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements.**

LEAs with Tier I and Tier II schools will be monitored on an ongoing basis as outlined in Section D(4) of this application to determine each applicable school’s progress toward meeting its LEA-established annual goals and making progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements, including progress toward meeting the AYP benchmarks.

Based upon the outcomes from the monitoring process referenced above, NDE will use the following process annually for determination of whether to renew an LEA’s SIG application if one or more Tier I and/or Tier II schools in the LEA are not meeting their annual goals and making progress on the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements:

- Determination of whether the applicable school(s) is making progress toward meeting those goals; and
- Examination of other factors, such as the school’s progress on the leading indicators or the fidelity with which it is implementing the chosen intervention model.

**Requirement 3: The SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier III schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals.**

NDE will utilize the following process to approve the goals established by the LEA for any Tier III schools that an LEA includes in its SIG application:

- Determination of the appropriateness of the proposed goals to the results of the school's state assessment profile in terms of current achievement levels; and
- Determination of the alignment of the proposed goals to either the same student achievement goals that an LEA establishes for its Tier I and/or Tier II schools, or to the existing AYP requirements, including making AYP through safe harbor.

NDE will utilize the following process annually for determination of whether to renew an LEA's SIG application if one or more Tier III schools in the LEA are not meeting their annual goals:

- Review of required LEA SIG Quarterly Implementation Reports that document the progress each school, including any Tier III schools included in the LEA's SIG application, is making toward achievement of the LEA-established goals for the school;
- Determination of whether there is progress being made toward meeting those goals by the applicable school(s).

**Requirement 4: The SEA's process for monitoring each LEA that receives a SIG to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and/or Tier II schools identified in the LEA's application.**

LEAs serving Tier I and/or Tier II schools will be monitored by the following processes to ensure that the selected intervention model is being implemented fully and effectively in each Tier I and/or Tier II school identified within the LEA's application:

- Bi-monthly onsite visits beginning in August 2010 to each Tier I and Tier II school within the LEA identified in its application as well as to the LEA office(s) with management oversight for the LEA's SIG-served school(s). Such visits will utilize pre-established interview and observation protocols;
- Submission of required SIG Quarterly Implementation Reports to NDE that will document:

**Nevada Department of Education**

**Revised: March 23, 2010**

- the LEA's progress on completion of the action steps delineated in its implementation timeline developed for each Tier I and Tier II school identified in its application, and
- the progress of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school toward meeting its LEA-established goals.

**Requirement 5: The SEA's process for prioritizing SIGs to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient SIG funds to serve all eligible schools for which an LEA applies.**

If there are insufficient SEA SIG funds to award, for up to three years, a grant to each LEA that submits an approvable application, NDE will give first priority to LEAs that apply to serve both Tier I or Tier II schools and then give priority to LEAs that apply to serve only Tier III schools. NDE will also take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among the eligible LEAs to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the state can be served.

**Requirement 6: The criteria (if any) that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.**

NDE will provide the following criteria for an LEA to use when prioritizing among Tier III schools that it will serve in its application:

- Focus on clusters of Tier III elementary and/or middle schools that are feeder schools into Tier I and Tier II middle and/or high schools;
- Focus on those schools that are identified in corrective action or restructuring.

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

NDE does not anticipate taking over any Tier I or Tier II schools in order to implement the interventions in the final requirements.

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

**Nevada Department of Education**  
**Revised: March 23, 2010**

NDE does not intend to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover.

**E. ASSURANCES:**

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

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

**F. SEA RESERVATION:**

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

**Administration:**

NDE will engage in the following activities in the area of administration:

- Develop and implement policy and procedures to apply the definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools to all schools in Nevada;
- Develop and implement policy and procedures to determine an LEA's commitment to ensure SIG funds are provided adequately to enable its persistently lowest-achieving schools to substantially improve student achievement;
- Develop and implement policy and procedures to determine an LEA's capacity to implement the selected interventions in the Tier I and Tier II schools for which it applies;
- Develop and implement policy and procedures to monitor districts and schools to ensure the effective implementation of the identified interventions;
- Develop and implement procedures to post all required information on NDE's website within 30 days of awarding SIGs to LEAs.

**Evaluation:**

NDE will engage in the following activities in the area of evaluation:

- Develop and implement policy and procedures to establish the extent to which districts and schools are meeting the required performance measures. Such procedures will include ongoing monitoring that includes formative evaluation to inform the need for appropriate interventions as well as summative evaluation to determine overall progress.
- In addition, NDE is planning on participating in a three-year study as part of a consortium of states organized through the Center on Innovation and Improvement. This study will focus on the intervention models and the factors and combinations that produce the desired results, and will bring invaluable nationwide context and best practice analysis to NDE's evaluation efforts.

## **Nevada Department of Education**

**Revised: March 23, 2010**

### **Technical Assistance:**

NDE will engage in the following activities in the area of technical assistance:

- Develop and implement policy and procedures to provide adequate technical assistance to eligible LEAs that will include but not be limited to:
  - Initial development and distribution of FAQs to LEAs and other stakeholders, with updates provided on a bi-weekly basis [these FAQs are also posted on the NDE website's SIG webpage [www.doe.nv.gov/Recovery/SIG.htm](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Recovery/SIG.htm)];
  - In-person meetings and telephone conferencing with LEAs throughout development of their SIG applications on an as-needed basis;
  - Video conferencing with eligible LEAs as mutual issues arise;
  - On-site monitoring of SIG implementation to identify additional technical assistance needs.
  
- NDE anticipates that, in order to implement the selected intervention models effectively, LEAs will likely need assistance in one or more of the following areas:
  - Adoption and implementation of high quality standards and assessments;
  - Development and implementation data systems to support instruction;
  - Development of and support for effective teachers and leaders;
  - Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools.
  
- To facilitate such assistance, LEAs may be required, if applicable, to contract with an outside expert with expertise in one or more of the following areas:
  - Implementation of the selected intervention model at a school or schools;
  - Evaluation of current policies and practices that support or impede reform;
  - Scaling up evidence-based practices.

**G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS:**

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

NDE has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application on February 3, 2010

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

NDE has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including:

Eligible LEAs via video-conferencing on January 26, 2010.

## **Nevada Department of Education**

**Revised: March 23, 2010**

### **H. WAIVERS:**

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

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

**XX** 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.

**XX** 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.

**XX** 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.

# REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

## TITLE I – SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT Section 1003 (g)

### SEPARATE APPLICATION FOR A SUBGRANT UNDER THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001 P.L. 107-110

ISSUED BY:

**Nevada Department of Education  
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113  
Carson City, NV 89701**

Grant Period: May 2010 – September 30, 2011, if applicable,  
September 30, 2013

Applications Due: Tentatively scheduled due date, May 14, 2010; 5:00  
PM; (dependent upon approval of the NDE's  
application by the USDOE

Grant Amounts: \$50,000 minimum - \$2,000,000 maximum is  
available per funded school

Source of Funding: U.S. Department of Education

Under Section 1003(g) of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) will make awards to LEAs that have one or more identified Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I, Part A served or eligible schools identified as In Need of Improvement (INOI).

Questions related to this funding should be addressed to:

Marcia Calloway, Education Consultant  
Nevada Department of Education  
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113  
Carson City, NV 89701  
775-687-9161 (phone) or 775-687-9120 (fax)  
mcalloway@doe.nv.gov

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Part I</b>	<b>Application Guidance</b>	
	<b>A. Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>B. Application Requirements and Guidelines</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Part II</b>	<b>Application</b>	
	<b>A. Certification Page</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>B. List of Schools To Be Served</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>C. Descriptive Information</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>D. Budget Summary and Supplemental Summary</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>E. Assurances</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>F. Waivers</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Part III</b>	<b>Application Rubric</b>	<b>20-47</b>
<b>Part IV</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	
	<b>A. Budget Summary Form</b>	<b>49</b>
	<b>B. Supplemental Schedule Form</b>	<b>50</b>

# NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## School Improvement, Section 1003(g) LEAs with Title I Schools in Need of Improvement

### Application

The Application document is organized into four (4) parts. Part I provides the Introductory Information and the Application Requirements and Guidelines. Part II contains the required Application documents, including the Application Certification Page, the Application Narrative, the Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedule, and Project Assurances and Waivers. Part III contains the rubric that will be utilized by the review panel in evaluating the applications. Part IV contains the appendices of forms to be used when completing the budget.

#### *Part I*

- A. Introduction*
- B. Application Requirements & Guidelines*

## A. INTRODUCTION:

The school improvement grants (SIG) program authorized under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, provides funding through State Educational Agencies (SEAs) to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) with the lowest achieving schools that have the greatest need for the funds and demonstrate the strongest commitment to use the funds to raise significantly the achievement of their students. To implement the SIG program, the U.S. Department of Education published final requirements in the Federal Register on December 10, 2009 (74 FR 65618).

The December 10 SIG Final Requirements reflect Secretary Duncan's determination to ensure that SIG funds are used to implement one of four rigorous school intervention models – Turnaround Model, Restart Model, School Closure, and Transformation Model – in each States persistently lowest-achieving schools. To direct school improvement funds to LEAs with these schools, the SIG Final Requirements require each SEA to identify three tiers of schools:

- Tier I schools: any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that: (1) is among the lowest-achieving five percent of those schools in the State (or the lowest-achieving five such schools); or (2) is a high school that has had a graduation rate below 60 percent for a number of years.
- Tier II schools: any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I, Part A funds and: (1) is among the lowest-achieving five percent of such secondary schools in the State (or the lowest-achieving five such secondary schools); or (2) is a high school that has had a graduation rate below 60 percent for a number of years.
- Tier III schools: any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I school.

The recently enacted Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (Appropriations Act), which was signed into law by President Obama on December 16, 2009, included two critical changes to the SIG program. First, the law allows SEAs and LEAs to use SIG funds to serve certain “newly eligible” schools. In particular, SIG funds may now be used to serve Title I schools that are not in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds if those schools: (1) have not made adequate yearly progress for at least two years; or (2) are in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates. However, **the Appropriations Act has made this expansion of the list of eligible schools optional for the SEAs. The Nevada Department of Education has decided not to use this flexibility and will stand by its original list of schools designated as “persistently lowest-achieving schools”.**

Second, the Appropriations Act increased the amount that an SEA may award each school participating in the SIG program from \$500,000 annually to \$2 million annually per school per school year. This higher limit will permit an SEA to award directly the \$1 million or more annually that may be necessary for successful implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation models in most Tier I and Tier II schools (*e.g.*, a school of 500 students might require \$1 million and a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million).

\*\*\*The following chart summarizes how an SEA identifies an eligible school as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school. The left column represents the schools an SEA must identify in each of Tiers I, II, and III; the right column represents the newly eligible schools based on the Appropriations Act that an SEA MAY, but is not required to identify in Tiers I, II, and III.

	Schools an SEA <b>MUST</b> identify in each Tier	Newly eligible schools an SEA <b>MAY</b> identify in each Tier
Tier I	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible <u>elementary schools</u> that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest- achieving schools” <b>and</b> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <b>or</b></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>
Tier II	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.”	Title I eligible <u>secondary schools</u> that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” <b>or</b> (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years <b>and</b> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <b>or</b></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>
Tier III	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I.	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II <b>and</b> that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <b>or</b></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two years.</li> </ul>

**SPECIAL NOTE:** The December 10, 2009 Final Requirements also require that an SEA give priority in awarding SIG funds to LEAs that commit to serve Tier I or Tier II schools by implementing one of the four models.

### **Turnaround Model**

A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must do the following:

- (1) Replace the principal and grant the new 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;
- (2) 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;
- (3) 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;
- (4) 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;
- (5) 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;
- (6) 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;
- (7) 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;
- (8) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and
- (9) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

### **Restart Model**

A restart model is one in which an LEA 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 restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

## **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.

## **Transformation Model**

An LEA implementing a transformation model must:

- (1) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
- (2) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that —
  - (a) Take into account data on student growth 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 graduation rates; and
  - (b) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
- (3) 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;
- (4) 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 they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and
- (5) 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 model.

## **B. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES:**

### **1. Eligible Applicants**

*There are nine Nevada LEAs that currently have one or more Title I schools identified as INOI which are eligible to apply for Section 1003(g) funds; these districts are **Carson City, Churchill, Clark, Elko, Mineral, Nye, Pershing, Washoe, and White Pine**. This is a competitive grant award process, and each grant application will be reviewed based upon a number of criteria.*

**Priority will be given to the LEAs with the lowest achieving schools that demonstrate the greatest need and the strongest commitment to improve the academic achievement of**

**students.** “Greatest need” has been determined through analysis of AYP data to priority rank schools based on whether the entire school and/or the identified special populations did not meet the AYP targets. “Strongest commitment” will be documented through specific actions taken by an LEA that support systemic changes designed to improve student achievement at its lowest achieving schools.

**\*\*\*An SEA MUST award SIG funds to serve all of the State’s Tier I and Tier II schools that an LEA commits to serve, and that the SEA determines which LEAs have the capacity to serve, before awarding funds to serve Tier III schools.**

**Grant award amounts will be based on documentation of need and a description of what resources will be needed to implement a school’s chosen intervention model.** The narrative description for each school must include a detailed description of how that school and the LEA will implement each requirement of the chosen intervention model.

## **2. Grant Awards**

The initial funding period will be from *June 4, 2010 through June 30, 2010*. Section 1003(g) awards to an LEA will be renewable for up to three additional one-year periods if schools in the LEA are meeting their identified goals and objectives as stated in their LEA application and which are documented through the NDE evaluation process. Section 1003(g) awards will not be less than \$50,000 for each school per school year and may not exceed the total amount of \$2 million for each school per school year.

## **3. Proposed Timeline**

April 2010	Application available to all eligible applicants
May 14, 2010	Applications due at the Nevada Department of Education on or before this date.
May 15-June 3, 2010	Applications Reviewed and Interview Process conducted.
June 4, 2010	Applicants notified of competition results.
June 4, 2010	Grant period begins

## **4. Application Preparation/Submission:**

All forms required for this Application are included in Part III. Applications are to contain the information identified below and the information is to be organized in the order listed below.

### **Section A. Certification Page**

The Certification Page is found in Section A; inclusion of this page is mandatory.

### **Section B. List of Schools To Be Served**

A template to upload the list of schools to be served is found in Section B. Each LEA to receive funds must identify the school(s) to be served and the intervention model that will be implemented at that school(s).

### **Section C. Descriptive Information**

Directions for completing the Descriptive Information are found in Section C of the application. Each LEA that receives School Improvement Funds must implement one of the four intervention models described on page 14 of this application. As part of the Descriptive Information, each LEA must address the ten requirements that are listed in Section C.

### **Section D. Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedules**

Complete the Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedule found in Appendix B for the amount listed on the Certification page (Section A). An LEA must include a budget for each school to be served that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve. Each LEA that applies for SIG funds will be required to submit a three-year budget for each school it commits to serve separated by fiscal years.

Signatures on the Budget Summary page must be in **blue** ink. The total of the Budget Summary should equal the total of the Supplemental Schedule. There **MUST** be a detailed narrative supplied for items and amounts requested in the Supplemental Schedule; each budgeted item must be directly linked to the selected School Improvement Intervention Model Descriptive Information.

### **Section E. Assurances**

Signatures on the Assurances page must be in **blue** ink. Inclusion of this page is mandatory. The only page that must be included with the proposal is the signature page (Section E).

### **Section F. Waivers**

Inclusion of the “waiver” page is mandatory. As a reminder, if the NDE has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, the LEA **MUST** indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

**Please submit the original signed application and 2 copies of the LEA application to the NDE on or before May 14, 2010.**

**Application Questions:** All questions must be directed to Marcia Calloway at:

Marcia Calloway, Education Consultant  
Nevada Department of Education  
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113  
Carson City, NV 89701  
775-687-9161 (phone) or 775-687-9120 (fax)  
[mcalloway@doe.nv.gov](mailto:mcalloway@doe.nv.gov)

## **5. Process for Review of LEA Applications**

The Nevada Department of Education will establish a panel to review the School Improvement Section 1003(g) funding applications. Each LEA application will be reviewed by at least two panel members.

Each section/item will be reviewed for completeness. The review panel will utilize the attached scoring rubric to determine if the application has all of the required information and then it will be rated to determine if the information is acceptable under the terms of the application. LEAs are asked to refer to the scoring rubric, which is provided in Part II of this application, continuously as they complete their application.

LEAs will submit their written application containing all sections in detailed format to the NDE. If in the opinion of the review panel, the LEA's application meets the requirements of the application and demonstrates the potential capacity to serve the schools identified to be served, each LEA will then be given the opportunity to elaborate on its plan in an interview format. After the interview process, the NDE will determine the final grant awards.

# NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## School Improvement, Section 1003(g) LEAs with Title I Schools in Need of Improvement

### Application

#### Part II

- A. Certification Page*
- B. List of Schools to Be Served*
- C. Descriptive Information*
- D. Budget Summary & Supplemental  
Schedule*
- E. Assurance Certification*
- F. Waivers*

**SEPARATE APPLICATION FOR A SUBGRANT UNDER THE  
NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001  
P.L. 107-110**

**Title I School Improvement  
Section 1003(g)**

Return to: NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Special Education, ESEA & School Improvement Programs  
700 East Fifth Street, Suite 113  
Carson City, NV 89701 ATTN: Marcia Calloway

**SECTION A: CERTIFICATION**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is correct.

The applicant designated below hereby applies for a subgrant of Federal funds to provide instructional activities and services to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children as set forth in this application. The local Board of Trustees has authorized me to file this application and such action is recorded in the minutes of the agency's meeting held on \_\_\_\_\_ (Date).

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Superintendent of Schools or Designated Representative

**PART I - APPLICANT**

Applicant (Legal Name of Agency)	
Mailing Address (Street, P.O. Box, City/Zip)	<b>Application for FY2010</b>
	Starting Date <b>June 4, 2010</b>
Name, title and phone number of authorized contact person:	Ending Date <b>June 30, 2011</b>
<b>Amount of application:</b>	

**PART II - STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION USE**

Date Received:	Obligation Amount	\$ _____
Panel Member Signature:	Date:	

**SECTION B**

**LIST OF SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED**

**School Improvement Section 1003(g)**

**SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.**

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

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

## SECTION C

### DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

**Descriptive Information: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.** This information will be evaluated using the rubric, which begins on page 21. Please consult this rubric throughout this process in order to shape your application.

**Please provide a narrative explaining the following requirements. As a reminder, some of these requirements address the LEA as a whole while others address each school in the application. If you are an LEA with only Tier III schools, please respond to Requirements 8 and 9 only.**

**Requirement 1:** For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs for each school and selected an intervention.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 2:** The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the application in order to implement, fully, and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 3:** If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA, as a whole, must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 4:** The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements at each Tier I and Tier II school to be served.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 5:** The LEA, as a whole, must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—

- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
- Align other resources with the interventions;
- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 6:** The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 7:** The LEA, must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor at each of its Tier I and Tier II schools that receives school improvement funds.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 8:** If applicable, the LEA must identify the services that each Tier III school, that the LEA commits to serve, will receive or the activities the school will implement.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 9:** If applicable, the LEA, as a whole, must describe the goals it has established to hold accountable the Tier III schools it will serve with SIG funds.

*Insert narrative here:*

**Requirement 10:** As appropriate, the LEA, as a whole, must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

*Insert narrative here:*

## **SECTION D**

### **BUDGET SUMMARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE**

**An LEA must include a budget, along with a narrative, for each school to be served that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.**

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to:

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

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

**An LEA's budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I and Tier II schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000, nor drop below the \$50,000 minimum grant award per school.**

**\*\*\*The budgetary forms found in Appendices A and B must be used for each of the fiscal periods listed below:**

1. May 2010 to June 30, 2010
2. July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011
3. July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012
4. July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013
5. July 1, 2013 to September 30, 2013

**SECTION E**

**STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE  
CERTIFICATION - FY2010**

**Name Of District Or Agency:**

**Printed Name And Title Of The District's (Agency's) Signatory:**

The LEA must assure 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 LEA 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 SEA) 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 SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

By signing below, it indicates the individual has read and agrees to follow all of the assurances.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature of Authorized Person**

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

## **SECTION F**

### **WAIVERS**

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

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Note: If an SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in the State.

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

Note: If an SEA has not requested and received a waiver of any of these requirements, an LEA may submit a request to the Secretary.

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF  
EDUCATION**

**School Improvement, Section 1003(g)  
LEAs with Title I Schools in  
Need of Improvement**

**Application**

**Part III**

***Application Review Rubric***

**PART III**

**TITLE I – SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT SECTION 1003(g)  
APPLICATION REVIEW RUBRIC  
2010-2011**

Applicant (Legal Name of Agency):		Total Amount Requested:	
Section Title		Pts. Available	Pts. Awarded
Section A. Certification Page		0	
Section B. List of Schools to be Served		25	
Section C. Descriptive Information		300	
Section D. Budget Summary and Supplemental Schedule		175	
Section E. Assurance Certification		0	
Section F. Waivers		0	
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		<b>500</b>	

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:**

**Do Not Fund**                       **Fund in Full**  
 **Fund in Part**                      **Recommended Funding Amount: \$** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments -Funding Recommendation:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Panel Member Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION A: CERTIFICATION PAGE**

**Maximum Points for this Section: 0 points** - Although no points are allocated for this section, failure to include a signed Certification Page makes the applicant ineligible to receive funding.

**SECTION B: SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED**

**Maximum Points for Section: 25 points**

**Recommended Points \_\_\_\_\_**

**Requirement 1:** The LEA has identified each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

Level I 1-8 Points	Level II 9-17 Points	Level III 18-25 Points
The required chart is completely missing or so many components are incomplete that it is unclear which schools will be served, what Tier the school(s) falls into, or what model will be used.	The required chart is mostly complete, but some required information maybe incomplete or incorrect (for example, NCES numbers are missing).	The required chart is complete with all of the required components.
<b>Comments:</b>		

**SECTION C: DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION**

Maximum Points for this Section: 300 points

Recommended Points: \_\_\_\_\_

**Requirement 1:** For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs for each school and selected an intervention.

Level I 1-16 Points	Level II 17-33 Points	Level III 34-50 Points
<p>The LEA has not used one of Nevada’s established tools for conducting a needs assessment; rather, the needs assessment seems haphazard and disorganized.</p> <p>The needs assessment does not establish a clear, databased link between the data itself and the schools needs. There is a disconnect between the problems and the proposed solutions.</p>	<p>The LEA has attempted to use an established tool for conducting its needs assessment, but the results of that attempt may be somewhat incomplete or limited.</p> <p>The needs assessment provides some evidence of the school’s needs, but it is unclear if the proposed solutions track closely to the data.</p>	<p>The LEA has employed an established tool for conducting its needs assessment (such as the SAGE Data Analysis Guide, the NCCAT-S, or the needs assessment tool contained in the state approved restructuring plan template).</p> <p>The needs assessment provides detailed, databased evidence that clearly shows the schools prioritized needs.</p>
<b>Comments:</b>		

**Requirement 2: The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the application in order to implement, fully, and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.**

Level I 1-16 Points	Level II 17-33 Points	Level III 34-50 Points
<p>The LEA provides little or no evidence that it has the capacity to implement whatever intervention models it has chosen. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates competency in either very few or none of the areas discussed below. The reviewer sees little evidence that the district possesses the capacity to successfully put the specific change drivers in place.</p> <p>a.) <u>Staff recruitment and selection</u>—Staff selection processes for the school to be served are not discussed in any detail and the reviewer does not have a clear picture in mind of how staff selection processes will change at the schools to be served. Some guidance may be available from the LEA to support schools in recruiting personnel. Job descriptions have not been revisited in some time and there is no plan to analyze them for possible changes. Principals have not been removed or relocated and no appetite exists to do so at this time.</p>	<p>LEA provides evidence that it has some capacity to implement whatever intervention models it has chosen, but the evidence may be somewhat thin or lacking. Specifically, the LEA may demonstrate competency in some of the areas discussed below, but fail to address others in sufficient detail, causing the reviewer to wonder if the compensatory nature of some of the change drivers is enough to ensure fidelity and sustainability.</p> <p>a.) <u>Staff recruitment and selection</u>—From the description provided, it is evident that some district-wide policies exist, individual schools determine the methodology they use for recruiting and selecting personnel. Job descriptions are rigidly in place and are not evaluated to determine if changes are needed. Principals have not been removed from schools when there is evidence to suggest that they should be, or they have been moved from one school to another, without the application of supports to increase the administrators’ capacity to improve.</p>	<p>LEA demonstrates in a strong and convincing manner that it has the capacity to fully and effectively implement whatever intervention models it has chosen. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates that it has the capacity to implement change in the following key areas:</p> <p>a.) <u>Staff recruitment and selection</u>—From the description provided, it is evident that the district is committed to reviewing and if necessary revising job descriptions and/or hiring practices for staff members at targeted schools, reviewing and if necessary, modifying the methodology that has been used to recruit and select staff. Furthermore, the district demonstrates that it has the capacity to remove principals who have a history of low achievement (i.e., students have not on the whole, experienced growth in test scores during the administrator’s tenure at the school). The LEA also demonstrates that preliminary conversations have been held</p>

<p>b.) <u>Staff training</u>—The LEA presents little evidence as to how staff training will be used at the school to be served in order to ensure fidelity of implementation of the intervention model. There is no district-wide plan for professional development.</p> <p>c.) <u>Consultation and coaching</u>—The LEA provides little or no detail on how consultation and coaching will be implemented in the school to be served. Specifically, a system for coaching principals and teachers has not yet been attempted, or attempts have not resulted in positive behavior change in those who have been coached.</p>	<p>b.) <u>Staff training</u>—The LEA presents a moderate level of evidence as to how staff training will be used at the school to be served in order to ensure fidelity of implementation of the intervention model. Specifically, Professional development may be inconsistently planned and/or delivered across the district with regard to the criteria established under Level III.</p> <p>c.) <u>Consultation and coaching</u>—The LEA provides some detail on how consultation and coaching will be implemented in the school to be served. Specifically, a system of coaching for both principals and teachers may exist, but is not fully conceptualized with regard to the attributes listed under Level III. Policies and procedures are in development but are not yet fully established, and/or are being tried in limited situations.</p>	<p>with stakeholders such as union representatives regarding changes in recruitment and hiring practices.</p> <p>b.) <u>Staff training</u>—The LEA presents a strong and detailed description of how staff training will be used at the school to be served in order to ensure fidelity of implementation of the intervention model. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates that it has well-established policies and procedures which are consistently implemented so that most or all professional development is planned in response to data based needs; is delivered in accordance with established principles of adult learning (e.g., job-embedded, not one-shot; is evaluated and the results used for school improvement; and is individualized based on a given staff member’s needs or on the needs of the majority of the staff at a school site).</p> <p>c.) <u>Consultation and coaching</u>—The LEA describes with detail and focus how consultation and coaching will be implemented in the school to be served. Specifically, the LEA demonstrates that it has an effective coaching system in place for principals and teachers in which coaching is provided in authentic settings, and which is delivered according to well-established procedures including methods for determining who needs coaching, in what content areas, from whom, and ways</p>
--	--	---

<p>d.) <u>Staff evaluation</u>—The LEA provides little or no description of how staff evaluation processes will reflect those skills taught through staff training and coaching opportunities. There is little or no evidence that the evaluations system is designed to yield changes in staff members’ capacity (i.e., consequences for staff members that result in increased performance, as measured by data, or removal of staff members when necessary).</p> <p>e.) <u>Program evaluation</u>—The LEA demonstrates little evidence as to how it will evaluate the overall performance of the organization over time in implementing the intervention model that has been chosen for the school. A comprehensive evaluation system is not in place to determine the degree to which a school is able to sustain and scale up successful practices.</p>	<p>d) <u>Staff evaluation</u>—The LEA provides a description of how staff evaluation processes will reflect those skills taught through staff training and coaching opportunities. Well-established policies are in place to evaluate staff members, yet these measures do not consider student achievement data as part of the analysis. When evaluations reveal that individuals’ skills are insufficient, systems of support are accessed, but perhaps not consistently and routinely across most or all school setting, or perhaps not for all of most of those individuals who need such support.</p> <p>e) <u>Program evaluation</u>—The LEA demonstrates with some detail how it will evaluate the overall performance of the organization over time in implementing the intervention model that has been chosen for the school. The LEA has a protocol for program evaluation but it is not sufficiently comprehensive to determine the necessary supports that a</p>	<p>of determining if behavior change is occurring in the person(s) being coached, including why the coaching is effective, or if not, then why not.</p> <p>d) <u>Staff evaluation</u>—The LEA presents a detailed description of how staff evaluation processes will reflect those skills taught through staff training and coaching opportunities. The LEA has well-established policies and procedures in place to evaluate the degree to which skills taught through staff training and coaching come to fruition in improved student performance. When data reveal that individuals’ skills are insufficient, systems of support are consistently and routinely accessed for all individuals who have demonstrated insufficient mastery of content (i.e., low student performance as assessed through multiple measures). Preliminary conversations have been held with stakeholders such as union representatives, regarding changes in recruitment and hiring practices</p> <p>e) <u>Program evaluation</u>—The LEA effectively demonstrates how it will evaluate the overall performance of the organization over time in implementing the intervention model that has been chosen for the school. The LEA demonstrates that it has a comprehensive evaluation system in place to assess the degree to which system supports exist to sustain and scale</p>
--	---	--

<p>f.) <u>Facilitative administrative supports</u>—The LEA provides little or no detail as to how the LEA will provide support at the district level. Technical assistance is not routinely available to schools, even when they have failed to achieve targeted performance measures for a year or more.</p> <p>g.) <u>Systems interventions</u>—The LEA provides little or no evidence of how it will facilitate system intervention when the implementation of the model it has chosen for a school needs to be adjusted or realigned in order to ensure fidelity and sustainability of the intervention. A plan is for realignment and adjusted is either not provided at all or it contains so little detail that it is evident that no clear plan of action</p>	<p>school needs in order to improve, and/or those supports are not consistently and routinely applied to all schools that demonstrate such a need. Fidelity of implementation is not consistently assessed or analyzed.</p> <p>f.) <u>Facilitative administrative supports</u>—The LEA demonstrates that it has some capacity to provide support at the district level, but typically schools must request assistance from the LEA when staff members believe support is needed. An evaluation system is not in place to determine which schools are accomplishing targeted objectives versus those that may need greater than typical support.</p> <p>g.) <u>Systems interventions</u>—The LEA provides moderate evidence of how it will facilitate system intervention when the model it has chosen for a school needs to be adjusted or realigned in order to ensure fidelity and sustainability of the intervention. A plan exists but contains limited details on what criteria will be used to make such decisions and/or how intervention will be undertaken.</p>	<p>up successful practices in schools. The LEA has well-established policies and procedures to evaluate why schools achieve the results they do. This system pays particular attention to the fidelity with which implementation of a given variable occurs. Results continually help drive on-going implementation and progress.</p> <p>f.) <u>Facilitative administrative supports</u>—The LEA demonstrates that it has a sufficient number of personnel at the district level to support the number of schools targeted in the LEA’s application. District staff members’ roles are clearly defined relative to the ways in which they will offer support to targeted schools. There is a plan to assess the ways in which targeted district support is assisting schools to improve, and to use those data accordingly (e.g., to leverage supports and/or apply consequences in response to such analyses; to change the way(s) in which support is provided, if necessary.</p> <p>g.) <u>Systems interventions</u>—The LEA has provided evidence that there is a detailed plan for how the LEA will evaluate the degree to which a targeted school is achieving preliminary success with the intervention model that is being implemented at the school and how, when necessary, the LEA will intervene when the model it has chosen for a school needs to be adjusted or realigned in order to ensure</p>
---	--	---

exists.		fidelity and sustainability of the intervention. Possible interventions might include tapping into and aligning external support systems to improve operating conditions, ensuring sufficient financial resources and flexibility, and providing additional organizational support and expertise.
<b>Comments:</b>		

**Requirement 3: If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks the capacity to serve each Tier I school.**

Level I 1-8 Points	Level II 9-17 Points	Level III 18-25 Points
The LEA fails to provide a rationale as to why the LEA lacks the capacity to serve each Tier I school, nor does it show a clear alignment with its needs analysis.	The LEA provides a somewhat vague or limited rationale as to why the LEA lacks the capacity to serve each Tier I school or the rationale may not be in clear alignment with its needs analysis.	The LEA provides a strong detailed rationale as to why the LEA lacks the capacity to serve each Tier I school. The rationale shows a clear alignment with its needs analysis.
<b>Comments:</b>		

**Requirement 4: The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements at each Tier I and Tier II school to be served.**

Level I 1-25 Points	Level II 26-50 Points	Level III 51-75 Points
<p>The LEA makes a very weak case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model. The evidence underlying the choice is non-existent or very limited.</p>	<p>The LEA makes a case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model, but the evidence might not be as convincing as it could be.</p>	<p>The LEA makes a strong case for why it has chosen a particular intervention model for a certain school and how it will implement <u>all</u> of the requirements of that intervention model; each requirement of the chosen model must be included in the LEAs description of how it will implement that model.</p>
<b>TURNAROUND MODEL</b>		
<p>In the case of the turnaround model, the following items may not be addressed at all or in only the most limited of ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The LEA provides little or no description of the process whereby the principal will be replaced, and the description of how the new principal will be given sufficient operational flexibility is also missing or extremely weak;</li> <li>2. The LEA provides little or no description of the measure it will use to determine the effectiveness of staff and of how will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent;</li> <li>3. The LEA offers little or no description</li> </ol>	<p>In the case of the turnaround model, the following items are addressed, but perhaps not to the extent that the reviewer might hope for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The LEA describes a process whereby the principal will be replaced, but this description may lack focus. Additionally, the description of how the new principal will be given sufficient operational flexibility may lack detail as well;</li> <li>2. The LEA provides some description of the measure it will use to determine the effectiveness of staff and of how it will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent;</li> <li>3. The LEA offers some limited</li> </ol>	<p>In the case of the turnaround model, the following items are addressed in detail:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The LEA describes a detailed process whereby the principal will be replaced and the new principal will be given sufficient operational flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement;</li> <li>2. The LEA describes fully the measure used to determine the effectiveness of staff, and provides a detailed description of how it will screen existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent;</li> <li>3. The LEA describes completely such</li> </ol>

<p>of how it will use 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;</p> <p>4. The LEA provides little or no description of how it will provide staff with professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instruction program. What description that is offered of the planned professional development does not demonstrate how the professional development is ongoing, high-quality, or job-embedded;</p> <p>5. The LEA has provided little or no description of how it will implement a new governance structure, for the school;</p> <p>6. The LEA provides little or no description of how it will 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;</p> <p>7. The LEA does not demonstrate with any degree of specificity how it will</p>	<p>description of how it will use 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;</p> <p>4. The LEA presents a description of how it will provide staff with professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instruction program but the professional development described may not meet all the descriptors of being on-going, high-quality, or job-embedded;</p> <p>5. The LEA has provided some description of how it will implement a new governance structure for the school, but the vision for these changes may not be described in much detail;</p> <p>6. The LEA provides some limited description of how it will 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;</p> <p>7. The LEA has demonstrated with a limited degree of specificity how it will</p>	<p>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;</p> <p>4. The LEA presents a compelling description of how it will provide staff with on-going, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program;</p> <p>5. The LEA has described in detail how it will implement a new governance structure for the school;</p> <p>6. The LEA has provided detailed information about how it will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and both horizontally and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards;</p> <p>7. The LEA has fully demonstrated how it will promote the continuous use of student</p>
---	--	--

<p>promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction;</p> <p>8. The LEA has provided little or no description of how the schools to be served by the turnaround model will establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and</p> <p>9. The narrative provides little or no evidence of the LEA’s commitment to provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for schools.</p>	<p>promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction;</p> <p>8. The LEA has provided some description of how the schools to be served by the turnaround model will establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time, but the description may be somewhat lacking in detail; and</p> <p>9. The narrative provides some evidence of the LEA’s strong commitment to provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for schools.</p>	<p>data to inform and differentiate instruction;</p> <p>8. The LEA has clearly described how the schools to be served by the turnaround model will establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and</p> <p>9. The narrative demonstrates the LEA’s strong commitment to provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.</p>
<b>RESTART MODEL</b>		
<p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the Restart model, the following requirements are either not addressed at all or are discussed with little or no supporting detail:</p> <p>1. The LEA offers little or no detail on how it will reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO), nor does it offer much description of the review process that was used.</p>	<p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the Restart model, the following requirements are addressed, but without precision, focus, or much detail:</p> <p>1. The LEA describes in some detail how it will reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a review process. The process may not be described in much detail.</p>	<p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the Restart model, the following requirements are addressed in detail:</p> <p>1. The LEA describes in detail how it will reopen a school under an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. The details of the review process are clearly delineated in the application.</p>
<b>SCHOOL CLOSURE MODEL</b>		
<p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the School Closure model, the following requirements are either not discussed at all or are discussed but only</p>	<p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the School Closure model, the following requirements are addressed, but not in great detail:</p>	<p>In the case where the LEA has chosen to implement the School Closure model, the following requirements are addressed in detail:</p>

<p>in the most sketchy or tangential way:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides little or no description of how the students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. The application does not demonstrate evidence that the schools where these students will be sent are within a reasonable proximity to the closed school nor does the application demonstrate how charter schools or new schools for which there is no achievement data will be considered as possible sites for student transfer.</p>	<p>1. The LEA describes how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher performing schools within the district. 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. However, the description of the process for closing the school and dispersing the students to other schools leaves the reader with some questions about the process.</p>	<p>1. The LEA describes in detail how students originally enrolled in the school that will be closed will be dispersed to other higher-performing schools within the district. 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.</p>
<b>TRANSFORMATION MODEL</b>		
<p>In the case where an LEA has chosen to implement the Transformation model, the following items may addressed in only the most limited way or not at all:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides little or no consideration of how it will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness. Descriptions of the following activities may be extremely limited or not found in the application: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation model will be replace; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers</p>	<p>In the case where an LEA has chosen to implement the Transformation model, the following items are addressed, but perhaps not to the extent that the reviewer might hope for:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides a limited consideration of how it will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness, including all of the following activities: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation model will be replaced; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers that take into account data on student growth as a</p>	<p>In the case where an LEA has chosen to implement the Transformation model, all of the following requirements must be addressed in detail:</p> <p>1. The LEA provides an in-depth consideration of how it will develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness, including all of the following activities: a) a discussion of how the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the Transformation model will be replaced; b) a description of how the district will develop and use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers that take into account data on student growth as a</p>

<p>that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factor sand that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a description of how the LEA will provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development 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) the LEA provides a description of how it will 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 skill necessary to meet the needs of the students in a Transformation school.</p> <p>2. The LEA provides little or no</p>	<p>significant factor as well as other factors and that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a description of how the LEA will provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development 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) the LEA provides a description of how it will 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 skill necessary to meet the needs of the students in a Transformation school. While descriptions of all these elements must be present for the application to be scored as Level II in this area, the descriptions may lack depth and detail.</p> <p>2. The LEA provides a limited</p>	<p>significant factor as well as other factors and that were designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; c) a fully developed description of how the LEA will identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to them to improve their professional practice, have not done so; d) a fully developed description of how the LEA will provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development 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) the LEA provides an in-depth description of how it will 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.</p> <p>2. The LEA provides a detailed</p>
---	---	---

<p>consideration of how it will 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 of how it will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.</p> <p>3. The LEA provides little or no description of how it will increase learning time and create community oriented schools through establishing schedules and strategies that lead to an increase in learning time and that promote family and community engagement.</p> <p>4. The LEA presents little or no detail on how it will provide operational flexibility and sustained support to schools implementing the Transformational model. The application contains no or extremely sketchy descriptions of how such operational flexibility will be granted to schools or of how the LEA will ensure</p>	<p>consideration of how it will 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 of how it will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students. Although the application addresses all areas in which data must be used, the overall impression for the reviewer may be that the description is somewhat lacking in necessary detail.</p> <p>3. The LEA provides a limited demonstration of how it will increase learning time and create community oriented schools through establishing schedules and strategies that lead to an increase in learning time and that promote family and community engagement. However, the description provides may leave the reviewer wondering if the LEA has a full-blown vision for how it will accomplish these requirements.</p> <p>4. The LEA demonstrates with a limited degree of detail how it will provide operational flexibility and sustained support to schools implementing the Transformational model by describing the operational flexibility that will be granted to such schools and ensuring that the school receives ongoing, intensive</p>	<p>consideration of how it will use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and both horizontally and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards and of how it will promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.</p> <p>3. The LEA provides an in-depth demonstration of how it will increase learning time and create community oriented schools through establishing schedules and strategies that lead to an increase in learning time, and that promote family and community engagement.</p> <p>4. The LEA demonstrates in detail how it will provide operational flexibility and sustained support to schools implementing the Transformational model by describing the operational flexibility that will be granted to such schools and ensuring that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support</p>
--	---	--

that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization.	technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization. However, the description of operational flexibility and sustained support is not detailed enough that the reviewer can easily grasp the breadth and depth of flexibility and technical assistance that will be offered.	from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization.
<b>Comments:</b>		

\* Please note that some activities related to the Transformation Model are permissible, but not required. Specifically, in regard to each of the following areas, these “permissible activities” are listed:

- Developing teacher and school leader effectiveness: 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.
  
- Comprehensive instructional reform strategies: 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 assessment, 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.

- Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools: 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.
  
- Providing operational flexibility and sustained support: An 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.

**Requirement 5: The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—**

- **Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;**

Level I 1-8 Points	Level II 9-17 Points	Level III 18-25 Points
<p>If the LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its chosen intervention model, the LEA present little or no evidence to support the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality.</p>	<p>If the LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its chosen intervention model, the LEA presents some limited evidence as to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality.</p>	<p>If the LEA intends to involve external providers in implementing its chosen intervention model, the LEA presents strong evidence as to the process it will use to recruit, screen, and select those providers in order to ensure their quality. A fundable application must include the following strong evidence:            a) A detailed discussion of the recruitment process the LEA will undertake to identify potential external providers; b) A detailed description of what roles the LEA will play in the implementation of the model(s) and of what specific services the external provider will be expected to offer; c) A copy of the LEA’s application for external providers; d) A detailed description of the process that the LEA would utilize o evaluate these applications; e) A discussion of how final selections of external providers will be made; and 7) A detailed process for the monitoring and evaluation of the work of the external provider(s) by the LEA.</p>

- **Align other resources with the interventions;**

The LEA presents little or no evidence as	The LEA demonstrates in a limited manner	The LEA demonstrates in a convincing
---	--	--------------------------------------

<p>to how it will align other resources available to the school and the district to carry out its chosen intervention model.</p>	<p>how it will align other resources available to the school and the district to carry out its chosen intervention model.</p>	<p>manner how it will align other resources available to the school and the district to carry out its chosen intervention model. A fundable application narrative for this requirement must include: a) a workable plan for aligning resources to implement the components of a given intervention model;</p>
--	---	---

- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and**

<p>The LEA provides little or no discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.</p>	<p>The LEA provides some discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; however, the details about these proposed modifications may be sketchy.</p>	<p>The LEA provides a specific and detailed discussion of how it will modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.</p>
--	--	---

- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.**

<p>The LEA presents little or no discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.</p>	<p>The LEA presents some discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends, but the discussion lacks sufficient detail for the reviewer to be convinced that the reforms will indeed be sustained after the funding is gone.</p>	<p>The LEA presents a convincing and detailed discussion of how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. For instance, the LEA specifies what areas, items, or personnel will no longer be budgeted in order to continue this endeavor.</p>
---	--	---

<p><b>Comments:</b></p>
<p> </p>
<p> </p>


**Requirement 6:** The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.

Level I 1-8 Points	Level II 9-17 Points	Level III 18-25 Points
The LEA fails to provide a description of the timeline for each intervention selected to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school identified.	The LEA provides a description of the timeline, which vaguely delineates steps, benchmarks and persons responsible for each intervention selected to be implemented in each Tier I, and Tier II school identified.	The LEA provides a detailed timeline delineating the steps, benchmarks, and persons responsible for each intervention selected to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school identified.
<b>Comments:</b>		

**Requirement 7:** The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.

Level I 1-8 Points	Level II 9-17 Points	Level III 18-25 Points
The LEA fails to provide a description of how determined goals for student achievement in both ELA and Math will monitor Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.	The LEA provides a limited description of how selected annual goals for student achievement in both ELA and Math on State assessments will be used to monitor Tier I and Tier II schools identified.	The LEA provides a clear description of how predetermined annual goals for student achievement on State assessments in both ELA and Math will be used to monitor Tier I and Tier II schools identified.
<b>Comments:</b>		

**Requirement 8:** For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.

Level I 1-8 Points	Level II 9-17 Points	Level III 18-25 Points
The LEA fails to provide a list of each Tier III school to be served, nor does it identify the services the school should receive or the activities to be implemented at the school.	The LEA provides a list of each eligible Tier III school to be served, but the list does not include a detailed description of the services the school would receive or activities to be implemented at the school.	The LEA provides a list of Tier III schools to be served and identifies all of the detailed services the schools will receive or the activities the schools will implement.
<b>Comments:</b>		

**Requirement 9:** As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

Level I Points Combined with #8	Level II Points Combined with #8	Level III Points Combined with #8
The LEA fails to provide a description of how it consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEAs application and implementation of school improvement models in Tier I and Tier II schools.	The LEA provides a vague or limited description of how it consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEAs application and implementation of school improvement models in its identified Tier I and Tier II schools.	The LEA provides a detailed description of the process it used to consult with relevant stakeholders (i.e., staff, parents, community, etc.) regarding the LEAs application and implementation of school improvement models in its identified Tier I and Tier II schools.
<b>Comments:</b>		

**SECTION D: BUDGET**

Maximum Points for Section: 175 Points

Recommended Points: \_\_\_\_\_

**Requirement 1:** An LEA must include a budget, and narrative, for each school to be served that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to:

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

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

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

Level I 1-58 Points	Level II 59-117 Points	Level III 118-175 Points
The LEA provides an extremely limited budget narrative or none at all. The narrative provides the reader with no clearly delineated description of how the funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve; does not demonstrate how the LEA will conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEAs Tier I and	The LEA provides a budget narrative that provides some description of how the funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve; conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation models in the LEAs Tier I and Tier II schools; and support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEAs application.	The LEA provides a detailed budget narrative that describes how the requested funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve; conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEAs Tier I and Tier II schools; and support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school

<p>Tier II schools; and fails to show how the LEA will support school improvement activities for each Tier III school identified in the LEAs application.</p> <p>Calculations on the Budget Summary pages may contain numerous errors, and the breakdown of activities into proper administrative, support, and instructional categories may seem totally wrong.</p> <p>The narrative extensions in the supplemental budget pages show little or no link to the descriptions found in the overall budget narrative, and demonstrate a very limited or no linkage between proposed expenditures and the school intervention model chosen.</p> <p>Calculations in the supplemental budget may contain numerous errors.</p>	<p>All calculations on the Budget Summary are accurate, but the breakdown of activities into proper administrative support, and instructional categories may not always seem appropriate.</p> <p>The narrative extensions in the supplemental budget pages show some link to the descriptions found in the overall budget narrative, and show a limited linkage between proposed expenditures and the school intervention model chosen.</p> <p>All calculations in the supplemental budget are correct.</p>	<p>identified in the LEAs application.</p> <p>The budget summary pages reflect an appropriate and clear breakdown and identification of administrative, support, and instructional expenses, and all calculations are correct.</p> <p>The narrative extensions in the supplemental budget pages clearly link to the descriptions found in the overall budget narrative, and show a clear linkage between proposed expenditures and the school intervention model chosen.</p> <p>All calculations in the supplemental budget are correct.</p>
<b>Comments:</b>		

## **SECTION E: ASSURANCES**

**Maximum Points for Section: 0 points** – Although no points are allocated for this section, failure to include signed Assurances makes applicant ineligible to receive funding.

**Requirement 1: Assurances: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.**

The LEA must assure 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 LEA 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;
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 SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

## **SECTION F: WAIVERS**

**Maximum Points for Section: 0 Points** - Although no points are allocated for this section, failure to include the checked Waiver page makes the applicant ineligible to receive funding.

**Requirement 1: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.**

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

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

NOTE: If an SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to ALL LEAs in the State.

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

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF  
EDUCATION**

**School Improvement, Section 1003(g)  
LEAs with Title I Schools in  
Need of Improvement**

**Application**

**Part IV**

**Appendices**

- A. Budget Summary***
- B. Supplemental Schedule***

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**State or Federal Budget Expenditure Summary**

Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Fiscal Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Check One:      Budget       Budget Amendment       Final Report

OBJECT	DESCRIPTION	INSTRUCTION COST	SUPPORT SERVICES	TOTAL
100	Salaries			
200	Benefits			
300	Purchased Professional/Technical Services			
400	Purchased Property Services			
500	510 Student Transportation Services			
	580 Staff Travel			
	Other (520, 530, 540, 550, 560, 570, 590)			
	<b>Total 500</b>			
600	610 General Supplies (exclude 612)			
	* 612 Non-Technology Items of Higher Value			
	620 Energy			
	630 Food			
	640 Books and Periodicals (exclude 641)			
	641 Textbooks			
	650 Supplies - Information Technology Related (exclude 651, 652, 653)			
	651 Software			
	* 652 Technology Items of Higher Value			
	653 Web-based and Similar Programs			
	<b>Total 600</b>			
800	810 Dues and Fees			
	830 Other Miscellaneous			
	Other (820, 830)			
	<b>Total 800</b>			
Subtotal 100 – 600 & 800				
** Approved Indirect Cost Rate: _____ %				
700	730 Equipment			
	Other (710, 720, 740, 780)			
	<b>Total 700</b>			
<b>TOTAL</b>				

\* All items of value must be itemized in the budget detail

\*\* Indirect cost rates must be approved by the Department of Education before the subgrantee may budget for and charge those costs to the grant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature of Authorized Agency Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

Department of Education Use Only	
Initial	Date Approved

**STATE OR FEDERAL FINAL REPORT OF EXPENDITURES  
SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULE/DETAIL \***

**Project Number:**

**Page Number:**

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
<b>OBJECT CODE</b>	<b>TITLE OF POSITION/PURPOSE OF TIME/NARRATIVE **</b>	<b>PROJECT TIME (FTE)</b>	<b>QUANTITY</b>	<b>SALARY, RENTAL OR UNIT COST</b>	<b>BUDGETED AMOUNT</b>	<b>EXPENDED AMOUNT</b>

**\* If additional space is needed, duplicate this page and number pages.**

**\*\* Explain each item in specific terms. All items must be named, directly related and necessary to the operation of the program.**

**Carson City School District, NCES 3200390**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCES #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>	<b>Grad Rate</b>
Eagle Valley Middle School	320039000315		x		
Empire Elementary School	320039000364			x	
Fremont Elementary School	320039000285			x	
Mark Twain Elementary School	320039000160			x	

**Churchill County School District, NCES 3200030**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCES #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>
Best Elementary School	320003000004			x
Numa Elementary School	320003000431			x

**Clark County School District, NCEC 3200060**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCEC #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>	<b>Grad Rate</b>
Carson Elementary School	320006000064	x			
Desert Pines High School	320006000495	x			x
Fitzgerald Elementary School	320006000269	x			
Hancock Elementary School	320006000027	x			
Mojave High School	320006000445	x			x
Rancho High School	320006000089	x			x
Western High School	320006000114	x			x
Chaparral High School	320006000018		x		x
Cheyenne High School	320006000405		x		x
Eldorado High School	320006000032		x		x
Bailey Middle School	320006000663			x	
Beckley Elementary School	320006000116			x	
Bridger Middle School	320006000057			x	
Brinley Middle School	320006000053			x	
Brown Middle School	320006000301			x	
Cambeiro Elementary School	320006000441			x	
Canyon Springs High	320006000567			x	
Cashman Middle School	320006000056			x	
Cortez Elementary School	320006000471			x	
Cortney Middle School	320006000476			x	
Cozine Elementary School	320006000549			x	
Craig Elementary School	320006000069			x	
Cunningham Elementary School	320006000381			x	
Dearing Elementary School	320006000066			x	
Decker Elementary School	320006000022			x	
Del Sol High School	320006000571			x	
Detwiler Elementary School	320006000489			x	
Diskin Elementary School	320006000086			x	
Edwards Elementary School	320006000031			x	
Elizondo Elementary School	320006000470			x	
Findlay Middle School	320006000570			x	
Fong Elementary School	320006000375			x	
Fremont Middle School	320006000059			x	
Garside Middle School	320006000034			x	
Gibson Middle School	320006000094			x	
Goldfarb Elementary School	320006000439			x	
Griffith Elementary School	320006000028			x	
Guinn Middle School	320006000289			x	
Hal Smith Elementary School	320006000510			x	
Harney Middle School	320006000553			x	
Harris Elementary School	320006000036			x	
Herr Elementary School	320006000397			x	
Herron Elementary School	320006000033			x	
Hickey Elementary School	320006000656			x	
Hollingsworth Elementary School	320006000587			x	
Hughes Middle School	320006000592			x	
Ira Earl Elementary School	320006000050			x	

Iverson Elementary School	320006000551			x	
Jeffers Elementary School	320006000657			x	
Johnston Middle School	320006000672			x	
Keller Middle School	320006000462			x	
Kelly Elementary School	320006000075			x	
Knudson Middle School	320006000062			x	
Lake Elementary School	320006000092			x	
Long Elementary School	320006000113			x	
Lunt Elementary School	320006000373			x	
Mack Middle School	320006000659			x	
Manch Elementary School	320006000052			x	
Martin Middle School	320006000096			x	
Martinez Elementary School	320006000507			x	
McCall Elementary School	320006000088			x	
McCaw Elementary School	320006000038			x	
McWilliams Elementary School	320006000055			x	
Mendoza Elementary School	320006000357			x	
Monaco Middle School	320006000536			x	
Moore Elementary School	320006000508			x	
Mountain View Elementary School	320006000079			x	
O'Callaghan Middle School	320006000404			x	
Orr Middle School	320006000117			x	
Paradise Elementary School	320006000085			x	
Peterson Elementary School	320006000589			x	
Pittman Elementary School	320006000106			x	
Priest Elementary School	320006000584			x	
Reed Elementary School	320006000039			x	
Robert Taylor Elementary School	320006000093			x	
Robison Middle School	320006000025			x	
Ronnow Elementary School	320006000014			x	
Ronzone Elementary School	320006000008			x	
Rundle Elementary School	320006000401			x	
Sawyer Middle School	320006000274			x	
Sedway Middle School	320006000538			x	
Smith Middle School	320006000051			x	
Squires Elementary School	320006000015			x	
Stanford Elementary School	320006000338			x	
Sunrise Acres Elementary School	320006000102			x	
Swainston Middle School	320006000084			x	
Tartan Elementary School	320006000652			x	
Tate Elementary School	320006000081			x	
Thiriot Elementary School	320006000653			x	
Thomas Elementary School	320006000097			x	
Tobler Elementary School	320006000303			x	
Tom Williams Elementary School	320006000104			x	
Vegas Verdes Elementary School	320006000109			x	
Virgin Valley Elementary School	320006000110			x	
Von Tobel Middle School	320006000029			x	
Warren Elementary School	320006000095			x	

Wasden Elementary School	320006000289			x	
Wengert Elementary School	320006000024			x	
West Middle School	320006000460			x	
Whitney Elementary School	320006000115			x	
Woodbury Middle School	320006000017			x	
Woolley Elementary School	320006000372			x	
Wynn Elementary School	320006000377			x	

**Elko County School District, NCES 3200120**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCES #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>	<b>Grad Rate</b>
Adobe Middle School	320012000326		x		
Owyhee Junior High School	320012000684			x	
Southside Elementary School	320012000140			x	
West Wendover Elementary School	320012000308			x	

<b>Mineral County School District, NCEC 3200330</b>				
<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCEC #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>
Hawthorne Elementary School	320033000479			x

<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCEC #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>
Hawthorne Elementary School	320033000479			x

**Nye County School District, NCES 3200360**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCES #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>
Amargosa Valley Elementary School	320036000185			x
Clarke Middle School	320036000412			x
Johnson Elementary School	320036000351			x
Manse Elementary School	320036000191			x

**Pershing County School District, NCES 3200420**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCES #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>
Pershing Middle School	320042000167			x

**Washoe County School District, NCES 3200480**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCES #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>	<b>Grad Rate</b>
Duncan Elementary School	320048000218	x			
Loder Elementary School	320048000209	x			
Smithridge Elementary School	320048000245	x			
Veterans Memorial Elementary School	320048000251	x			
Clayton Middle School	320048000204		x		
Dilworth Middle School	320048000216		x		
O'Brien Middle School	320048000235		x		
Bennett Elementary School	320048000481			x	
Booth Elementary School	320048000230			x	
Cannan Elementary School	320048000240			x	
Corbett Elementary School	320048000242			x	
Kate Smith Elementary School	320048000227			x	
Lincoln Park Elementary School	320048000231			x	
Mariposa Academy	320048000560			x	
Mitchell Elementary School	320048000241			x	
Risley Elementary School	320048000201			x	
Sun Valley Elementary School	320048000249			x	
Traner Middle School	320048000215			x	
Vaughn Middle School	320048000207			x	

<b>White Pine County School District, NCES 3200510</b>				
<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCES #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>
Norman Elementary School	320051000255			x

<b>School Name</b>	<b>NCES #</b>	<b>Tier I</b>	<b>Tier II</b>	<b>Tier III</b>
Norman Elementary School	320051000255			x