

School Improvement Grant Application


Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act



State Education Agency (SEA)
2010-13

Grant Abstract.....	3
Introduction	3
SEA Requirements.....	5
Appendix A: Oregon Statewide System of Support Overview.....	21
Appendix B: Oregon’s Tier I, II, & III Schools.....	23
Appendix C: Defining & Identifying Oregon’s Tier I, II, & III Schools.....	25
Appendix D: Timeline.....	28
Appendix E: Oregon’s Local Education Agency SIG Application Template	26

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Oregon Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: Oregon Department of Education 255 Capitol Street NE Salem, Oregon 97310
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Tryna M. Luton Position and Office: Director of School Improvement and Accountability Office of Educational Improvement & Innovation Contact's Mailing Address: Oregon Department of Education Public Service Building 255 Capitol Street NE Salem, Oregon 97310-0203 Telephone: (503) 947-5922 Fax: (503) 378-5156 Email address: <u>tryna.luton@state.or.us</u>	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Susan Castillo	Telephone: (503) 947-5740
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: 	Date: June 28, 2010
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

Grant Abstract

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) is applying for full funding of its School Improvement Grant application under authorization of Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Under the requirements of this grant, the SEA (ODE) will require each identified Local Education Agency (LEA) funded school to establish and verify its NEED for improvement, based upon common state and local measurement data, and to establish its CAPACITY to take the collaborative steps proposed in the locally-developed School Improvement Plan.

The SEA will provide a system of consistent support for identified LEAs and funded schools through an Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS), and require an annual evaluation review of the process and progress of each funded school to initiate and sustain the improvement measures proposed. Budgets that match improvement proposals for each area in the School Improvement Plan will be of particular importance, especially as the school sustains school improvement efforts beyond the life of this Federal School Improvement Grant opportunity.

Introduction

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as reauthorized in 2002, states were required to establish a state system of support to assist schools designated in need of improvement under the act. Oregon responded by creating the Regional School Improvement Coordinator (RSIC) program, with the assistance of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (now Education Northwest). This program then became the Oregon School Improvement Facilitator (OSIF) program, under the leadership of the Oregon Association of Education Service Districts (OAESD). This has been the primary support for schools identified as needing improvement.

The School Improvement and Accountability Team, within the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation, supports and facilitates efforts in all schools to increase student achievement by assisting schools in developing, implementing, and monitoring school improvement plans; building the capacity of local schools to support effective leadership at all levels; and provide professional learning to design and support meaningful student work. In addition, the Team coordinates the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS; see Appendix A) for all Oregon schools and provides resources and intensive support for schools not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). As identified LEAs become involved in the process of school improvement, collaboration between and among the various players is required; schools will not be allowed to exist in isolation without a strong support system for the work they are doing.

ODE has an established history of consistent work in identifying, monitoring, and evaluating the identified Title I and other School Improvement Schools in the state. Through analysis of data from schools, ODE has created a resource base of critical information about those schools in need of assistance and intervention. Under Federal guidelines, ODE staff has developed criteria for the identification, review, monitoring, and sustained support of low-achieving schools, in collaboration with stakeholders in the districts and schools, the regional Education Service Districts (ESDs), and other organizations. ODE has consistently taken advantage of all funds and programs available to assist the identified persistently low-achieving schools in the state to address and change their performance. With diligence and sustained efforts in the schools across the state, a number of schools needing improvement have been able to meet AYP.

SEA Requirements

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

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

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

For list of Tier I, Tier II and Tier II schools, see Appendix B. Note: Included on this list is an explanation of how Oregon Tier I and Tier II schools were selected (by achievement, graduation rate or both).

For the Tier Definition, see Appendix C.

The Oregon Department of Education did not exercise the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school, a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

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

Part 1

The attached (see Appendix E) Local Education Agency School Improvement Grant Application contains questions that address the NEED and CAPACITY each applicant will need to establish for the identified Tier I and Tier II schools in their jurisdiction (see Appendix B for the ODE definition of Tiers).

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

1. The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

The LEA Application outlines the information each LEA funded school will need to provide to establish the NEED for School Improvement Grant funds for the intervention selected for that school. Those applications, once submitted by the LEA, will be reviewed in a formal review process by a trained set of readers, and each application will be rated, based upon the LEA's establishment of the need for the identified school.

Specifically:

The SEA will require evidence that the LEA has conducted needs assessments of each Tier I and Tier II school to determine which intervention will be selected.

An acceptable needs assessment will include:

- An analysis of more than one previous school improvement plan to identify measurable targets set, how effective the plans were in meeting targets, and other indicators (such as student growth, multiple observation-based assessments of performance, and/or ongoing collections of professional practice matched to student achievement) to determine the level of fidelity of implementation
- OR**
- In the case where multiple years of school improvement plans are not available from the school, alternative sources of similar information will be specified and used.
 - The LEA has examined student achievement in sub groups to determine instructional needs of students. This will include subgroups identified as unique and consequential to the school beyond those specified in ESEA. These might include neighborhood of residence, students transferring from other districts, and/or Career and Technical Education (CTE) program participants that could include mathematics and/or English/Reading instruction that also serves to improve and enhance student achievement and skills.
 - The LEA has examined such factors as governance, staffing, parent involvement, curriculum, instruction, staff capacity to meet instructional needs, facilities, and funding sources to determine areas of concern and weakness. The district may also conduct a match-gap analysis to identify any possible gaps between the existing Oregon standards and actual instructional practice in the classroom. Any identified gaps can then be closely examined to improve the school curriculum and instruction to improve student achievement.
 - The LEA has examined all of the above in order to select the most appropriate intervention for each of the Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

As with item (1) above, each submitting LEA must show its CAPACITY to find and develop the required resources for the intervention selected. The selected intervention for each school must

be sufficiently supported through the development of a workable School Improvement Plan by a School Improvement Grant Leadership Team (SIG-LT) drawn from the local educational community, and be planned out such that ACTIONS proposed are matched on the timeline and budget submitted.

The consistency, efficacy, ability to implement the interventions fully and effectively, and the sustainability over time of the proposed improvement plans and actions will be reviewed in a formal process with sufficient feedback offered to each submitting LEA so that it receives a solid start on the intervention process. Collaboration between and among all involved parties will be emphasized as the School Improvement Grant Leadership Team (SIG-LT) moves ahead.

The formal process for review of submitted LEA applications will occur as follows: The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) will post the LEA/School application online, and districts and schools will download the document to complete. All applications are due by May 7, 2010.

ODE will assemble a panel of K-12 and other educators to review the submitted applications. There will be a half-day of training for the reviewers using the Scoring Rubric (see attached.) Once an acceptable level of reader reliability is achieved, the actual review will begin, and is expected to take 1.5 days.

Each application will be read and rated three times. Reviewer comments regarding specific areas of the application will be made and discussed by each of the teams, and those comments will be pulled together for feedback to LEAs/Schools. One member of each team reading the applications will be ODE staff.

At the conclusion of the review (May 13 and 14, 2010) ODE staff will compile the ratings to see which of the applications is complete, and ready for funding, and which are in need of further work.

ODE staff will contact districts and schools with applications needing more information or other work, and schedule a face-to-face meeting, as needed, to help with the application completion. Those applications will again be submitted, with the expectation that all applicants will be funded by the first week of June 2010.

After thorough evaluation and research, the LEA will commit to:

- Dedicate adequate and experienced staff, resources, time and focus to fully implementing the selected intervention in each of the Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools identified in its application;
- Participation in the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS) as part of fully and effectively implementing the selected intervention

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

LEAs will be required to submit a separate budget for each identified Tier I and Tier II school that will allow for a detailed assessment as to whether sufficient funds have been requested and appropriately budgeted to implement the selected intervention model. Due to the funding needed

to fully and effectively implement one of the intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school in the State, Tier III schools will not be funded through SIG. The assessment of sufficiency of funds will be guided primarily by the demonstrated needs of the LEA to allow them to serve each Tier I and Tier II school.

LEAs will be asked to describe their needs to implement the selected intervention model(s), and they will also be asked to identify relevant areas of alignment with other federal, state and local funding sources. LEAs will be required to also include information about other fiduciary resources that are allocated to the school that will be used to implement the selected intervention model. Considering the LEA's demonstrated needs and identified areas of alignment with other funding sources, The Oregon Department of Education will determine if sufficient funds have been budgeted to fully and effectively implement the selected intervention model and other grant requirements, as follows:

- Implementing fully and effectively the components, as outlined in the final requirements, of the selected intervention model for each Tier I and /or Tier II School for which the LEA has elected to serve.
- Implementing systemic changes in leadership, student support, curriculum, instruction and assessment that will support the implementation of the selected intervention
- Participating in the Oregon Statewide System of Support.
- Providing time for staff collaboration and professional development that directly supports implementation of the selected intervention model.
- Providing leadership development for principals and other school leaders that directly supports implementation of the selected intervention model.
- Providing training for new teachers that join turnaround schools through mentoring and job-embedded professional development.

Part 2

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

Introduction

The Oregon Department of Education has committed to a 3.5 year plan process (see Timeline in Appendix D), with implementation of the model starting at the beginning of the 2010-11 school year. Planning on the part of identified LEA's/schools will begin as soon as funds are made available.

Additionally, LEAs will be expected to examine data from past years of School Improvement efforts, including existing and proposed School Improvement Plans, and the results and outcomes from work with those plans. In addition, LEAs will be required to address the following questions in the application for School Improvement Grant funds.

1. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.
2. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

3. Align other resources with the interventions.
4. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.
5. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

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

Some factors that Oregon Department of Education will use to assess the LEAs commitment to design interventions consistent with the final requirements may include, but are not limited to:

Leadership and Decision Making:

- The LEA has plans to regularly engage the school community to inform them of progress toward the design and implementation of the interventions and to give them an opportunity to provide input.
- The LEA has successfully completed a continuous improvement planning process that will guide the design of interventions.
- The LEA has implemented a comprehensive needs assessment that will inform the design and implementation of intervention strategies.

Curriculum and Instruction:

- The LEA provides direction to the school in the description, scope, focus, articulation and alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessments with state standards.

Human Capital (Personnel):

- The LEA has staff in place with the expertise and experience to research and design the selected intervention as intended while still meeting local needs.

Student Support:

- The LEA will engage parents in supporting students in increased student achievement
- The LEA will describe how it will address the needs of specific student populations including, but not limited to students of poverty, English Language Learners and students with disabilities.

Budgeting:

- The LEA has set aside time and resources sufficient to facilitate the design and ongoing implementation of interventions.
- The LEA has demonstrated adequate fiscal capacity to implement the selected intervention models.

The SEA will convene a review committee comprised of ODE staff, district leaders (from districts not eligible for the grant), and leaders from various educational agencies. The review committee will meet for two days to evaluate the grant applications and to assess the LEA's commitment to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Each application will be reviewed more than once by separate individuals. The review committee will use a rubric created by the SEA to evaluate the extent to which the SEA exceeds, meets, or fails to meet requirements. Following the initial review process, ODE staff will meet with each LEA to discuss areas of concern (i.e., failure to meet requirements). The LEA will have the opportunity to rewrite its applications

and resubmit it to the review committee which will convene for a second time to evaluate the SEA's commitment.

Continued assessment of the LEA's commitment and sufficiency will take place by means of the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS). Each district will be assigned a support coach and ODE team member. School coaches will be assigned to help meet and review goals. ODE team members will meet with the district and school teams, communicate, and monitor progress on an ongoing basis.

These are the same process for each of # 1- 5 in this section.

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

The Oregon Department of Education will use the following criteria to assess the LEA's request for additional external support beyond what is available through the Oregon Statewide System of Support:

Reasonable and timely steps it will take to recruit and screen providers to be in place by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year that may include, but are not limited to:

- Analyzing the LEA's operational needs.
- Researching and prioritizing the external providers available to serve the school.
 - Consider and analyze the external provider market.
 - Contact other LEAs currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding their experience.
- Engaging parents and community members to assist in the selection process.
- Delineating clearly the respective responsibilities and expectations to be assumed by the external provider and the LEA.

Detailed and relevant criteria for selecting external providers that take into account the specific needs of the Tier I and/or Tier II schools to be served by external providers. These criteria may include, but are not limited to:

- A proven track record of success working with a particular population or type of school. For example, success in working with high schools or English Language Learners.
- Alignment between external provider services and existing LEA services.
- Willingness to be held accountable to high performance standards.
- Capacity to serve the identified school and its selected intervention model.

The SEA will assist LEAs in their review processes for selecting external providers if the LEA recruits, screens and selects any external providers for use in their implementation plan. The external providers that will be part of statewide services provided as part of the OSSS, will be recruited, screened and selected within the ODE contract and procurement process. The ODE School Improvement team will, with the assistance of the ODE Procurement Office, create contracts and request for proposals to be put out for bid. When proposals are reviewed, a review team will be selected of ODE team members, district personnel, Educational Service District personnel, and/or other appropriate ODE partners. The review team will read and score proposals individually using procurement evaluation criteria. The review team will come together after doing individual reviews and make decisions on the external providers. Potential providers will be scrutinized by the Oregon

Department of Justice and/or the Oregon Department of Administrative Services for fiscal stability and a check of references and criminal record. ODE will then negotiate further details of the contract and finish the procurement process.

3. Align Resources with interventions.

An LEA can build capacity for a school to implement one of the intervention models through the alignment of resources with school improvement activities. In general, funding sources for LEAs come from two sources; the state general fund and federal funds. It is critical that areas for alignment of resources are identified in the LEA application. The Oregon Department of Education will carefully assess the LEA's commitment to align ALL school resources with the SIG funds by determining the extent to which it demonstrates the ability and willingness to effectively integrate various activities funded at the federal and state level with SIG-funded activities. Funding sources that may be considered when assessing the LEA's commitment to align other resources to the SIG interventions include, but are not limited to: Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A; Title II, Part D; Title III, Part A; and state and local revenues.

Budgeting:

- The LEA completes a thorough examination of all resources provided to school to ensure systemic efforts in fully implementing the selected intervention model.
- The LEA has set aside time and resources sufficient to facilitate the design and ongoing implementation of interventions.
- The LEA has demonstrated adequate fiscal capacity to implement the selected intervention model.
- The LEA includes provisions for sustaining support for the school when funding ends under the program.

The SEA will convene a review committee comprised of ODE staff, district leaders (from districts not eligible for the grant), and leaders from various educational agencies. The review committee will meet for two days to evaluate the grant applications and to assess the LEA's commitment to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Each application will be reviewed more than once by separate individuals. The review committee will use a rubric created by the SEA to evaluate the extent to which the SEA exceeds, meets, or fails to meet requirements. Following the initial review process, ODE staff will meet with each LEA to discuss areas of concern (i.e., failure to meet requirements). The LEA will have the opportunity to rewrite its applications and resubmit it to the review committee which will convene for a second time to evaluate the SEA's commitment.

Continued assessment of the LEA's commitment and sufficiency will take place by means of the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS). Each district will be assigned a support coach and ODE team member. School coaches will be assigned to help meet and review goals. ODE team members will meet with the district and school teams, communicate, and monitor progress on an ongoing basis.

These are the same process for each of # 1- 5 in this section.

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

Leadership:

- The LEA will describe development or modification of policies that will support full implementation of the intervention model.

Human Capital (Personnel):

- The LEA will describe performance incentives for personnel
- The LEA will describe changes in policies and procedures (hiring, placing, evaluating, promoting, retaining and replacing) to ensure full implementation of the intervention model.
- The LEA will describe how it will work with local collective bargaining agreements and labor unions in order to fully implement the selected intervention model.
- The LEA will describe professional development processes and procedures that align with full implementation of the selected intervention model.

Student Support:

- The LEA will describe programs and services for English language learners
- The LEA will describe extended learning time, (extension of the school day and year, after-school programs, summer school,) for example:
 - Additional instructional time during the school day and during the summer
 - Parental involvement, communication, and options
 - Special education programs and procedures
 - Student support services (tutoring, counseling, placement, for example)

The SEA will convene a review committee comprised of ODE staff, district leaders (from districts not applying for the grant), and leaders from various educational agencies. The review committee will meet for two days to evaluate the grant applications and to assess the LEA's commitment to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Each application will be reviewed more than once by separate individuals. The review committee will use a rubric created by the SEA to evaluate the extent to which the SEA exceeds, meets, or fails to meet requirements. Following the initial review process, ODE staff will meet with each LEA to discuss areas of concern (i.e., failure to meet requirements). The LEA will have the opportunity to rewrite its applications and resubmit it to the review committee which will convene for a second time to evaluate the SEA's commitment.

Continued assessment of the LEA's commitment and sufficiency will take place by means of the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS). Each district will be assigned a support coach and ODE team member. School coaches will be assigned to help meet and review goals. ODE team members will meet with the district and school teams, communicate, and monitor progress on an ongoing basis.

These are the same process for each of # 1- 5 in this section.

5. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

Sustainability of practices beyond the funding period begins with careful planning of the initial implementation of the selected intervention model. LEAs will need to develop initial implementation plans for the selected model that demonstrate how School Improvement funds will be used. However, the plan LEAs submit will also need to demonstrate careful planning of how the reform efforts will continue after the SIG funds have ended. The SEA will not approve LEA applications that do not include this long-term sustainability plan. The long-term plan is described below:

The LEA will describe how it will sustain implementation of the intervention model when funding ends, that addresses and includes the following:

- Shared leadership between the school and the broader community in planning and implementation of the intervention model during and after the funding period;
- Plans for addressing staffing and funding changes including transitions in leadership;
- Long-term planning processes that will support implementation of reforms with progress monitoring levels of implementation and progress toward outcomes;
- A comprehensive system of formative and summative data collection that is in place to monitor progress and drive decision-making;
- The ability to continue offering additional instructional time and extended school year;
- Institutionalizing the measuring fidelity of implementation of research-based instructional practices;
- Protecting staff time for collaboration in order to sustain the initiatives;
- Professional development for new staff and leadership to continue implementation of the reforms;
- Job-embedded professional development to ensure high fidelity of implementation of reforms in the classroom.

The SEA will convene a review committee comprised of ODE staff, district leaders (from districts not eligible for the grant), and leaders from various educational agencies. The review committee will meet for two days to evaluate the grant applications and to assess the LEA's commitment to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements. Each application will be reviewed more than once by separate individuals. The review committee will use a rubric created by the SEA to evaluate the extent to which the SEA exceeds, meets, or fails to meet requirements. Following the initial review process, ODE staff will meet with each LEA to discuss areas of concern (i.e., failure to meet requirements). The LEA will have the opportunity to rewrite its applications and resubmit it to the review committee which will convene for a second time to evaluate the SEA's commitment.

Continued assessment of the LEA's commitment and sufficiency will take place by means of the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS). Each district will be assigned a support coach and ODE team member. School coaches will be assigned to help meet and review goals. ODE team members will meet with the district and school teams, communicate, and monitor progress on an ongoing basis.

These are the same process for each of # 1- 5 in this section.

B. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to

implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school.

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

The SEA expects that all districts with schools identified as Tier I and II have the capacity to meet the needs of ALL of those schools in implementing these reforms. Districts claiming a lack of capacity must make a strong argument of a lack of capacity. LEAs will be required to complete a School Capacity Check List (included in the LEA application) that addresses four general areas. They are:

- **Human Capacity:** referring to the knowledge, understanding, and commitment of individuals in the LEA.
- **Organizational Capacity:** referring to relationships among individuals both within the LEA and with individuals outside the LEA to support intervention implementation (i.e., collaboration, networking, partnerships, and culture).
- **Structural Capacity:** referring to the functional elements of the system such as LEA policies, procedures, and practices to support implementation.
- **Material Capacity:** referring to fiscal and material resources available to support implementation in the LEA.

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

LEAs will need to establish a lack of CAPACITY, based upon findings from completion of the Capacity Check List and other data. The Oregon Department of Education will place a high priority of serving each of its Tier I schools. LEA's claims of lack of capacity to serve these schools will receive additional attention from the Oregon Department of Education. ODE will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model using the LEA's responses on the School Capacity Check List to further investigate claims of lack of capacity. In addition, ODE will assess lack of capacity in implementation of an intervention model with regard to the following issues:

- A commitment to support the selected intervention model by the teachers' union, the School Board, staff and parents.
- Ability of the LEA to recruit staff with credentials and capability to implement the selected intervention models successfully.

If an LEA is found to have more capacity than it claimed, the ODE's subsequent steps might involve any or all of the following actions:

- ODE team discussion and evaluation of the lack of capacity.
- Discussion with upper ODE management.
- A meeting with the LEA to address questions and concerns as well as to invite clarification of the LEAs statements on the application.

- Based on results from the previous steps, the ODE team may determine that the LEA does not have capacity and is excused from applying.
- OR
- That LEA capacity is present. At that point, ODE would require the LEA to apply for the SIG. Title I School Improvement Funds would be withheld until the LEA is in compliance.

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

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

LEA applications will be due May 7, 2010
 LEAs will receive notification no later than July 31, 2010
 Grant funds will be disbursed immediately on approval
 For more information refer to Appendix D

2. Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant if one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) will have in place the Oregon Statewide System of Support that includes a Network and a school review to support the work of School Improvement Grant districts and schools.

As part of the LEA application process, schools are to list and describe the goals they have for implementation in the selected intervention model. Over the year, the school is required to collect formative data regarding their implementation and the progress made over the year toward achievement of their goals.

In May of 2011, ODE will visit each funded school to conduct a Compliance Review to see where goals were met and where further work needs to be done. Achievement and other data demonstrating progress toward stated school achievement goals in mathematics and reading/language arts will be considered for this first Compliance Review; however primary emphasis for this first year will be placed upon school efforts toward total goal accomplishment for the selected intervention model. The “quality” of their steps will be measured this first year; the second year ODE will require more specific mathematics and reading/language arts achievement goals for students at each funded school so that measurable performance becomes the focus as the school moves into the second and third years of funding. Funding in each succeeding year is dependent upon movement toward accomplishment of stated implementation goals for the selected intervention. Specifically,

- The SEA will review student performance on statewide assessments to evaluate progress.
- The SEA will require an annual report that describes progress toward meeting improvement goals, measured on common local assessments using measures closely-related to established goals, and administered at least three times during the academic year toward meeting growth targets in the school’s improvement plan.

- The SEA will meet annually with the LEA to evaluate progress toward improvement goals

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

The SEA will review progress toward the goals established by the LEAs for Tier III schools. Schools that meet goals would be provided continuing funding. Schools that make progress, but do not meet the proposed goals would be required to present evidence as to why the school did not meet the anticipated goals. Each case would be individually weighed to make a determination of whether or not continued funding would be appropriate. Schools that either remain status quo or decline in progress will not receive continued funds.

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

- The SEA will conduct an annual on-site review of the implementation of the school Intervention Model
- The District Support Coach (DSC) from the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS) will provide quarterly reports and briefings to the SEA on implementation and student achievement progress at the LEA;
- Annual School Progress Reports will include a detailed description of progress toward implementation of the planned activities related to the reform/Intervention effort.

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

Applying LEA’s will be funded in the following manner:

- Adequate funding for Tiers I and II; and
- Tier III schools are ranked by achievement and persistence of low-achievement, and will be funded in order from lowest achieving to highest achieving until all funds are distributed, with priority given to Tier III schools that will implement one of the Intervention Models.

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

Tier III schools are ranked by achievement and persistence of low-achievement, and will be funded in order from lowest achieving to highest achieving until funds are committed, with priority given to Tier III schools that will implement one of the Intervention Models.

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.

The State does not have the capacity to take over any schools.

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

This is not applicable.

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

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

- ✓ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- ✓ Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- ✓ Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.
- ✓ Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the State receives FY 2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the State).
- ✓ Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- ✓ Monitor each LEA's implementation of the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- ✓ To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model 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

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

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.

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

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

ODE staff has developed the LEA application template, and will be applying the adopted review rubric to evaluate the LEA plans, implementation strategies, and associated budgets.

Additionally, we will (see TIMELINE, Appendix D):

- Provide regional SIG application workshops
- Conduct evaluation of applications
- Create associated forms and other digital tools
- Review plans and administer sub-grants
- Host technical assistance meetings with districts

To delineate, ODE will be doing the following:

- Provide overall coordination of the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS) for low achieving schools, feeder schools and schools/districts in improvement
- Oversee reporting processes, including but not limited to reporting to policymaking groups and the public sector.
- Create and implement an LEA and School Improvement Network for low achieving schools, feeder schools and schools/districts in improvement. This will include:
 - Coaches for funded schools,
 - Professional development for funded schools, and
 - Ongoing evaluation of progress being made toward school improvement goals.
- Provide mentoring opportunities for administrators in participating schools and districts. This will include a strong evaluation component as school leaders work with their improvement and action plans.
- Provide state and regionally based content expert support for participating schools and districts. Through the OSSS program specialists in reading/language arts, STEM, English Language Learners, Special Education, and mathematics will be provided to identified funded schools. The overall impact and success of this work will be evaluated as part of the ongoing assistance through OSSS.
- Create and implement a school review protocol for implementation in participating schools and districts. This review protocol will be closely matched to the rubric used to guide LEAs and Focus Schools in the writing of their LEA application to ODE, and also to the annual evaluation and review, upon which each year of LEA funding is hinged.
- Enhance and expand LEA and Focus School capacity for family and community involvement through a coordinated, systemic process – building on the existing “Family

Involvement Matters” curriculum.

- Build on existing extended learning programs; expand opportunities for low achieving schools, feeder schools, and LEAs/schools in improvement.
- Create and conduct an external evaluation of the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS).

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

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

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

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

The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including Northwest Regional Comprehensive Center (NWRCC), Oregon Education Association (OEA), Oregon Association of Education Service Districts (OAESD), and others.

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

The Oregon 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.

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a school wide 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.

[The waiver request has been posted to the Title IA School Improvement website at:

<http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=1942>.

Appendix A

Oregon Statewide System of Support Overview Oregon Department of Education

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as reauthorized in 2001, states were required to establish a state system of support to assist schools designated as in need of improvement. Oregon responded by creating the Oregon School Improvement Facilitator (OSIF) Program to support schools identified as needing improvement.

Although the OSIF program has been contributing to the successful transformation of schools, the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) saw the need to expand the program to provide additional support to districts, and therefore, be more effective in their efforts to improve schools. Furthermore, the US Department of Education (USDOE) has undergone a significant transition with the incoming new administration. The USDOE is aligning several initiatives and related funding to bring about coherence in how states address low achieving schools. As a result, Oregon's system of supporting schools must evolve in order to assist districts in meeting increased demands toward improved student achievement.

Theory of Action

While there are very fine schools in Oregon, we acknowledge that some schools need help to meet the needs of all students. Individual educators are doing the best they know how but there is always room for improvement. The one thing that can improve student academic performance is improved instruction. Therefore, the following Theory of Action was generated to guide the Statewide System of Support.

If school administration and staff:

- Acknowledge that improvement is necessary, and take responsibility for changing and improving instructional practices
- Develop and continuously refine a common understanding of how students learn in their respective subject areas that is based on research
- Focus Collaborative team work to enact their understanding of how students learn in their efforts to improve teaching and learning
- Hold all students, including all subgroups, to high expectations, and appropriately challenge all students
- Implement safe and collaborative school-based professional development experiences that involves teachers observing students across classrooms and debriefing that focuses on improving instructional practice of how all students learn
- Align what is taught to state standards and benchmarks
- Utilize local assessments and progress monitoring to inform instruction and respond with appropriate adjustments in instruction.

Then:

- Schools will develop a culture of excellence for all students focused on continuous improvement of teaching and learning that changing students' lives for the better

- Student achievement will improve; schools will meet AYP; and schools will no longer be in improvement or lowest achieving status.

School Improvement Network

The school improvement network is comprised of a multi-tiered coaching model that will directly and collaboratively work with districts in improvement and districts with schools in improvement, identified under Title I-A. Under this model, schools and districts are provided support and resources through a District Support Coach, a School Support Coach, a Regional School Improvement Specialist, and a Support Network Coordinator. Additionally, to ensure districts receive a proper level of technical assistance and support from the SEA, a District Response Team has been created to work with the District Support Coach for every district in improvement or districts with schools in improvement.

School Reviews

The school review process provides a comprehensive framework for identifying the needs and strengths of a school as a whole. The process is based on a set of school and district standards that were developed from research on best practices in education. During a school visit the review team gathers an array of evidence from a variety of sources including: student work, classroom observations, interviews, surveys, school improvement plans and other documents. A written report is provided to the school and district upon completion of the review, making the data available for assistance in planning and implementing improvement efforts.

Mentoring

Mentoring programs are designed to support development of school leadership. In looking at the needs of a particular school or district in improvement, the district/or support coach may focus their attention on mentoring an individual or a team of leaders within the school and or district, depending on the identified needs.

Appendix B

Oregon's Tier I, II, and III Schools

District Name	School Name	NCES Code	Tier	Grad Rate	Achvmt	Reason for Incl
Portland SD 1J	Arts, Communication, & Technology School	411004001529	I	50.10	45.2	Grad Rate
Portland SD 1J	Biz Tech High School (not applying)	411004001605	I	42.70	41.0	Achvmt
Portland SD 1J	Pursuit of Wellness Education at Roosevelt	411004001532	I	74.87	43.1	Achvmt
Portland SD 1J	Spanish - English International School	411004001531	I	59.50	39.2	Achvmt
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	Hallman Elementary School	411082001444	I	NA	43.7	Achvmt
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	McKay High School	411082001296	I	76.47	41.8	Achvmt
Beaverton SD 48J	Community School	410192000220	II	73.73	23.4	Achvmt
Bend-LaPine Administrative SD 1	Marshall High School	410198000688	II	62.26	13.0	Achvmt
Eugene SD 4J	Network Charter School (not applying)	410474001593	II	50.26	52.3	Grad Rate
Fern Ridge SD 28J	Willamette Leadership Academy (not applying)	410495001525	II	50.00	43.4	Achvmt
Jefferson County SD 509J	Madras High School	410674000456	II	79.59	39.8	Achvmt
Klamath Falls City Schools	Eagle Ridge High School	410708001687	II	NA	39.4	Achvmt
North Clackamas SD 12	New Urban High School (not applying)	410883001583	II	63.34	37.3	Achvmt
Ontario SD 8C	Ontario High School	410927000746	II	64.23	40.3	Achvmt
Oregon City SD 62	Oregon City Service Learning Academy	410933001666	II	63.06	28.2	Achvmt
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	Early College High School	411082001717	II	30.77	43.2	Both
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	Roberts High School	411082001738	II	30.52	23.8	Both
Amity SD 4J	Amity Elementary School	410123001260	III			
Astoria SD 1	Lewis & Clark Elementary School	410162000156	III			
Bend-LaPine Administrative SD 1	LaPine Middle School	410198000264	III			
Centennial SD 28J	Harold Oliver Intermediate Center	410280001015	III			
Centennial SD 28J	Lynch Meadows Elementary School	410280001012	III			
Central Point SD 6	Central Point Elementary School	410294000402	III			
Coos Bay SD 9	Madison Elementary School	410366000211	III			
Creswell SD 40	Creswell Middle School	410369000605	III			
David Douglas SD 40	Mill Park Elementary School	410394001033	III			
David Douglas SD 40	Ron Russell Middle School	410394001676	III			
Eagle Point SD 9	Mountain View Elementary	410450000415	III			
Forest Grove SD 15	Tom McCall Upper Elementary	410516001339	III			
Gervais SD 1	Douglas Avenue Alternative School	410001501588	III			
Gervais SD 1	Gervais High School	410001500853	III			
Gervais SD 1	Gervais Middle School	410001500831	III			
Gresham-Barlow SD 10J	Highland Elementary School	410600000991	III			

District Name	School Name	NCES Code	Tier	Grad Rate	Achvmt	Reason for Incl
Hillsboro SD 1J	Mooberry Elementary School	410002301173	III			
Hillsboro SD 1J	W L Henry Elementary School	410002301175	III			
Hillsboro SD 1J	Witch Hazel Elementary School	410002301202	III			
Jefferson SD	Jefferson Middle School	410671001294	III			
Jefferson County SD 509J	Buff Elementary School	410674001569	III			
Jefferson County SD 509J	Jefferson County Middle School	410674000656	III			
Jefferson County SD 509J	Madras Elementary School	410674000451	III			
Jefferson County SD 509J	Warm Springs Elementary School	410674000454	III			
Klamath Falls City Schools	Mills Elementary School	410708000485	III			
Klamath Falls City Schools	Pelican Elementary School	410708000486	III			
Medford SD 549C	Howard Elementary School	410804000430	III			
Morrow SD 1	Windy River Elementary School	410852001597	III			
Mt Angel SD 91	St Mary's Public School	410855000838	III			
Myrtle Point SD 41	Myrtle Crest School	410064000233	III			
North Wasco County SD 21	Colonel Wright Elementary School	410004801155	III			
Ontario SD 8C	Alameda Elementary School	410927000739	III			
Oregon Department of Education	Four Rivers Community School	410000901592	III			
Parkrose SD 3	Shaver Elementary School	410948000982	III			
Portland SD 1J	Bridger Elementary School	411004000877	III			
Portland SD 1J	George Middle School	411004000893	III			
Portland SD 1J	Jefferson High School	411004000964	III			
Portland SD 1J	Kelly Elementary School	411004000909	III			
Portland SD 1J	King Elementary School	411004000911	III			
Portland SD 1J	Sitton Elementary School	411004000937	III			
Rainier SD 13	Hudson Park Elementary School	410326500181	III			
Reynolds SD 7	Alder Elementary School	411052000997	III			
Reynolds SD 7	Glenfair Elementary School	411052000999	III			
Reynolds SD 7	Salish Ponds Elementary School	411052001579	III			
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	Claggett Creek Middle School	411082001440	III			
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	Houck Middle School	411082000664	III			
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	Stephens Middle School	411082000668	III			
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	Waldo Middle School	411082000814	III			
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	Washington Elementary School	411082000809	III			
Sheridan SD 48J	Faulconer-Chapman School	411122001285	III			
Silver Falls SD 4J	Mark Twain Middle School	411145000763	III			
Silver Falls SD 4J	Robert Frost Elementary School	411145000764	III			
South Umpqua SD 19	Tri City Elementary School	411161000312	III			
Springfield SD 19	Hamlin Middle School	411167000591	III			
Springfield SD 19	Springfield Middle School	411167000592	III			
Sutherlin SD 130	West Sutherlin Intermediate	411194000340	III			
Three Rivers/Josephine County SD	Manzanita Elementary School	410690000473	III			
Umatilla SD 6R	Clara Brownell Middle School	411260001090	III			

Appendix C

Defining and Identifying Oregon's Tier I, II, and III Schools

In an effort to blend State and Federal requirements and to create a unified comprehensive system for assisting low achieving schools, Oregon has one definition and method of identifying Tier I, II, and III schools for School Improvement Grants and also for Race to the Top and State Fiscal Stabilization funding.

In the December 2009 School Improvement Grants Application for funding under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA):

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status.

Selecting schools eligible for funding requires that the SEA identify three levels of need described as Tier I, II, and III schools. Oregon's "persistently lowest achieving" schools are within Tiers I and II.

Identifying Tier I

Tier I schools consist of the following:

- 1) The lowest performing schools among those identified as in Title IA improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status. Performance is measured using a combined 2-year average of the percent of the "all students" group meeting or exceeding the performance standards on state testing in English/language arts and mathematics. The lowest-achieving five percent or the lowest-achieving five Title IA schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the state, whichever number of schools is greater are identified as Tier I schools.
- 2) Also added to the Tier I list are those Title I schools currently in Title IA improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status that had a 2-year average NCES graduation rate of less than 60% for the previous two graduating classes.

Identifying Tier II

Tier II schools are identified as follows:

- 1) Those secondary schools eligible for, but not receiving, Title IA funds. Eligibility for funds is defined as having a percentage poverty rate greater than or equal to 40 percent as reported by the district in the application for Title I funds. The schools identified for inclusion in Tier II are the lowest-achieving five percent or the lowest-achieving five among these secondary schools as measured by a combined 2-year average of the percent of students meeting or exceeding the performance standards on state testing in English/language arts and mathematics.

- 2) Also added to the Tier II list are those secondary schools eligible for but not receiving Title I funds for the 2009-10 school year that had a 2-year average NCES graduation rate of less than 60% for the previous two graduating classes.

Identifying Tier III

Tier III consists of the schools in Title IA improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status, that are not included among the Tier I schools.

Other Definitions

High school: Any school enrolling students in grade 10 or higher.

Middle school: Any school enrolling students in a grade no lower than 5th grade and no higher than 9th grade.

Secondary school: Any middle or high school.

NOTE:

The Oregon Department of Education did not exercise the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school, a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Appendix D

TIMELINE: 2010-2011 School Improvement Grant Process

#	Date/Event	2010												2011					
		F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J
1	BY February 8: SIG LEAs Notified																		
2	March 18: Letter of Acknowledgement & Intent DUE from notified LEAs																		
3	MARCH: LEA Planning Begins & Continues																		
4	March: Required attendance at Planning Workshops for SI Grant Leadership Team(s) (Dates TBD)																		
5	May 7: LEA applications DUE to ODE																		
6	June: ODE Review of LEA Applications																		
7	June – July: discussion with LEA re REVISION assistance of Application to meet ODE Requirements																		
8	July: Notification of LEA grant award & release of 2010-11 SI Grant funds.																		
9	July through September: LEA Hires staff as needed																		
10	August: Begin LEA OSSS SI Program Assistance; (AND continuing)																		
11	August: IMPLEMENTATION Begins																		
12	October/November: DUE-Annual School Improvement Plan																		
13	June 1, 2011: LEA Annual School Intervention Review Report DUE to ODE																		
14	June: ODE Review of LEA Annual SIG Report																		
15	July 2011: Release of 2011-12 SI funds to LEA (pending acceptance of LEA Annual Review Report)																		
16	September 1: Annual Budget Narrative DUE																		
17	QUARTERLY Reporting DUE: End of June, 2010 End of September, 2010 End of December, 2010 End of March, 2011 End of June, 2011																		

Appendix E

Oregon's Local Education Agency School Improvement Grant Template

(Separate document)

School Improvement Grant Application

Section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act



2010-13

Local Education Agency (LEA)

Section I: Grant Information	30
Section II: Local Education Agency Application Template	35
Section III: School Application Template	46

School Improvement Grant Application

Primary Application for LEA Due to ODE no later than May 7, 2010

Submission Information and Technical Assistance

Submitting Completed Applications

Mail all forms to:

**Stacie Ankrum, Office Specialist
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol Street N.E.
Salem, OR 97310**

FAX and E-mail forms will not be accepted

For Technical Assistance, please contact any member of the Oregon Department of Education School Improvement Team

Russ Sweet, School Improvement Specialist, 503-947-5638,
E-mail: russ.sweet@state.or.us

Jan McCoy, School Improvement Specialist, 503-947-5704,
E-mail: jan.mccoy@state.or.us

Brad Capener, School Improvement Team Leader, 503-947-5860
E-mail: brad.capener@state.or.us

Kirk deFord, School Improvement Specialist,
E-mail: kirk.deford@state.or.us

Denny Nkemontoh, School Improvement Specialist,
E-mail: denny.nkemontoh@state.or.us

Gary Graves, School Improvement Specialist,
E-mail: gary.graves@state.or.us

Section I: Grant Information

Background

This School Improvement Grant Packet contains the information LEA/district and school staffs need to apply for School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds from the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), including the Local Education Agency Grant Application Template (Section II), and the School Application Template (Section III). Please follow all of the directions and requirements to insure a complete application. LEAs will not be able to receive the School Year 2010-11 Improvement Grant Funds until the LEA/school application has been reviewed and accepted by ODE. See the attached TIMELINE, page 5 for important benchmark dates and requirements.

Staff will need to consider school assessments, past School Improvement Plans, personnel and community surveys, and achievement progress as they make a selection of the intervention model you will implement starting in the beginning of the 2010-11 school year. Here are the possible Interventions:

Planning and People

Bring together a School Improvement Grant Leadership Team (SIG-LT—See Section III, School Application) of district/school personnel who are closest to the workings of the identified school. That group of representative adults will be responsible for developing, writing, and monitoring the school intervention. That leadership team will also be responsible for the ongoing work of updating the Intervention Plan, and ensuring that the intervention efforts are sustained over time, beyond the period of fund availability.

Intervention Models

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides for the U.S. Secretary of Education to allocate funds to SEAs for the purpose of school improvement. Within the regulations and guidelines established by the Secretary, each SEA administers grants to LEAs to “enable the lowest-achieving schools” to meet accountability requirements. Program guidelines require SEAs to fund LEAs with identified “persistently lowest-achieving schools” to support rapid improvement through four intervention models:

- Turnaround model, which includes, among other actions, replacing the principal, unless this person has been principal two years or less and the LEA taking advantage of this flexibility should be able to demonstrate that: (1) the prior principal in the school at issue was replaced as part of a broader reform effort, and (2) the new principal has the experience and skills needed to implement successfully a turnaround, restart, or transformation model; and rehiring no more than 50 percent of the school’s staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with a State’s academic standards.
- Restart model, in which an LEA converts the school or closes and reopens it under the management of a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
- School closure, in which an LEA closes the school and enrolls the students who attended the school in other, higher-achieving schools in the LEA.
- Transformation model, The LEA replaces the principal; unless this person has been principal two years or less and the LEA taking advantage of this flexibility should be able to demonstrate that:

(1) the prior principal in the school at issue was replaced as part of a broader reform effort, and (2) the new principal has the experience and skills needed to implement successfully a turnaround, restart, or transformation model; implements a rigorous staff evaluation and development system; institutes comprehensive instructional reform; increases learning time and applies community-oriented school strategies; and provides greater operational flexibility and support for the school.

Grant Process and Structure

As the responsible State Education Agency (SEA), the Oregon Department of Education will provide LEAs with sub grants, and the LEA will be responsible and accountable for school and student improvement with the intervention selected.

In awarding School Improvement Grants, an SEA (the Oregon Department of Education) must give priority to LEA's (Local Education Agencies i.e., districts and schools) that demonstrate in their application to the SEA, (1) the greatest need for the funds and (2) the strongest commitment to ensure that the funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to raise substantially the achievement of their students.

As staff select from among these interventions, and write the School Improvement Plan for the coming year, there are two areas that need particular attention:

- What **NEED** does the school have for SIG funds to implement the intervention model chosen (turnaround, restart, school closure, or transformation), and
- What **CAPACITY** does the LEA, working with the school, have as an educational community, to use SIG 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 selected?

Steps to be taken:

1. Based upon an analysis of progress measurements (test scores, graduation rate, personnel and community surveys, etc.) select the intervention appropriate to the school's needs.
2. Develop a **VISION** for implementation over the three years of the grant.
3. Write an Improvement Plan for the first (2010-11) of the three years, and include that as part of this application. Note: Implementation of the selected interventions are to begin at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year.

Be complete and thorough, and provide research-based justifications for the indicated actions in support of the intervention model selected. Write measurable and observable goals and objectives, and include any personnel actions needed to implement the plan. Make certain all parts of the intervention plan are reflected in the Year 1 Budget.

Goals and intervention plans for Years 2 and 3 (2011-12 and 2012-13) will be developed as the Year 1 intervention is implemented, so goals for those years will be tentative. Budget projections for Years 2 and 3 must be included in the application, though will of necessity be briefer than the budget for Year 1.

Technical Assistance over the Grant Period

As part of the mutual ASSURANCES, ODE provides technical assistance and opportunities for professional development and mentoring through the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS.) Staffs from LEAs and schools affected by the intervention will learn more about OSSS at the Planning Workshop in March.

NOTE: For LEAs with more than ONE funded school, a separate application and signed Cover Sheet must be completed, including all components of the template, for EACH school.

Timeline: 2010-2011 School Improvement Grant Process

#	Date/Event	2010												2011					
		F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J
1	BY February 8: SIG LEAs Notified																		
2	March 18: Letter of Acknowledgement & Intent DUE from notified LEAs																		
3	MARCH: LEA Planning Begins & Continues																		
4	March: Required attendance at Planning Workshops for SI Grant Leadership Team(s) (Dates TBD)																		
5	May 7: LEA applications DUE to ODE																		
6	June : ODE Review of LEA Applications																		
7	June – July : Discussion with LEA re REVISION assistance of Application to meet ODE Requirements																		
8	July: Notification of LEA grant award & release of 2010-11 SI Grant funds.																		
9	July – September: LEA Hires staff as needed																		
10	August: Begin LEA OSSS SI Program Assistance; (AND continuing)																		
11	August: IMPLEMENTATION Begins!																		
12	October/November: DUE-Annual School Improvement Plan																		
13	June 1, 2011: LEA Annual School Intervention Review Report DUE to ODE																		
14	June: ODE Review of LEA Annual SIG Report																		
15	July 2011: Release of 2011-12 SIG funds to LEA (pending acceptance of LEA Annual Review Report)																		
16	September 1: Annual Budget Narrative DUE																		
17	QUARTERLY Reporting DUE: End of June, 2010 End of September, 2010 End of December, 2010 End of March, 2011 End of June, 2011																		

Section II: Local Education Agency Application Template

District Information

Only one copy of Section II is required to be submitted

#	Template Component	DONE <input type="checkbox"/>
1	LEA Cover Sheet	
2	LEA Grant Abstract	
3	LEA/School Information and LEA Explanation of School Service Choice	
4	LEA Explanation of School Service Choice	
5	LEA Budget Summary	
6	Assurances from LEA	

1. LEA Application Cover Sheet for School Improvement Grants

NOTE: This cover sheet is required as part of your overall application. Additional coversheets are needed for each school application (see page 15).

District Name:	Mailing Address:	
LEA Superintendent Name:	School Board Chair Name:	
Position and Office:	Position and Office:	
Mailing Address:	Mailing Address:	
Telephone:	Telephone:	
Fax:	Fax:	
Email address:	Email address:	
LEA Superintendent (Printed Name):	Telephone:	
Signature of LEA Superintendent:	Date:	
School Board Chair (Printed Name):	Telephone:	
Signature of School Board Chair:	Date:	
The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to this School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.		

2. LEA Grant Abstract

Describe the district's overall VISION for improvement over the three-year period of the grant. Address the LEA's vision for improvement for each school as the school implements the selected intervention. Describe district level activities and modifications in support of school implementation.

3. LEA/School Information

Provide the information below for each Tier I, II, and/or III school identified. The LEA must identify the intervention model and/or services to be implemented for each Tier I, II and/or III school for which it is seeking funding.

For each Tier I, II, and/or III school for which the LEA has decided not to fund, The LEA must submit a completed School Capacity Check List as well as complete the capacity question on the next page.

NOTE REGARDING AN LEA’S DECISION NOT TO SEEK FUNDING FOR A TIER I SCHOOL:

ODE will review the completed School Capacity Check List to determine if the LEA lacks sufficient capacity to serve the Tier I school. In addition, the LEA will be required to complete the capacity question on the next page for each Tier I school the LEA has chosen not to serve.

Dist. ID	School ID.	School Name	NCES Code	Tier	Turnaround	Restart	Closure	Transformation	Lack Capacity

Information about each of the four models can be found at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/faq.html>.

4. LEA Explanation of School Service Choice

For EACH school that will not be served under this grant, explain why the District has decided NOT to apply for School Improvement Funds for this school. Be specific and give reasons, supported by data references, for your choice. Use the School Capacity Check List as a guide to addressing the LEA decision.

5. LEA Budget Summary

Budgeting

Using the attached Template, create a Year 1 (2010-11,) Year 2, and Year 3 budget for the categories listed that match the GOALS for improvement for the intervention selected.

Budget information for School (include):

- 1) The Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.
- 2) The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. The maximum amount an LEA may be awarded and subsequently spend is \$2 million annually to implement the chosen model in a Tier I, II, and/or III school. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.
- 3) The SIG portion of school closure costs may be lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.
- 4) The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.
- 5) The overall LEA budget must indicate how it will allocate school intervention funds, over a three-year period, among the Tier I and Tier II schools it commits to serve. Note that the proposed allocation for each school served depends on the interventions to be carried out and level of benefits provided, and not on the funding generated by the school under the statute.
- 6) If the SEA does not request the waiver from the Secretary required extending the availability of School Improvement Grant funds to permit three-year awards, the LEA may request such a waiver.

LEA School Improvement Grant Summary

School Year 2010-2011

Budget Area	LEA*	School (Identify)	School (Identify)	School (Identify)	School (Identify)	School (Identify)
Intervention Model Chosen						
Licensed Salaries						
Classified Salaries						
Employee Benefits						
Purchased or Contracted Services						
Supplies/Materials						
Equipment/Capital Outlay						
Professional Development						
Parental Involvement						
Travel						
Food Services						
Other (Identify)						
Totals	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
						\$ -

*An LEA may use SIG funds to pay for district-level activities to support implementation one of the four school intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve and to support any other school improvement strategies in the Tier III schools it commits to serve. For example, an LEA might hire a district-level turnaround specialist to establish an “early warning system” designed to identify students in Tier I or Tier II schools who may be at risk of failing to achieve high standards or graduate, or to support implementation of a turnaround model. However, an LEA may not use SIG funds to support district-level activities for schools that are not receiving SIG funds.

LEA School Improvement Grant Summary

School Year 2011-2012

Budget Area	LEA*	School (Identify)	School (Identify)	School (Identify)	School (Identify)	School (Identify)
Intervention Model Chosen						
Licensed Salaries						
Classified Salaries						
Employee Benefits						
Purchased or Contracted Services						
Supplies/Materials						
Equipment/Capital Outlay						
Professional Development						
Parental Involvement						
Travel						
Food Services						
Other (Identify)						
Totals	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
						\$ -

*An LEA may use SIG funds to pay for district-level activities to support implementation one of the four school intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve and to support any other school improvement strategies in the Tier III schools it commits to serve. For example, an LEA might hire a district-level turnaround specialist to establish an “early warning system” designed to identify students in Tier I or Tier II schools who may be at risk of failing to achieve high standards or graduate, or to support implementation of a turnaround model. However, an LEA may not use SIG funds to support district-level activities for schools that are not receiving SIG funds.

LEA School Improvement Grant Summary

School Year 2012-2013

Budget Area	LEA*	School (Identify)	School (Identify)	School (Identify)	School (Identify)	School (Identify)
Intervention Model Chosen						
Licensed Salaries						
Classified Salaries						
Employee Benefits						
Purchased or Contracted Services						
Supplies/Materials						
Equipment/Capital Outlay						
Professional Development						
Parental Involvement						
Travel						
Food Services						
Other (Identify)						
Totals	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
						\$ -

*An LEA may use SIG funds to pay for district-level activities to support implementation one of the four school intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve and to support any other school improvement strategies in the Tier III schools it commits to serve. For example, an LEA might hire a district-level turnaround specialist to establish an “early warning system” designed to identify students in Tier I or Tier II schools who may be at risk of failing to achieve high standards or graduate, or to support implementation of a turnaround model. However, an LEA may not use SIG funds to support district-level activities for schools that are not receiving SIG funds.

6. Assurances from LEA

General Assurances to the Oregon Department of Education

Required for ALL LEA's applying for funding under the

School Improvement Grant Program

Due Signed upon making application

Read and initial each statement below regarding district/LEA responsibilities for assisting schools identified for School Intervention funds that have been identified as Tier I, II, or III schools.

- _____ 1. The LEA will provide ongoing technical assistance to schools making application AND funded under this School Improvement program as they develop or revise their School Improvement Plan, and throughout the implementation of that plan.
- _____ 2. The LEA will coordinate the technical assistance provided to school(s) under the provisions of this School Improvement Grant program. Assistance to schools may be provided by district staff, Oregon Statewide System of Support, external consultants such as ODE, ESD or university staff, or by private consultants or organizations with experience and expertise in helping schools improve academic achievement. Indicate name/position of individual who will coordinate this assistance:

Name _____ Position _____

- _____ 3. The LEA will help the school analyze results from the state assessment system and other relevant examples of student work to set measurable goals. Technical assistance will be provided to school staff to enable them to use data to identify and solve problems in instruction, to strengthen parental involvement and professional development, and to fulfill other responsibilities that are defined in the school intervention plan.
- _____ 4. The LEA will ensure that the school intervention plan includes provisions for teacher mentoring as a part of its professional development plan. Mentor programs pair novice teachers with more experienced teachers to provide practical support and guidance.
- _____ 5. The LEA will help the school choose and sustain effective instructional strategies and methods and ensure that the school staff receives high quality professional development relevant to the implementation of instructional strategies. The chosen strategies must be grounded in scientifically based research and address the specific instructional or other issues, such as attendance or graduation rate, that caused the school to be identified for school intervention.
- _____ 6. The LEA will help the school analyze and revise its school budget to fund activities most likely to increase student achievement and remove it from school improvement status.
- _____ 7. The LEA will ensure that at least 10% of the school's grant allocation will be expended for high quality professional development for the school's teachers, principal, and as appropriate, other instructional staff.
- _____ 8. The Oregon Department of Education may, as it deems necessary, supervise, evaluate and provide guidance and direction to the local school system and local school in the conduct of the activities performed under this plan.
- _____ 9. The school(s) and LEA shall adhere to Oregon Department of Education reporting and evaluation requirements. This includes project reports that address the progress toward

meeting the established, measurable goals, and any other reports requested by ODE to measure intervention effectiveness.

- _____ 10. Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II funded school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- _____ 11. 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 intervention funds;
- _____ 12. 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
- _____ 13. Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

Superintendent

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

SIG Leadership Team Coordinator

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date _____

Section III: School Application Template

School Application Check List

The LEA must complete a separate Section III template for **each** Tier I, II, and III school identified.

#	Template Component	Completed
1	School Cover Sheet	
2	School Grant Abstract	
3	Planning Personnel Listed—SIG-LT	
4	School Need Check List & Need Narrative Answer (4.1)	
5	School Capacity Check List & Capacity Narrative Answer (5.1)	
6	(6.1, 2, 3, 4, 5): LEA & School Support to Fully Implement the Intervention Model	
7	School Improvement Goals	
8	Results Measurement Narrative	
9	School Annual Timeline of Intervention Activities	
10	Budget Information/Justification	

NOTE: Also included for reference are the **Scoring Guide/Rubric for School Improvement Grant Applications**, and a list of **Additional Resources**.

1. School Application Cover Sheet for School Improvement Grant

NOTE: A separate application and signed Cover Sheet must be completed, including all components of the template, for EACH school.

Name of SCHOOL for which funds are sought:	Mailing Address:	
Name of District Superintendent Telephone:	Name of School Principal Telephone: Email address:	
District Superintendent (Printed Name):		Telephone:
Signature of District Superintendent:		Date:
School Principal (Printed Name):		Telephone:
Signature of School Principal:		Date:
The school, under authorization from the district, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to this School Improvement Grant program, including the requirements and the conditions that apply to the selected intervention model.		

2. School Grant Abstract

Describe the school's overall VISION for improvement over the three-year period of the grant.
Address the school's vision for improvement as the school implements the selected intervention.

3. Personnel Involved in the Development and Implementation Process

List the key personnel who will be working to develop the plan for the School Intervention, and how each will be involved. Suggested categories include: Parents and other community members, licensed staff, classified/support staff, administrators, LEA staff, Title I staff, etc. Work toward **collaboration** as the plan, actions, and associated budgets are developed.

School Improvement Grant Leadership Team (SIG—LT):

#	Name	Role	Signature
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

Stakeholders

List any additional stakeholders that were consulted and worked with in the development of this School Application. In paragraph form, describe your consultation with stakeholders regarding the LEA application and implementation of school improvement models.

4. School Need Check List

This set of questions pertains to the school's NEED for School Improvement Grant Funds to implement the intervention selected. To help you formulate your answers to question 4.1, please consider and mark the following (include this when you return the application.)

Foundation for Change:

7) *Assessment and Data Collection*

	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Small extent</i>	<i>Moderate extent</i>	<i>Great extent</i>
a) The district/school has identified the sources of data/assessments that will be used to establish a need for implementation funds for the intervention selected.				
b) The district has helped the identified school pinpoint the reasons for the persistently low-achieving status.				
c) The district shows clear support for the changes required at the identified school for the selected intervention.				

8) *Leadership and Decision-making*

	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Small extent</i>	<i>Moderate extent</i>	<i>Great extent</i>
a) Plans are under way for modifying district structures and/or practices in the first year of implementation of the selected intervention.				
b) District and school leaders have involved a diversity of other educators and people from the community when implementation plans for the selected intervention are discussed and adopted.				

9) Curriculum and Instruction

	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Small extent</i>	<i>Moderate extent</i>	<i>Great extent</i>
a) The district will help the identified school identify existing curriculum and instruction that will be modified to meet intervention goals.				
b) Scientifically based research strategies that strengthen the core academic program are being used as a basis for planned intervention efforts.				
c) The district will help the school identify instructional practices that are not effective, with the intent of changing to match the requirements of the selected intervention.				
d) The district is helping the school develop plans for administrator and teacher professional development to match the implementation actions of the selected intervention.				
e) The district is helping the school develop plans to target the needs of low achieving students.				
f) There is a general feeling among LEA/district and school planners that the new goals will contribute to the likelihood that the identified school will improve with the selected intervention.				

- g) If extended time and/or a change of school day or year are part of the implementation plan for the selected intervention, there are plans for how that will happen.

--	--	--	--

10) Human Capital (Personnel)

	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Small extent</i>	<i>Moderate extent</i>	<i>Great extent</i>
a) District and school staff has taken into consideration the need for parental involvement for implementation of the intervention selected?				
b) District and school staff has identified the sources and types of outside technical assistance that will be needed to implement the selected intervention?				
c) Is there an understanding at the LEA/district level that there may be staffing changes to support implementation of the selected intervention?				
d) Will the district be able to provide curriculum and instructional resources for implementation of the intervention selected?				
e) Is the selected intervention implementation supported in the district budget?				

11) Student Support

	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Small extent</i>	<i>Moderate extent</i>	<i>Great extent</i>
--	-------------------	---------------------	------------------------	---------------------

- a) District and school staff have identified all changes that will affect students when the selected intervention is implemented.
- b) District and school staff have paved the way with students and their parents for the implementation of the selected intervention actions.

12) Budgeting

Not at all *Small extent* *Moderate extent* *Great extent*

- a) District and school fiscal planning has occurred (e.g., reallocation of funding, concentration of funds to particular intervention expenditures, etc.) to support the implementation of the intervention selected?
- b) District and school staff have identified HOW these fiscal changes will have an impact on student achievement with the selected intervention?

4.1. Evidence of Need

Using the data analyzed, including the previous needs inventory, explain why the school has a need for School Improvement Funds to implement the intervention selected. Incorporate multiple sources of data into the analysis of need of the Tier I, II, and III school identified in the LEA's application. Establish a clear relationship between the specific needs of the Tier I, II and III school identified in the LEA's application and the selected intervention. Include the needs of both the LEA and the school in relation to the intervention model.

5. School Capacity Check List

Please rate the extent to which the following capacity elements are observable in your school. Use your answers for the narrative required in Question 5.1 and following.

The next questions pertain to the school's capacity to support implementation of the intervention selected. For the purposes of this application, CAPACITY is defined as "the ability of the organization to fulfill the functions needed to implement and sustain the intervention successfully."

1) HUMAN CAPACITY: Refers to the knowledge, understanding, and commitment of individuals in the LEA/district.

- a) Is district staff knowledgeable about the requirements for implementing the intervention selected?
- b) Is the Tier I school staff receptive to the selected intervention?
- c) Is the Tier II school staff receptive to the selected intervention?
- d) Do local school board members understand the requirement of the selected intervention?
- e) Is there a written Vision for the district's intervention implementation?
- f) Is district leadership committed to complete and full implementation of the intervention selected?

	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Small extent</i>	<i>Moderate extent</i>	<i>Great extent</i>
a) Is district staff knowledgeable about the requirements for implementing the intervention selected?				
b) Is the Tier I school staff receptive to the selected intervention?				
c) Is the Tier II school staff receptive to the selected intervention?				
d) Do local school board members understand the requirement of the selected intervention?				
e) Is there a written Vision for the district's intervention implementation?				
f) Is district leadership committed to complete and full implementation of the intervention selected?				

2) ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY: Refers to relationships among individuals both within the LEA/district and with individuals outside the district to support intervention implementation (i.e., collaboration, networking, partnerships, and culture).

	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Small extent</i>	<i>Moderate extent</i>	<i>Great extent</i>

- a) Will teachers receive professional development to build their capacity for implementation of the selected intervention?
- b) Do teachers have the opportunity to network with others to learn about and share intervention practices?
- c) Has the district partnered with external organizations for support with implementation of the selected intervention?
- d) Has the district created a shared understanding of the selected intervention implementation across the district?

3) STRUCTURAL CAPACITY: Refers to the functional elements of the system such as LEA/district policies, procedures, and practices to support implementation.

Not at all Small extent Moderate extent Great extent

- a) Has the district adopted local policies or requirements for selected intervention implementation?
- b) Are the selected intervention implementation actions coordinated with other district standards-based school improvement efforts?
- c) Will the district have the capacity to monitor intervention implementation practices in schools?
- d) Is there recognition of student involvement in the actions called for with the selected intervention?

4) MATERIAL CAPACITY: Refers to the fiscal and material resources available to support implementation in the district.

	<i>Not at all</i>	<i>Small extent</i>	<i>Moderate extent</i>	<i>Great extent</i>
a) Are resources allocated to provide time for teachers to work together on the implementation of the intervention selected?				
b) Is current district staffing sufficient to support implementation of the selected intervention?				
c) Is there an understanding at the LEA/district level that there may be staffing changes to support implementation of the selected intervention?				
d) Will the district be able to provide curriculum and instructional resources for implementation of the intervention selected?				
e) Is the selected intervention implementation supported in the district budget?				

5.1. Evidence of Capacity

Describe the school's capacity to carry out the selected intervention model. Indicate the process you will use to determine that the school has the capacity to fully and effectively implement the required activities of the intervention model selected. Please refer to the School Capacity Checklist and address all areas listed.

6.1 School Support to Fully Implement the Intervention model

Describe actions the school has taken, or will take, to:

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

Consider the following in the response:

Leadership and Decision Making:

- The school has plans to regularly engage the school community to inform them of progress toward the design and implementation of the interventions and to give them an opportunity to provide input.
- The school has successfully completed a continuous improvement planning process that will guide the design of interventions.
- The school has implemented a comprehensive needs assessment that will inform the *design and implementation of intervention strategies*.

Curriculum and Instruction:

- The school provides direction to the school in the description, scope, focus, articulation and alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessments with state standards.

Human Capital (Personnel):

- The school has staff in place with the expertise and experience to research and design the selected intervention as intended while still meeting local needs.

Student Support:

- The school will engage parents in supporting students in increased student achievement
- The school will describe how it will address the needs of specific student populations including, but not limited to students of poverty, English Language Learners and students with disabilities.

Budgeting:

- The school has set aside time and resources sufficient to facilitate the design and ongoing implementation of interventions.
- The school has demonstrated adequate fiscal capacity to implement the selected intervention models.

6.2 School Support to Fully Implement the Intervention model

Describe actions the school has taken, or will take, to:

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

Consider the following in the response:

Reasonable and timely steps it will take to recruit and screen providers to be in place by the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year that may include, but are not limited to:

- Analyzing the school's operational needs.
- Researching and prioritizing the external providers available to serve the school.
 - Consider and analyze the external provider market.
 - Contact other schools currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding their experience.
- Engaging parents and community members to assist in the selection process.
- Delineating clearly the respective responsibilities and expectations to be assumed by the external provider and the school.

Detailed and relevant criteria for selecting external providers that take into account the specific needs of the Tier I, II, and III schools to be served by external providers. These criteria may include, but are not limited to:

- A proven track record of success working with a particular population or type of school. For example, success in working with high schools or English Language Learners.
- Alignment between external provider services and existing school services.
- Willingness to be held accountable to high performance standards.
- Capacity to serve the identified school and its selected intervention model.

6.3 LEA & School Support to Fully Implement the Intervention model

Describe actions the school has taken, or will take, to:

3. Align other resources with the intervention.

Consider the following in the response:

An LEA can build capacity for a school to implement one of the intervention models through the alignment of resources with school improvement activities. In general, funding sources for LEAs come from two sources; the state general fund and federal funds. It is critical that areas for alignment of resources are identified in the LEA application. The Oregon Department of Education will carefully assess the LEA's commitment to align ALL school resources with the SIG funds by determining the extent to which it demonstrates the ability and willingness to effectively integrate various activities funded at the federal and state level with SIG-funded activities. Funding sources that may be considered when assessing the LEA's commitment to align other resources to the SIG interventions include, but are not limited to: Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A; Title II, Part D; Title III, Part A; and state and local revenues.

Budgeting:

- The LEA completes a thorough examination of all resources provided to school to ensure systemic efforts in fully implementing the selected intervention model.
- The LEA has set aside time and resources sufficient to facilitate the design and ongoing implementation of interventions.
- The LEA has demonstrated adequate fiscal capacity to implement the selected intervention model.
- The LEA includes provisions for sustaining support for the school when funding ends under the program.

6.4 LEA & School Support to Fully Implement the Intervention model

Describe actions the LEA & school has taken, or will take, to:

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

Consider the following in the response:

Leadership:

- How will the LEA/school develop or modify policies that will support full implementation of the intervention model?

Human Capital (Personnel)

- How will the LEA/school utilize performance incentives for personnel?
- How will the LEA/school make changes in policies and procedures (hiring, placing, evaluating, promoting, retaining and replacing) to ensure full implementation of the intervention model?
- How will the LEA/school work with local collective bargaining agreements and labor unions in order to fully implement the selected intervention model?
- How will the LEA/school adopt and utilize professional development processes and procedures that align with full implementation of the selected intervention model?

Student Support

- How will the LEA/school develop programs and services for English language learners?
- How will the LEA/school institute extended learning time (supplemental educational services, after-school programs, summer school,) for example:
 - Additional instructional time during the school day and during the summer
 - Parental involvement, communication, and options
 - Special education programs and procedures
 - Student support services (tutoring, counseling, placement, for example?)

6.5 LEA Support to Fully Implement the Intervention model

Describe actions the LEA/school has taken, or will take, to:

5. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

Consider the following in the response:

Sustainability of practices beyond the funding period begins with careful planning of the initial implementation of the selected intervention model. LEAs/schools will need to develop initial implementation plans for the selected model that demonstrate how School Improvement funds will be used. However, the plan LEAs/schools submit will also need to demonstrate careful planning of how the reform efforts will continue after the SIG funds have ended. The SEA will not approve LEA and/or school applications that do not include this long-term sustainability plan. The long-term plan is described below:

The LEA/school must describe how it will sustain implementation of the intervention model when funding ends, that addresses and includes the following:

- Shared leadership between the school and the broader community in planning and implementation of the intervention model during and after the funding period;
- Plans for addressing staffing and funding changes including transitions in leadership;
- Long-term planning processes that will support implementation of reforms with progress monitoring levels of implementation and progress toward outcomes;
- A comprehensive system of formative and summative data collection that is in place to monitor progress and drive decision-making;
- The ability to continue offering additional instructional time and extended school year;
- Institutionalizing the measuring fidelity of implementation of research-based instructional practices;
- Protecting staff time for collaboration and professional development in order to sustain the initiatives;
- Professional development for new staff and leadership to continue implementation of the reforms;
- Job-embedded professional development to ensure high fidelity of implementation of reforms in the classroom.

7. School Improvement Goals

What improvement will be made with the funded school? List specific SMART GOALS for improvement for this school?

A SMART goal is:

Student-centered/specific

Measurable

Attainable

Realistic

Time bound

(Example of a SMART Goal format)

By: _____ we will improve the performance of

(time)

_____ students at/in _____ to

(target group/grade)

(school/district)

_____ in _____ as

(performance level)

(subject area)

evidenced by _____

(date and name of assessment measures)

Additionally, we will narrow the gap between _____

(student group)

and _____ by _____.

(student group)

(target amount)

Are there any possible barriers to achieving the new goals for the intervention selected? What strategies will the LEA use to address these barriers?

How will Tier I, II, and/or III schools that are funded be held accountable for these goals?

8. Results Measurement

How will you measure progress toward the stated improvement goals? Pay particular attention to mathematics and reading/language arts progress measurements. Be specific, and relate these measures to the intervention selected.

9. School Annual Timeline of Intervention Activities

Year 1 (2010-11) TIMELINE: Please show a YEAR 1 timeline for the intervention model selected for the school that directly relates to the proposed actions. Please use additional rows as needed.

#	Month/Year	Event	Description of Activity	Approximate Cost	Funding Source
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					

Years 2 and 3 TIMELINE: Please delineate a timeline for YEARS 2 and 3 for the intervention model selected for the school that directly relate to the proposed actions. Please use additional rows as needed.

YEAR 2 (2011-12)

#	Month/Year	Event	Description of Activity	Approximate Cost	Funding Source
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					

YEAR 3 (2012-13)

#	Month/Year	Event	Description of Activity	Approximate Cost	Funding Source
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					

10. Budget Information/Justification

List all resources from federal, state and local funds that will be available to the school for the purposes of implementing the selected intervention.

Identify the amount of School Improvement Grant funds that are being requested for this school's implementation of the selected intervention model. (See **Sample** following.)

NOTE: The amount of funds requested for each Tier I, II, and/or III school listed here will be transcribed to the LEA School Improvement Grant Summary Sheets in Section II, the Local Education Agency Application Template.

10.1. Sample Explanation of Proposed Activities to Accompany Budget

Proposed Activities	Note
Planning	Staff time for developing and updating improvement plans and data analysis.
Participation in the State System of Support	Districts will be expected to access the State System of Support network providers for school and district support coaches as well as access the Regional Support network providers for specialized needs such as ELL, Special Education, and others.
Technical Assistance Meetings	Travel expenses to attend required meetings called by the Oregon Department of Education for the purpose of receiving technical assistance on school improvement and turnaround efforts.
Reporting Requirements	Time and expenses related to required reporting quarterly on the use of ARRA funds and mid-term and final reports.
Complete School Review	The school is expected to complete an ODE sanctioned review of the school's environment including a thorough review of instruction.
Coaching Training	District and school administrator teams will be expected to attend leadership training.
Implementation of the Model	In this scenario, the district is implementing the Transformational Model in one of its schools
1) Developing and Increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness	Replacement of the principal, developing and implementing a rigorous evaluation system, overhauling the school's assessment system and adding assessments, job-embedded professional development, increasing observations in the classroom
2) Comprehensive Instructional reform strategies	Aligning curriculum and completing fidelity checks, implementing an Response to Intervention model
3) Increasing Learning time and creating community-oriented schools	Parent support training, adding instructional time at the end of the day and during the summer
4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support	Intense technical support to implement the transformational model.

Other Parental Involvement	Develop parent support systems for the purposes of increasing student achievement. Increase communications to parents including mailings, materials and the like.
Other Professional Development	Planned and approved professional development related to improving school systems that will lead to increased student achievement. Professional development will need to support research-based practices leading to increased student achievement.
Programs and Materials	The purchase and implementation of new programs will be allowed during the second and third year of the grant only. Earlier purchase and implementation of a program will require ODE approval and the support of the School Support Coach.
Staffing	Funding for instructional coaching. Other staff will need the approval of the ODE

11. Scoring Guide/Rubric for School Improvement Grant Applications

Section	Not Adequately Demonstrated	Adequately Demonstrated	More than Adequately Demonstrated
LEA Application			
1. LEA Application Cover Sheet for School Improvement Grants	Circle One	Incomplete Complete	
2. LEA Grant Abstract	LEA's description of their 3-year vision for each school is inadequately developed and/or does not address years 2 and 3, and could use further development.	LEA description of a 3-year vision for each school to be served is intact.	LEA describes a complete 3-year vision for each school to be served.
3. LEA/School Information	Circle One	Incomplete Complete	
4. LEA Explanation of School Service Choice	LEA gives few or minimal reasons and/or supporting data for NOT electing to serve a school.	LEA reasons and supporting data for NOT electing to serve a school are generally acceptable.	LEA provides specific reasons supported by data for NOT electing to serve a school
5. District Budget	The budget is incomplete, poorly developed, or needs further explanation of numbers or proposed activities.	Budget submitted by LEA is adequately developed in scope.	LEA provides comprehensive 3-year budget for schools to be served that aligns expenditures to components of intervention selected.

School Application			
1. School Application Cover Sheet for School Improvement Grant	Circle One	Incomplete Complete	
2. School Grant Abstract	School description of their 3-year vision for intervention implementation is inadequately developed and/or does not address years 2 and 3.	School description of their 3-year vision for intervention implementation is intact.	The school describes a complete 3-year vision for intervention implementation.
3. Personnel involved in the Development and Implementation Process	Circle One	Incomplete Complete	
4.1 Evidence of Need	The School Need Check List is incomplete or missing, little data has been incorporated in planning, and/or the school has not established a relationship between the needs identified and the intervention selected. A clearer relationship between the needs identified and the selected intervention needs to be developed.	The school has completed the Need Check List, with appropriate data.	The school has completed the Need Check List. The school has incorporated multiple sources of data, and has established a clear relationship between the needs identified and the selected intervention.

5.1 Evidence of Capacity	The School Capacity Check List is incomplete or missing. The school has not identified or addressed areas of deficiency. The process used by the school to determine the school's capacity to fully implement the selected intervention is missing or incomplete.	The school has completed the School Capacity Check List. The school has identified and appropriately addressed areas of deficiency.	The school has completed the School Capacity Check List, and has identified and addressed areas of deficiency. The school has described the process it has used to determine the school's capacity to fully implement the selected intervention.
6.1 School Support to Fully Implement the Intervention Model	School support is not adequately developed to fully implement the intervention model.	School support to adequately implement the intervention model is in place.	School support to fully implement the intervention model is well described, and links actions to the components of the selected intervention.
6.2 Design/implement interventions consistent with final requirements	School design/implementation of interventions is largely inconsistent with final requirements.	School design and/or implementation of interventions is adequate.	School design/implementation of interventions is clearly stated, and meets or exceeds final requirements.
6.2, cont. Recruit, screen, select external providers to ensure quality	Criteria for selection of external providers is nonexistent, inadequately described, or is minimal in nature.	The school outlines several relevant criteria for selection of external providers that take into account the needs of the schools to be served.	The school demonstrates a strong and detailed grasp of the relevant criteria for selecting external providers that takes into account the needs of the schools to be served.
6.3 Align other resources with interventions	The school has not identified other resources, and/or it fails to align those listed to other resources or with the listed actions to implement the selected intervention.	The school integrates a number of activities funded at the federal and state level with SIG-funded activities.	The school demonstrates the ability and willingness to effectively integrate various activities funded at the federal and state level with SIG-funded activities.

6.4 Modify practices/policies to enable implementation of interventions	The school indicates little or no willingness to modify practices/policies to enable implementation of the actions to implement the selected intervention.	The school describes development or modification of several policies to enable implementations of the intervention selected.	The school describes a range of development and/or modification of policies and procedures to enable implementation of a variety of components, including leadership, personnel, and student support.
6.5 Sustain the reforms after the period ends	The school demonstrates little or no capacity or planning to sustain the reforms after the grant period ends.	The school describes plans for sustaining reform efforts after the grant period ends.	The school demonstrates careful planning of how reform efforts will continue after the grant period ends.
7. School Improvement Goals	The school has written few or no SMART goals for the school that will serve as outcomes in implementation of the selected intervention.	The school has written SMART goals for the school that will serve as outcomes in implementation of the selected intervention.	The school has clearly written SMART goals for the school that will serve as outcomes in implementation of the selected intervention.
8. Results Measurement	The school description of how it will measure progress towards the stated improvement goals is unrealistic and/or does not show how the measurements will ensure full implementation of the intervention.	The school has a plan for measuring progress toward stated improvement goals.	The school describes how it will measure progress toward the stated improvement goals, and clearly describes how these measurements will ensure that the school will fully implement the selected intervention.
9. School Annual Timeline of Intervention Activities	The school timeline of intervention activities does not cover a 3-year period and/or does not relate directly to proposed actions.	The school has developed a basic 3-year timeline of annual intervention activities for the school.	The school has developed a thorough 3-year timeline of annual intervention activities for the school that relates directly to the proposed actions.

<p>10. School Budget</p>	<p>The budget request for the school lacks one or more of the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.-Alignment of budget request to proposed intervention components; 2.-Realistic size of budget; 3.-Realistic scope of budget; 4.-Covers 3-year grant period. 	<p>The budget request for school is adequately developed in these important four areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alignment of budget request to proposed intervention components; 2. Realistic size of budget; 3. Realistic scope of budget; 4. Covers 3-year grant period. 	<p>The budget request for the school is realistic, of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years, and is aligned accurately with the proposed components of the intervention selected.</p>
---------------------------------	---	--	--

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

The following websites will offer more information and resources as the LEA completes its application:

ESEA School Improvement Grants (SIG) webpage on the Oregon Department of Education website
Information about the US Department of Education (USED) School Improvement Grant program
<http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?=2919>

Title I-A School Improvement webpage on the Oregon Department of Education website
Resources for Schools in Title I-A School Improvement Status, including information on Statewide
Systems of Support, grants, and reporting requirements
<http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=1942>

Center on Innovation & Improvement

Handbook on Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants. This is an excellent resource for
how to implement the four intervention models.
<http://www.centerii.org/handbook/>

School Improvement Fund webpage on the US Department of Education website
Federal documents pertaining to the School Improvement Grant program including guidance, and
approved state grants
<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>