

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Arizona Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 1535 W. Jefferson St. Phoenix, AZ 85007
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Angela Denning Position and Office: Deputy Associate Superintendent of School Improvement and Intervention; School Effectiveness Division Contact's Mailing Address: 1535 W. Jefferson St. Bin #10 Phoenix, AZ 85007 Telephone: 602.364.2281 Fax: 602.364.2334 Email address: angela.denning@azed.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): <div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-family: cursive;">John Huppenthal</div>	Telephone: <div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-family: cursive;">602-542-2843</div>
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X 	Date: <div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-family: cursive;">3/22/2011</div>
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Arizona



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202



OMB Number: 1810-0682
Expiration Date: September 30, 2013

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0682. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 100 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

School Improvement Grants (SIG), authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) that SEAs use to make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs) 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 students in their lowest-performing schools. Under the final requirements published in the *Federal Register* on October 28, 2010 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible (and participating) elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools ("newly eligible" Tier I schools). Tier II schools are the lowest-achieving 5 percent of a State's secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds, secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds with graduation rates below 60 percent over a number of years, and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years ("newly eligible" Tier II schools). An LEA also may use school improvement funds in Tier III schools, which are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as Tier I or Tier II schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible (participating and non-participating) schools ("newly eligible" Tier III schools). (See Appendix B for a chart summarizing the schools included in each tier.) In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

Availability of Funds

The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010, provided \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in fiscal year (FY) 2010. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) estimates that, collectively, States have carried over approximately \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG funds that will be combined with FY 2010 SIG funds, for a total of nearly \$1.4 billion that will be awarded by States as part of their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

FY 2010 school improvement funds are available for obligation by SEAs and LEAs through September 30, 2012.

State and LEA Allocations

Each State (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas are eligible to apply to receive a School Improvement Grant. The Department will allocate FY 2010 school improvement funds in proportion to the funds received in FY 2010 by the States, the Bureau of Indian Education, and the outlying areas under Parts A, C, and D of Title I of the ESEA. An SEA must allocate at least 95 percent of its school improvement funds directly to LEAs in accordance with the final requirements (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-10-28/pdf/2010-27313.pdf>). The SEA may retain an amount not to exceed five percent of its allocation for State administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

Appendix A provides guidance on how SEAs can maximize the number of Tier I and Tier II schools its LEAs can serve with FY 2009 carryover and FY 2010 SIG funds when making their LEA allocations for the FY 2010 competition. See Appendix A for a more detailed explanation.

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

Before submitting its application for a SIG grant to the Department, an SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein. The Department recommends that the SEA also consult with other stakeholders, such as potential external providers, teachers' unions, and business, civil rights, and community leaders that have an interest in its application.

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's FY 2010 School Improvement Grant (SIG) application electronically. The application should be sent as a Microsoft Word document, not as a PDF.

The SEA should submit its FY 2010 application to the following address: school.improvement.grants@ed.gov

In addition, the SEA must submit a paper copy of the cover page signed by the SEA's authorized representative to the address listed below under "Paper Submission."

Paper Submission:

If an SEA is not able to submit its application electronically, it may submit the original and two copies of its SIG application to the following address:

Carlas McCauley, Education Program Specialist
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in government processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

If you have any questions, please contact Carlas McCauley at (202) 260-0824 or by e-mail at carlas.mccauley@ed.gov.

FY 2010 Application Instructions

Most of the FY 2010 SIG application is identical to the FY 2009 application. A new section for additional evaluation criteria (Section B-1) has been added and Section H on Waivers has been expanded. Section D on Descriptive Information (Section D – Part 1, Section D – Parts 2-8) has also been reformatted into two separate sections for the FY 2010 application, but all other parts of the application remain the same.

Consequently, except as provided below, an SEA must update only those sections that include changes from the FY 2009 application. In particular, the Department expects that most SEAs will be able to retain Section B on Evaluation Criteria, Section C on Capacity, and Section D (parts 2-8) on Descriptive Information, sections that make up the bulk of the SIG application. An SEA has the option to update any of the material in these sections if it so desires.

We are requiring SEAs to update some sections of the SIG application to ensure that each SEA focuses its FY 2010 SIG funds, including any funds carried over from FY 2009, on serving its persistently lowest-achieving schools in LEAs with the capacity and commitment to fully and effectively implement one of the four required school intervention models beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.

Note that while an SEA may be able to submit significant portions of its FY 2010 SIG application unchanged from FY 2009, we recommend that it review all sections of the FY 2010 application to ensure alignment with any required changes or revisions.

SEAs should also note that they will only be able to insert information in designated spaces (form fields) in the application because of formatting restrictions. Clicking on a section of the application that is restricted will automatically jump the cursor to the next form field which may cause users to skip over information in the application. Users may avoid this issue by using the scroll bar to review the application. However, due to these restrictions, the Department recommends that SEAs print a copy of the application and review it in its entirety before filling out the form.

APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Arizona Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: 1535 W. Jefferson St. Phoenix, AZ 85007</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Angela Denning</p> <p>Position and Office: Deputy Associate Superintendent of School Improvement and Intervention; School Effectiveness Division</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: 1535 W. Jefferson St. Bin #10 Phoenix, AZ 85007</p> <p>Telephone: 602.364.2281</p> <p>Fax: 602.364.2334</p> <p>Email address: angela.denning@azed.gov</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): John Huppenthal</p>	<p>Telephone: 602.542.5460</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X</p>	<p>Date:</p>
<p>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.</p>	

FY 2010 Application Checklist

Please use this checklist to serve as a roadmap for the SEA's FY 2010 application.

Please note that an SEA's submission for FY 2010 must include the following attachments, as indicated on the application form:

- Lists, by LEA, of the State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.
- A copy of the SEA's FY 2010 LEA application form that LEAs will use to apply to the SEA for a School Improvement Grant.
- If the SEA seeks any waivers through its application, a copy of the notice it provided to LEAs and a copy of any comments it received from LEAs as well as a copy of, or link to, the notice the SEA provided to the public.

Please check the relevant boxes below to verify that all required sections of the SEA application are included and to indicate which sections of the FY 2010 application the SEA has revised from its FY 2009 application.

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010
	<i>For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 (SEA is requesting waiver) <input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has less than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEA elects to generate new lists	<i>For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
SECTION C: CAPACITY	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
SECTION E: ASSURANCES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
SECTION H: WAIVERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section H: Waivers provided	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

Each SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools based on the State's most recent achievement and graduation rate data to ensure that LEAs continue to give priority to using SIG funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in each of their persistently lowest-achieving schools, rather than using SIG funds to support less rigorous improvement measures in less needy schools. However, any SEA that has five or more Tier I schools that were identified for purposes of the State's FY 2009 SIG competition but are not being served with SIG funds in the 2010-2011 school year may apply for a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists.

An SEA also has the option of making changes to its FY 2009 definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools". An SEA that exercises this option must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Regardless of whether it modifies its definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or generates new lists, along with its lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, an SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop these lists. The SEA may provide a link to the page on its Web site where its definition is posted, or it may attach the complete definition to its application.

Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is same as FY 2009

Definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” (PLA schools) is revised for FY 2010

For an SEA keeping the same definition of PLA schools, please select one of the following options:

1. SEA will not generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. SEA has five or more unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009 and is therefore eligible to request a waiver of the requirement to generate new lists of schools. Lists and waiver request submitted below.

SEA is electing not to include newly eligible schools for the FY 2010 competition. (Only applicable if the SEA elected to add newly eligible schools in FY 2009.)

2. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has fewer than five unserved Tier I schools from FY 2009. Lists submitted below.

3. SEA elects to generate new lists. Lists submitted below.

For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:

1. SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” Lists submitted below.

Insert definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or link to definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” here:

See attached for PLA definition.

An SEA must attach two tables to its SIG application. The first table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that are eligible for FY 2010 SIG funds. The second table must include its lists of all Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that were served with FY 2009 SIG funds.

Please create these two tables in Excel and use the formats shown below. Examples of the tables have been provided for guidance.

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE ¹

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE

EXAMPLE:

SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR FY 2010 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
LEA 1	##	HARRISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	MADISON ES	##	X				
LEA 1	##	TAYLOR MS	##			X		X
LEA 2	##	WASHINGTON ES	##	X				
LEA 2	##	FILLMORE HS	##			X		
LEA 3	##	TYLER HS	##		X		X	
LEA 4	##	VAN BUREN MS	##	X				
LEA 4	##	POLK ES	##			X		

EXAMPLE:

¹ “Newly Eligible” refers to a school that was made eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. A newly eligible school may be identified for Tier I or Tier II because it has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on State’s assessments; and is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school” or is a high school that has a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. For complete definitions of and additional information about “newly eligible schools,” please refer to the FY 2010 SIG Guidance, questions A-20 to A-30.

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS							
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE
LEA 1	##	MONROE ES	##	X			
LEA 1	##	JEFFERSON HS	##		X		X
LEA 2	##	ADAMS ES	##	X			
LEA 3	##	JACKSON ES	##	X			

Please attach the two tables in a separate file and submit it with the application.

SEA has attached the two tables in a separate file and submitted it with its application.

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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

- (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.
- (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.
- (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).

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 the criteria it will use to assess the LEA’s commitment to do the following:

- (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.

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

Changes to Rubric:
Section A was not changed.

Sections B.1 and B.2 were combined. The indicators for these two sections were subsumed and streamlined to better focus on:

- the capacity to create leadership focused on results,
- the commitment to improving instruction with clear expectations of classroom implementation
- the commitment to use data to drive decision and revise strategies
- the commitment to provide resources to implement continuous school improvement action steps

Section C was renumbered to better fit the LEA application. Some words were added to increase clarity. Two indicators were combined regarding how the chosen plan with increase student achievement.

Section D was not changed.

Section E was not changed. Some words were added to increase clarity.

Section F was not changed.

Section G was completely re-written to address the importance of funding sources, reduction/elimination of services, professional development, and maintaining policies.

Section K (optional) was added for the Pre-Implementation section of the LEA Application

AREA	Total Points Possible		Minimum Points Needed for Approval	
	With Early Implementation	Without Early Implementation	With Early Implementation	Without Early Implementation
A – Analysis of School Needs	30	30	27	27
B – Analysis of LEA Capacity and Commitment	85	85	78	78
C – Root Causes	35	35	32	32
D – School’s to Be Served	15	15	12	12
E – LEA’s Accountability	35	35	31	31
F – Budget	20	20	18	18
G – Sustainability	20	20	18	18
K – Pre-Implementation (optional)	65		59	
Total	305	240	275	216

Sections H, I and J will not be evaluated using a rubric score. These three sections of the LEA Application are scored as a Yes or No. If a No is scored, the application is considered incomplete and returned to the LEA for completion.

LEA applications must meet the minimum points for each area for approval. In addition, applications must score in the Fully Addressed or Partially Addressed indicators to be approved. Applications that meet the minimum points but receive a rubric score in Not Addressed, specifically in LEA Capacity, will not be approved.

Rubric points to be assigned for each component of the LEA application during the review process:

Fully Addressed

5 – All items addressed

4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed

Partially Addressed

3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness

2 – Missing a number of components

Not Addressed

1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue

0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan

See Appendix D for complete Rubric Evaluation Tool

Part 1

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

- (1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and/or Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application and has selected an intervention for each school.**

Evaluation Criteria

The SEA will review the LEA’s responses to questions in Sections A, C and D of the LEA application to determine the degree and level the LEA analyzed the needs of their schools and selected the best intervention for these schools using the following Rubrics:

- Rubric A – ***LEA’s Analysis of School Needs*** - addresses A.1-A.3 of the LEA Application
 - Minimum Rubric Score for consideration is 27 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.
- Rubric C – ***Root Causes*** - addresses C.1-C.4 of the LEA Application
 - Minimum Rubric Score for consideration is 32 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.
- Rubric D – ***Schools to Be Served*** – addresses D.1-D.3 of the LEA Application
 - Minimum Rubric Score for consideration is 12 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.

Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:

5 – All items addressed

4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed

3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness

2 – Missing a number of components

- 1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue**
- 0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan**

(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.

Evaluation Criteria

The SEA will review the LEA’s responses to the capacity matrix indicators to determine the LEA capacity to implement one of the four intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools using the following Rubrics:

- **Rubric B – *Evaluation of LEA Capacity and Commitment*** - addresses section B of the LEA Application
 - Minimum score for consideration is 78 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.

Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:

- 5 – All items addressed**
- 4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed**
- 3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness**
- 2 – Missing a number of components**
- 1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue**
- 0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan**

(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).

Evaluation Criteria

The SEA will review the LEA’s budget proposal, section F of the LEA application, to determine the level and degree that the LEA budget sufficiently funds the necessary components to fully and completely implement the chosen intervention model and support the continued improvement efforts in Tier III schools using the following Rubrics:

- **Rubric F – *Analysis of Budget*** – addresses Section F of the LEA Application
 - Minimum score for consideration is 18 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.

Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:

- 5 – All items addressed**
- 4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed**
- 3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness**
- 2 – Missing a number of components**

- 1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue
- 0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan

Part 2

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

The SEA will review the LEA's responses to determine the level and degree of LEA commitment to implement one of the four intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools. Rubric B will be used to determine to what extent the district has modified its practices and policies, align other resources with implementation of the model as well as select and evaluate the work of external providers. The SEA will use the following Rubrics to determine the actions the LEA has taken towards the above (4) areas:

- Rubric B – Analysis of *LEA Capacity and Commitment* - addresses B of the LEA Application (#2, #3 and #4)
 - Minimum score for consideration is 78 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.
- Rubric E – *LEA's Accountability* – addresses E.1-E.5 of the LEA Application
 - Minimum score for consideration is 31 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed (#1 & #2)

Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:

- 5 – All items addressed**
- 4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed**
- 3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness**
- 2 – Missing a number of components**
- 1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue**
- 0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan**

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

Evaluation Criteria

The SEA will review LEA's Sustainability Plan, section G, to determine quality and

viability of the long range plan to sustain continue improvement efforts after the funding period ends using the following Rubrics

- Rubric G – *Sustainability Plans* – addresses Section G of the LEA Application
 - Minimum score for consideration is 18 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.

Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:

5 – All items addressed

4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed

3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness

2 – Missing a number of components

1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue

0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan

B-1. ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: In addition to the evaluation criteria listed in Section B, the SEA must evaluate the following information in an LEA's budget and application:

Please note that Section B-1 is a new section added for the FY 2010 application.

(1) How will the SEA review an LEA's proposed budget with respect to activities carried out during the pre-implementation period² to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

(2) How will the SEA evaluate the LEA's proposed activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period to determine whether they are allowable? *(For a description of allowable activities during the pre-implementation period, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.)*

² "Pre-implementation" enables an LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011–2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application, consistent with the SIG final requirements. As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG-related activities in schools that will be served with FY 2010 and/or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds. For a full description of pre-implementation, please refer to section J of the FY 2010 SIG Guidance.

Insert response to Section B-1 Additional Evaluation Criteria here:

If the LEA chooses the Early Implementation option, the SEA will review the LEA's budget proposal for pre-implementation items while reviewing the budget section F of the LEA application, to determine the level and degree that the LEA budget sufficiently funds the necessary components for pre-implementation of the chosen intervention model. Pre-implementation items must assist the LEA in addressing difficult or timely decision points (hiring, professional development, etc.) that could hinder the SIG implementation timeline once the 2011-2012 school year begins. Each pre-implementation item must be directly associated with the chosen intervention model as well as address needs found in the LEA's need assessment.

- Rubric F – *Analysis of Budget* – addresses Section F of the LEA Application
 - Minimum score for consideration is 18 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.

Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:

5 – All items addressed

4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed

3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness

2 – Missing a number of components

1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue

0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan

- Rubric K – *Pre-Implementation* (optional) – addresses Section K of the LEA Application
 - Minimum score for consideration is 59 with scores in Fully Addressed and/or Partially Addressed.

Rubric points to be assigned during the review process:

5 – All items addressed

4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed

3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness

2 – Missing a number of components

1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue

0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan

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

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

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement any of the school intervention models in its Tier I school(s). The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

SEA is using the same evaluation criteria for capacity as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for capacity for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section C Capacity here:

LEA capacity will be determined through the analysis of responses to the capacity matrix using the Scoring Rubrics. LEAs demonstration of capacity will be assessed in the five areas for the Arizona Standards and Rubric for District and School Improvement; LEA and School Leadership, Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Development, Assessment, Culture, Climate, and Communication and Resource Management. The LEA's rubric score in Capacity and Commitment will determine whether an LEA demonstrates the capacity to implement the School Improvement Grant in their Tier I or Tier II school(s). LEAs responses must achieve a rubric score of at least 78 to be considered having the capacity and commitment to implement. The rubric scores represent the LEAs work and efforts to demonstrate their capacity to fully and completely implement an intervention model and support the continuous improvement work in Tier III schools

To determine the validity of an LEA's claim that it lacks sufficient capacity to serve one or more of its Tier I and Tier II school(s), the Arizona Department of Education will utilize the following actions:

1. Review the LEA Application. Specifically LEA responses to the individual indicators in the capacity matrix, synthesizing the strengths and weakness. Review the LEA responses demonstrating commitment, synthesizing the actions that have already taken place and those that are planned. Review the Standards and Rubrics for School/District Improvement Self Assessment to identify foundational indicators that are in the approaches or falls far below category.
2. Reference the evaluation tool completed for Part B

3. Meet with the LEA Team together and individually to gather information on the perception of capacity
4. Arizona Department of Education's School Improvement and Intervention team will conduct on-site visits of Tier I and/or Tier II schools in that LEA

If the Arizona Department of Education agrees that the LEA does not have the capacity at this time, the ADE will work with the LEA team, incorporating findings from above and will develop an Action Plan for building their capacity.

If the Arizona Department of Education disagrees with the LEA determination that it lacks capacity, the ADE will:

1. Convene a meeting with the LEA Team and provide evidence that the LEA has capacity and determine then if it is a "commitment" issue
2. Outline the LEA capacity identified in the evidence. Create an action plan for the LEA to implement the chosen intervention model in Tier I and/or Tier II school(s).
3. Provide technical assistance to address the issues that are most interfering with the LEA's moving forward with the grant application
4. Provide information on additional resources and external providers that would support the LEA
5. In addition, the Arizona Department of Education may convene a community forum to seek input from stakeholders

D (PART 1). TIMELINE: An SEA must describe its process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

Please note that Section D has been reformatted to separate the timeline into a different section for the FY 2010 application.

Insert response to Section D (Part 1) Timeline here:

Approval of LEA's applications for their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools will be accomplished in four steps. The School Improvement and Intervention (SII) Review teams will consist of three ADE Educational Program Specialists from School Improvement and Intervention, K12 Literacy, Title I and the Arizona Charter Board. Members of the review team will initially score independently, and then convene in small groups to collectively reach consensus on scores.

- a) **Step One:** upon receiving an LEA's Application, the SII Review Teams will apply the scoring rubric detailed in Appendix D. The rubric offers quality insight into the criteria that will be used to assess the applications. Review team members will review each application and provide a score for each section based on the rubrics A to G & K (Rubric scores will not be awarded to sections H, I or J. These sections are scored with a Yes or No. If the application receives a No score then it is considered incomplete and returned to the LEA for completion. If the application does not reach the minimum number of points required to move to Step 2, an Education Program Specialist will contact the district and assist with modifying the weaker areas. If the application achieves the necessary points, that LEA will move to Step Two.
- b) **Step Two:** using the online Arizona LEA Tracker (ALEAT) tool, the LEA creates a detailed action plan that includes goals, action steps, tasks, timeline, person responsible and budget allocation using the application components. Their completed action plan will be reviewed for alignment with their goals and actions outlined in the application.
 - The LEAs will use the ADE's online *Tracker* system, ALEAT to submit their plan for implementing the selected Improvement Model. ALEAT is an online tool to monitor the implementation and evaluate the effectiveness of a district and/or school Improvement Plan. ALEAT allows ADE to post support materials to provide guidance and assistance to LEAs to organize the information for planning, monitoring, and reporting. Once the plan is entered and approved, school, district and SEA staff can view the plan, and monitor progress of activities as well as report progress and outcomes. Currently, ADE is using *ALEAT* for LEA monitoring of federal and state programs and improvement planning. The SIG Goals and plans for individual schools will be incorporated into this same system, thus maintaining a consistent system

for planning, monitoring implementation and reporting.

If there are discrepancies between Action Plan on ALEAT and the SIG Application, the LEA will be contacted by their Education Program Specialist. If there is alignment the LEA's application will be considered approved and complete. Award Letters will be sent to LEAs.

- c) **Step Three:** as the LEA is developing their ALEAT plan, the LEA and ADE negotiate the submitted budget in order to ensure it meets the SIG requirements as well as financial requirements.
- d) **Step Four:** once the ALEAT Plan and Budget have been approved, the grant Award Letter will be sent. ADE SIG budget specialists will upload the LEA budget into the Arizona Grants Management Enterprise System.

Any grant proposal that does not meet the minimum threshold, as determined through each review process, will be returned to the LEA with specific suggestions for improvement. At each step in the process, staff of the School Improvement Section will be available to support LEA Teams as they work through the application process through on-site visits, informational sessions and conference calls.

2010 School Improvement Grant Timeline

Date	Event
Week of August 1, 2010	Superintendents of Tier I and Tier II schools will be notified
November 29, 2010	Follow up contact with Superintendents and LEA leadership teams
November 30, 2010	Draft of LEA application shared with Committee of Practitioners for review and comment
November 30, 2010	Public posting of Grant Waivers the state intends to request.
December 3, 2010	Public comment on Waivers closes.
December 3, 2010	Arizona's state School Improvement Grant submitted Public posting of Arizona's Tier I and Tier II schools
December 8, 2010	School Improvement Grant overview webinar for

	district leaders of Tier I and Tier II schools
January 6 & 7, 2011	School Improvement Grant Summit for LEA leadership teams
January 2011	Solutions Teams conduct educational systems audit of school and LEA.
January to March 2011	2010 School Improvement Grant LEA Application released
January to March 2011	Technical Assistance to LEAs provided by School Improvement Specialists
March 15 to April 15, 2011	LEA application submission deadline (earlier times for LEAs applying for early implementation funds)
March 15 to May 15, 2011	State team reviews and approves LEA applications
April 15 to June 15, 2011	Award Letters sent

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

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

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

(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.

(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.

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

(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.

(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.³

³ 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.

SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.

SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.

Insert response to Section D (Parts 2-8) Descriptive Information here:

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

The Arizona Department of Education’s School Improvement Section will employ a two-part process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for each of its Tier I and/or Tier II schools. The first part will be focused on those items that can be monitored and reviewed throughout the year (a,b) and the second part will be looking at change from year to year (c,d). The combination of this data will be reviewed to address renewal (e,f).

The Arizona Department of Education will review, on a quarterly basis, the LEA’s goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools using progress monitoring tools outlined by the LEA in its application. LEA will submit a semi-annual report detailing the progress towards goals and implementation progress. Site visits will be conducted by School Improvement Education Program Specialists using an implementation checklist based on the Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement.

- a) The Arizona Department of Education will monitor goals, timelines and implementation of activities and strategies reported by the LEA on its Implementation Plan for Tier I and Tier II schools using ALEAT and monthly site visits using the Monthly Progress Report. The *ALEAT* Plan includes descriptions of the Goals and Strategies, detailed Action Steps (start and end dates, person(s) responsible, specified budget allocations and expenditures), and related Tasks with due dates and assignments. The ADE will review and approve these plans online, and make comments back to the LEA about each item in the plan. Comments appear within the plan at the point of origin, and may also be emailed from *ALEAT* to the persons responsible for that section of the Plan. ADE will provide templates and guidance documents to the LEAs, attached within their online Plan, and may view documents uploaded by the LEAs. As the LEA implements their plan, they record their progress in *ALEAT* by providing status updates of Tasks and Action Steps, recording actual expenditures in their budgets, and uploading documentation related to activities and events to the file cabinet. The Plan Overview page shows the Status of each Goal, Strategy, and Action Step, including when it was last updated and by whom. Action Steps may be "tagged" with one or more designation set by ADE (e.g. SIG, PD, ELL, Parent) and the Plan View may be filtered by a Tag, and/or by a Funding Source, and/or by the Status of Action Steps (Not Begun, In Progress, Completed). The filters provide a view of just those selected features in the Plan, so Reviewer(s) may quickly assess all of the SIG-related Action Steps and see the progress that has been made on each one. An Implementation report is also available, which presents a chart view of each Action Step, it's current Status, and the history of Progress updates with related comments. Certain documentation can be uploaded to a particular

Strategy or Action Step, showing the implementation process and the impact on student achievement.

- b) The Arizona Department of Education will review the LEAs annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools by evaluating essential data to include, but not limited to, student achievement and leading indicators (Baseline data on the following indicators will be collected as part of the LEA’s initial SIG Application Process:
- Teacher attendance rate
 - Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g. AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes (High School)
 - Number of minutes within the school year
 - Average scale scores on AIMS (Arizona’s Instrument to Measure Standards) assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup
 - AYP status
 - Which AYP targets the school met and missed
 - School improvement status
 - Percentage of students that perform at the “meets” or “exceeds” level on the AIMS reading and math portions
 - Student participation rate on AIMS
 - Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency
 - Graduation rate (High School)
 - Dropout rate (High School)
 - Student attendance rate
 - College enrollment rates (High School)
 - Discipline incidents
 - Truants
 - Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA’s teacher evaluation system
- c) Every school and district in improvement needs to complete the corresponding *Arizona’s Standards and Rubrics for District/School Improvement* needs assessment and the results for each district with a Tier I and/or Tier II school, plus a self assessment for each of the Tier I and Tier II schools will be reviewed to identify progress made.
- d) The Arizona Department of Education will determine whether or not to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting goals and making progress on the achievement and leading indicators (identified above) in addition to the review of the needs assessment using the *Standards and Rubrics for District/School Improvement*. If substantial progress has not been made, the SEA will meet with the LEA team to review the data, progress reported on the Implementation Plan as documented in ALEAT, progress on the leading indicators (identified above) and other relative data that would aid the SEA in identifying specifically in which areas significant progress was not made in order to assist the LEA in prioritizing critical areas for improvement.
- e) The LEA must revise their School Improvement Grant and Implementation Plan to meet these priorities and resubmit their application to the SEA. The School Improvement

Grant and Implementation Plan will be reviewed by the SEA to determine viability and LEA capacity to implement the revised plans. If the revised application is approved, the SEA will renew the LEA's School Improvement Grant.

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

Due to limited financial resources to serve the 2010 SIG eligible schools, Arizona does not intend to run a Tier III application process using 2010 SIG 1003g funds.

However, if there are monies available, the Arizona Department of Education's School Improvement and Intervention Section will employ a two-part process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for each of its Tier III schools. The first part will be focused on those items that can be monitored and reviewed throughout the year (a,b) and the second part will be looking at change from year to year (c,d). The combination of this data will be reviewed to address renewal (e,f).

- a) The Arizona Department of Education will review the LEA's goals for student achievement for its Tier III schools using progress monitoring tools outlined by the LEA in its application

The SEA will monitor goals, timelines and implementation of activities and strategies reported by the LEA on its Implementation Plan for Tier III schools on ALEAT on a quarterly basis. The ALEAT Plan includes descriptions of the Goals and Strategies, detailed Action Steps (start and end dates, person(s) responsible, specified budget allocations and expenditures), and related Tasks with due dates and assignments. The ADE will review and approve these plans online, and make comments back to the LEA about each item in the plan. Comments appear within the plan at the point of origin, and may also be emailed from ALEAT to the persons responsible for that section of the Plan. ADE will provide templates and guidance documents to the LEAs, attached within their online Plan, and may view documents uploaded by the LEAs. As the LEA implements their plan, they record their progress in ALEAT by providing status updates of Tasks and Action Steps, recording actual expenditures in their budgets, and uploading documentation related to activities and events to the file cabinet. The Plan Overview page shows the Status of each Goal, Strategy, and Action Step, including when it was last updated and by whom. Action Steps may be "tagged" with one or more designation set by ADE (e.g. SIG, PD, ELL, Parent) and the Plan View may be filtered by a Tag, and/or by a Funding Source, and/or by the Status of Action Steps (Not Begun, In Progress, Completed). The filters provide a view of just those selected features in the Plan, so

Reviewer(s) may quickly assess all of the SIG-related Action Steps and see the progress that has been made on each one. An Implementation report is also available, which presents a chart view of each Action Step, its current Status, and the history of Progress updates with related comments. Certain documentation can be uploaded to a particular Strategy or Action Step, showing the implementation process and the impact on student achievement.

- b) The Arizona Department of Education will review the LEAs annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools by evaluating essential data to include, but not limited to, student achievement and leading indicators (Baseline data on the following indicators will be collected as part of the LEA’s initial SIG Application Process:
- Teacher attendance rate
 - Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g. AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes (High School)
 - Number of minutes within the school year
 - Average scale scores on AIMS (Arizona’s Instrument to Measure Standards) assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup
 - AYP status
 - Which AYP targets the school met and missed
 - School improvement status
 - Percentage of students that perform at the “meets” or “exceeds” level on the AIMS reading and math portions
 - Student participation rate on AIMS
 - Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency
 - Graduation rate (High School)
 - Dropout rate (High School)
 - Student attendance rate
 - College enrollment rates (High School)
 - Discipline incidents
 - Truants
 - Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA’s teacher evaluation system
- c) Every school and district in improvement needs to complete the corresponding *Arizona’s Standards and Rubrics for District/School Improvement* self assessment and the results for each district with a Tier I and/or Tier II school, plus a self assessment for each of the Tier I and Tier II schools will be reviewed to identify progress made.
- d) The Arizona Department of Education will determine whether or not to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting goals and making progress on the achievement and leading indicators (identified above) in addition to the review of the self assessment using the *Standards and Rubrics for District/School Improvement*. If substantial progress has not been made, the SEA will meet with the LEA team to review the data, progress reported on the Implementation Plan as documented in ALEAT, and other relevant data that would aid

ADE in identifying specifically in which areas significant progress was not made in order to assist the LEA in prioritizing critical areas for improvement.

- e) The LEA must revise their School Improvement Grant and Implementation Plan to meet these priorities and resubmit their application to the SEA. The School Improvement Grant and Implementation Plan will be reviewed by the SEA to determine viability and LEA capacity to implement the revised plans. If the revised application is approved, the SEA will renew the LEA's School Improvement Grant.

(3) 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 Arizona Department of Education will employ a number of methods to monitor and review LEAs that receive a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve. Monitoring progress towards effective implementation of the model and achievement of goals will include three distinct components, ALEAT monitoring, Monthly Site Visits, and Compliance Monitoring.

- a) This monitoring will include, but is not limited to, the following:
ALEAT (LEA Tracker) will assist the Arizona Department of Education in monitoring the implementation progress for each Tier I and Tier II schools in accordance with the intervention model selected by the LEA. ADE will monitor the LEA's plan implementation using *ALEAT*, providing "real-time" information on implementation (status updates, comments, documentation provided) as well as review the SIG schools' plans and the LEA's interactions within the school plans (e.g. comments, LEA-provided documents, monitoring reports in the LEA plans.) The implementation of the school intervention model will be evident in both the LEA plan implementation and in their interaction with the progress of the school plans. In addition to the LEA plans, *ALEAT* provides individual school Improvement Plans, accessible from their LEA Overview page. The school plans are structured like the LEA plans, and schools may "pull in" specific goals from the LEA plan, then edit them to reflect school-level implementation. The User Permission structure of *ALEAT* permits School users to view their LEA's Plan and other school plans within their LEA. They may only edit their own school plan. The LEA users may view and add comments to their schools' plans, and edit their LEA plan. State Administrators may view, edit, and add comments to all plans in *ALEAT*. The LEA and the ADE will monitor the school's progress in implementing their plan just as the ADE monitors the LEA's plan. The LEA may request specific documentation or evidence be attached to the school plan elements, such as formative assessment data, or evaluations of professional development. The school may upload the documents one time, yet provide them to anyone at the LEA who needs to see them, and attach them to multiple

points within the plan, as appropriate. The LEA will report on implementation according to approved timelines, strategies and activities included in the plan and documentation of progress made or outcomes. The LEA will update status reports quarterly.

- The Arizona Department of Education will provide monthly monitoring and review of plans, including use of funds, in ALEAT to ensure timelines are met and that adequate documentation is made by the LEA demonstrating implementation and sufficient progress. ADE will provide the LEA with ongoing feedback and guidance on documentation and implementation through weekly phone calls and/or emails. Webinars and online conferencing will be scheduled as needed.

b) In addition, the Arizona Department of Education will employ other methods to efficiently monitor an 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 following of which are embedded in the monitoring process, but are not limited to:

- Onsite visits and observations conducted monthly and documented by School Improvement Program Specialists using the Site Visit Report protocol (Monthly Progress Report). Sites will be evaluated on their progress towards full and complete implementation of the components of the selected model.
- Review of assessment and achievement data (progress monitoring data described in LEA plan) on a quarterly basis
- Monthly professional development regional meetings of Tier I and Tier II LEA teams, facilitated by School Improvement staff, to have LEA staff share successes and roadblocks with a broader audience building lateral capacity
- Semi-Annual reports on plan implementation completed by LEA
- End-of-Year Report submitted by LEA
- Monthly cash management review of the use of SIG funds
- Compliance Monitoring visit once within the 3 year period. Visits to be determined by level of need at the LEA and school. LEAs determined to exhibit the most need will have Compliance Monitoring visits in Year 1. The ADE, as part of its accountability and technical assistance responsibilities to School Improvement LEAs and schools, schedules and implements targeted comprehensive on-site Compliance Monitoring reviews during the school year at SIG schools with known potential programmatic and/or fiscal compliance concerns. These reviews are conducted by a team of Education Program Directors and Specialists from the School Effectiveness Division who have both programmatic and fiscal expertise.
 - i. Visitation priorities for the LEAs and SIG schools are determined annually based on the following considerations:
 - Discussions between the Fiscal Monitoring Team and the School Improvement and K–12 Literacy Teams who have shared responsibility for each school within their assigned geographic region.

- Recommendations from Education Program Specialists and review of their Monthly Reports and Implementation Checklists.
- Review of other ADE Units' recent program evaluation reports.
- Review of Single Audit findings from audits conducted by external audit entities and the Arizona Auditor General's Office.
- Review of LEA Quarterly and Annual SIG Progress Reports.
- Review of Arizona's LEA Tracker System (ALEAT) profiles.
- Annual review of leading indicators (as defined in Section 3 of the final guidance)

c) The SEA may request certain documentation from the LEA or employ more intensive support or monitoring (e.g. more frequent on-site monitoring, fiscal monitoring, etc.) as deemed necessary by the School Improvement Section staff.

(4) 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.

Arizona Department of Education will prioritize funding of School Improvement Grants in the following manner:

- a) First, applications received from LEAs with schools in Tier I and Tier II will be reviewed through use of rubrics in the Evaluation of LEA Applications.
- b) LEAs with Tier I and Tier II Applications will be prioritized by:
 - the total combined score of the 8 rubrics used in the evaluation process
 - the score for capacity and commitment to fully implement the chosen model (a strong focus on building district capacity to support all schools)
 - the score for budget – that sufficient funds were requested to fully implement the chosen model
- c) Priority will be given to LEAs with Tier III schools that choose to fully implement one of two priority intervention models (Turnaround Model, Transformation Model).

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

- a) First, as part of the application process, the LEA will prioritize their Tier III schools and provide their rationale for this order. The rationale needs to be data-driven.
- b) Arizona Department of Education will compare the LEAs prioritized list of Tier III schools against the same criteria the SEA used in identifying Tier I and II schools and the ranking list developed by our research department (percent of students below proficient on AIMS, number of years in improvement and for high school the percentage of students who graduate in four years.)
- c) LEAs with a Tier III school(s) that have chosen to fully implement one of the priority intervention models (Turnaround Model, Transformation Model)

d) Additionally, the SEA will consider past performance of an individual Tier III school's progress in implementing their ASIP (Arizona School Improvement Plan) to determine if there has been significant change and whether or not the school has the capacity for continued improvement.

(6) 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.

Due to local control, the state does not have plans to take over operation of a school, at this time. If an LEA requests a takeover, the Arizona Department of Education would contract with an EMO or a CMO to implement one of the models.

(7) 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.

Arizona Department of Education does not intend to provide services directly to any schools in absence of a takeover.

The provisions in items 7 and 8 are not applicable to Arizona at this time. State law does not currently allow a direct takeover of a district school. However, it does allow for significant interventions to be imposed upon underperforming schools. These consequences apply to a school if it earns a "Failing to Meet Academic Standards" label. This can occur when a school receives an "Underperforming" label for three consecutive years in the state's accountability system known as AZ LEARNS. The main performance measures are: pass rate and growth rate on the state's assessment instrument, reclassification rate of ELL students and graduation and drop-out rates (for high schools only).

A "Failing" school may be required to remove school administrators, select new curricula, hire additional personnel, and the like. Progress on these requirements will be monitored by the Intervention unit for a minimum of three years. Arizona law also allows the State Board of Education to select an outside agency to take control of a Failing school. This provision has not yet been imposed on any school within the state. All of the above flows from Arizona Revised Statute § 15-241.

Arizona State Board Policy enacted in the Spring of 2010 provides ADE the authority to designate any school identified as Persistently Lowest-Achieving as Underperforming under state statute ARS § 15-241 AZ LEARNS. This allows the state to apply the requirements of this statute to schools identified on the 2010 Persistently Lowest-

Achieving list.

E. ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following (check each box):

- 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.
- 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 "rigorous review process" of recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers as well as 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; total amount of the three year grant listed by each year of implementation; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION: The SEA 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 any State-level funds it chooses to reserve from its School Improvement Grant allocation.

Insert response to Section F SEA Reservation here:

Arizona Department of Education and specifically the School Improvement Section (SII) within the School Effectiveness Division has revised and refined our current practices with regard to supporting schools and districts in order to enhance the services provided by the School Improvement section. The SEA completed the State System of Support Evaluation process with the Southwest Comprehensive Center and the Center for Innovation and Improvement. A number of the recommendations guided the changes to the structure of the SII section. Significant steps have been taken over the past year to develop and create a cohesive and coordinated system of support for schools and LEAs in improvement status.

Arizona has formalized processes in place for addressing schools identified through the AZLEARNS system as Underperforming. These have been established in Arizona Statute 15-241. These processes include coaches, Solutions Team visits, development of School Improvement Plans and District Plans, Turnaround Coaches, Turnaround Principals, and Comprehensive Site visits with extensive planning. The Solutions Team and Comprehensive Site visits require teams of people to travel to the school and spend 1-2 days on-site collecting data, meeting with staff, reviewing documents to determine the current conditions in the school. This involves analyzing the overall systems that are in place and identifying what needs to be done to improve those systems so students can learn.

Support and assistance for LEAs that are eligible for and are awarded the School Improvement Grant will include a number of the components from the AZ LEARNS support structure.

- Solutions Teams have been repurposed to provide recommendations to the LEA and School based on the current status of the educational systems at the school level. This information will assist the LEA in conducting a Needs Assessment at the school, as well as complete the SIG application.
- SII specialist assigned to each of the eligible LEAs. The specialist will provide guidance and support during the application process.
- Regionally based professional development opportunities will be provided through face to face meetings as well as e-learning environments.
- Web-base learning opportunities and resources will be provided. This will include but not limited to: recorded webinars, IDEAL Just in Time e-learning modules, presentations, templates and flow charts.
- Monthly site visits to monitor implementation of the intervention model components as well as provide on the spot technical assistance or professional development to address the identified needs. Provided by a team of ADE specialists from SII and K-12 Literacy sections.

- Mentor Principal Coach assigned to each Turnaround Principal. Mentor principal coaches are former effective administrators that have a proven track record of improving schools.
- Compliance Monitoring of LEA and schools that are awarded the SIG grant.
- Collaborate with other ADE sections and units to provide professional development or technical assistance in identified areas of need

The School Improvement and Intervention Section reorganized in an effort to offer high quality service in a more effective and efficient manner to all schools and LEAs in improvement. Education Program Specialists are assigned to one of three regions within the state. This region is lead by a Program Director to make up the Regional Support Team. Each Regional Team is tasked with providing the necessary support, assistance and guidance needed in order to build the capacity of the LEAs to drive and support school improvement efforts at their schools.

- Differentiated support based on the level of need within the LEA and school. Multi-tiered support system would provide some on site technical assistance to the LEAs demonstrating the most critical need.
- Regionally based professional development opportunities provided to all schools in improvement through face to face meetings as well as e-learning environments.
- Web-base learning opportunities and resources provided to all schools in the state. This will include but not limited to: recorded webinars, IDEAL Just in Time e-learning modules, presentations, templates and flow charts.
- Quarterly professional development based on identified needs within the region offered to schools and LEAs in improvement status. Includes networking time for LEAs to share successes and challenges. Conducted by the SII staff.
- Specific trainings for LEAs with schools in Corrective Action and Restructuring. Provide LEAs with materials and resources to accurately choose the options and models to implement in their schools
- Continuous Improvement Plan training that includes the planning process, a plan worksheet, data analysis and root cause identification, development of goals, strategies and action steps, implementation and evaluation systems.
- Arizona LEA Tracker (ALEAT) training
- Collaborate with other ADE sections and units to provide professional development or technical assistance in identified areas of need.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The 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
- Parent Information Resource Center (PIRC),
 - ADE’s Title I Department,
 - ADE’s Research and Evaluation staff,
 - ADE’s High School Renewal staff,
 - Arizona RTI
 - Southwest Comprehensive Center @ WestEd

H. WAIVERS: SEAs are invited to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must check the corresponding box(es) to indicate which waiver(s) it is requesting.

WAIVERS OF SEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Arizona requests a waiver of the State-level requirements it has indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and raise the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and incorporation of that definition in identifying Tier II schools under Section I.A.1(b) of those requirements to permit the State to include, in the pool of secondary schools from which it determines those that are the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, secondary schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for at least two consecutive years or are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Assurance

The State assures that it will include in the pool of schools from which it identifies its Tier II schools all Title I secondary schools not identified in Tier I that either (1) have not made AYP for at least two consecutive years; or (2) are in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. Within that pool, the State assures that it will identify as Tier II schools the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with its approved definition. The State is attaching the list of schools and their level of achievement (as determined under paragraph (b) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”) that would be identified as Tier II schools without the waiver and those that would be identified with the waiver. The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to use SIG

funds in a Title I secondary school that becomes an eligible Tier II school based on this waiver will comply with the SIG final requirements for serving that school.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the Tier II waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” in Section I.A.3 of the SIG final requirements and the use of that definition in Section I.A.1(a) and (b) of those requirements to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the “all students” group in the grades assessed is less than **[Please indicate number]** .

Assurance

The State assures that it determined whether it needs to identify five percent of schools or five schools in each tier prior to excluding small schools below its “minimum n.” The State is attaching, and will post on its Web site, a list of the schools in each tier that it will exclude under this waiver and the number of students in each school on which that determination is based. The State will include its “minimum n” in its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” In addition, the State will include in its list of Tier III schools any schools excluded from the pool of schools from which it identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools in accordance with this waiver.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the n-size waiver for its FY 2009 definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” should request the waiver again only if it is generating new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 3: New list waiver

Because the State neither must nor elects to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, waive Sections I.A.1 and II.B.10 of the SIG final requirements to permit the State to use the same Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III lists it used for its FY 2009 competition.

Assurance

The State assures that it has five or more unserved Tier I schools on its FY 2009 list.

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

Enter State Name Here Arizona requests a waiver of the requirements it has indicated 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, Tier II, or Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State’s Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 4: School improvement timeline waiver

Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011–2012 school year to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

Assurances

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement this waiver only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests the waiver in its application as part of a plan to implement the turnaround or restart model beginning in 2011–2012 in a school that the SEA has approved it to serve. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, 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.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the school improvement timeline waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

Schools that started implementation of a turnaround or restart model in the 2010-2011 school year cannot request this waiver to “start over” their school improvement timeline again.

Waiver 5: Schoolwide program waiver

Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold and is fully implementing one of the four school intervention models.

Assurances

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

The State assures that, if it is granted this waiver, 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.

Note: An SEA that requested and received the schoolwide program waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver for the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY WAIVER

Enter State Name Here Arizona requests a waiver of the requirement indicated below. The State believes that the requested waiver will increase its ability to implement the SIG program effectively in eligible schools in the State in order to improve the quality of instruction and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools.

Waiver 6: Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver

Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2014.

Note: This waiver only applies to FY 2009 carryover funds. An SEA that requested and received this waiver for the FY 2009 competition and wishes to also receive the waiver to apply to FY 2009 carryover funds in order to make them available for three full years for schools awarded SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition must request the waiver again in this application.

ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS

(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

The State assures that, prior to submitting 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 its waiver request(s) 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 the above waiver request(s) 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.

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

Please note that for FY 2010, an SEA must develop or update its LEA application form to include information on any activities, as well as the budget for those activities, that LEAs plan to carry out during the pre-implementation period to help prepare for full implementation in the following school year.

The SEA must submit its LEA application form with its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant. The SEA should attach the LEA application form in a separate document.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - Align other resources with the interventions;
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA’s application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

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

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

Note: An LEA’s budget should cover three years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be included in the first year of the LEA’s three-year budget plan.

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000 or no more than \$6,000,000 over three years.

Example:

LEA XX BUDGET					
	Year 1 Budget		Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Three-Year Total
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 - Full Implementation			
Tier I ES #1	\$257,000	\$1,156,000	\$1,325,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,938,000
Tier I ES #2	\$125,500	\$890,500	\$846,500	\$795,000	\$2,657,500
Tier I MS #1	\$304,250	\$1,295,750	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,800,000
Tier II HS #1	\$530,000	\$1,470,000	\$1,960,000	\$1,775,000	\$5,735,000
LEA-level Activities	\$250,000		\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000
Total Budget	\$6,279,000		\$5,981,500	\$5,620,000	\$17,880,500

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

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

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

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

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

Congress appropriated \$546 million for School Improvement Grants in FY 2010. In addition, most States will be carrying over a portion of their FY 2009 SIG allocations, primarily due to the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG final requirements that if not every Tier I school in a State was served with FY 2009 SIG funds, the State was required to carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation, combine those funds with the State's FY 2010 SIG allocation, and award the combined funding to eligible LEAs consistent with the SIG final requirements. In FY 2009, the combination of \$3 billion in School Improvement Grant funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and \$546 million from the regular FY 2009 appropriation created a unique opportunity for the program to provide the substantial funding over a multi-year period to support the implementation of school intervention models. In response to this opportunity, the Department encouraged States to apply for a waiver extending the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds until September 30, 2013 so that States could use these funds to make three-year grant awards to LEAs to support the full and effective implementation of school intervention models in their Tier I and Tier II schools. All States with approved FY 2009 SIG applications applied for and received this waiver to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 SIG funds and, consistent with the final SIG requirements, are using FY 2009 funds to provide a full three years of funding (aka, "frontloading") to support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

The Department encouraged frontloading in FY 2009 because the extraordinary amount of SIG funding available in FY 2009 meant that, if those funds had been used to fund only the first year of implementation of a school intervention model, *i.e.*, to make first-year only awards, there would not have been sufficient funding for continuation awards in years two and three of the SIG award period (*i.e.*, SIG funding in FY 2009 was seven times the amount provided through the regular appropriation). Similarly, the estimated nearly \$1.4 billion in total SIG funding available in FY 2010 (an estimated \$825 million in FY 2009 SIG carryover funds plus the \$546 million FY 2010 SIG appropriation) is larger than the expected annual SIG appropriation over the next two fiscal years; if all funds available in FY 2010 were used to make the first year of three-year awards to LEAs for services to eligible Tier I and Tier II schools, there would not be sufficient funds to make continuation awards in subsequent fiscal years.

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

Continuing the practice of frontloading SIG funds in FY 2010 with respect to all SIG funds that are available for the FY 2010 competition (FY 2009 carryover funds plus the FY 2010 appropriation) would, in many States, limit the number of Tier I and Tier II schools that can be served as a result of the FY 2010 SIG competition. For this reason, the Department believes that, for most States, the most effective method of awarding FY 2010 SIG funds to serve the maximum number of Tier I and Tier II schools that have the capacity to fully and effectively implement a school intervention model is to frontload FY 2009 carryover funds while using FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year only awards.

For example, if a State has \$36 million in FY 2009 carryover SIG funds and \$21 million in FY 2010 funds, and awards each school implementing a school intervention model an average of \$1 million per year over three years, the SEA would be able to fund 12 schools with FY 2009 carryover funds (*i.e.*, the \$36 million would cover all three years of funding for those 12 schools), plus an additional 21 schools with FY 2010 funds (*i.e.*, the \$21 million would cover the first year of funding for each of those schools, and the second and third years would be funded through continuation grants from subsequent SIG appropriations). Thus, the State would be able to support interventions in a total of 33 schools. However, if the same State elected to frontload all funds available for its FY 2010 SIG competition (FY 2009 carryover funds and its FY 2010 allocation), it would be able to fund interventions in only 19 schools (\$57 million divided by \$3 million per school over three years).

LEAs that receive first-year only awards would continue to implement intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools over a three-year award period; however, second- and third-year continuation grants would be awarded from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years. This practice of making first-year awards from one year's appropriation and continuation awards from funds appropriated in subsequent fiscal years is similar to the practice used for many U.S. Department of Education discretionary grant programs.

States with FY 2009 SIG carryover funds are invited to apply, as in their FY 2009 applications, for the waiver to extend the period of availability of these funds for one additional year to September 30, 2014. States that did not carry over FY 2009 SIG funds, or that carried over only a small amount of such funds, need not apply for this waiver; such States will use all available FY 2010 SIG funds to make first-year awards to LEAs in their FY 2010 SIG competitions.

Continuation of \$2 Million Annual Per School Cap

For FY 2010, States continue to have flexibility to award up to \$2 million annually for each participating school. This flexibility applies both to funds that are frontloaded and those that are used for first-year only awards. As in FY 2009, this higher limit will permit an SEA to award the amount that the Department believes typically would be required for the successful

implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model in a Tier I or Tier II school (e.g., a school of 500 students might require \$1 million annually, whereas a large, comprehensive high school might require the full \$2 million annually).

In addition, the annual \$2 million per school cap, which permits total per-school funding of up to \$6 million over three years, reflects the continuing priority on serving Tier I or Tier II schools. An SEA must ensure that all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve, are awarded sufficient school improvement funding to fully and effectively implement the selected school intervention models over the period of availability of the funds before the SEA awards any funds for Tier III schools.

The following describes the requirements and priorities that apply to LEA budgets and SEA allocations.

LEA Budgets

An LEA's proposed budget should cover a three-year period and should take into account the following:

1. The number of 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. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.
3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly 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 number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.
6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by \$2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

SEA Allocations to LEAs

An SEA must allocate the LEA share of school improvement funds (*i.e.*, 95 percent of the SEA's allocation from the Department) in accordance with the following requirements:

1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.
4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.
5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.
7. Note that the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG requirements, under which an SEA that does not serve all of its Tier I schools must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation to the following year, does not apply to FY 2010 SIG funds.

An SEA's School Improvement Grant award to an LEA must:

1. Include not less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).
2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An

SEA may reduce an LEA's requested budget by any amounts proposed for interventions in one or more schools that the SEA does not approve the LEA to serve (*i.e.*, because the LEA does not have the capacity to serve the school or because the SEA is approving only a portion of Tier I and Tier II schools in certain LEAs in order to serve Tier I and Tier II schools across the State). An SEA also may reduce award amounts if it determines that an LEA can implement its planned interventions with less than the amount of funding requested in its budget.

3. Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.
4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.
5. Apportion any FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver to extend the period of availability to September 30, 2014).
6. Use FY 2010 school improvement funds to make the first year of three-year grant awards to LEAs (unless the SEA has received a waiver of the period of availability for its FY 2010 funds). Continuation awards for years 2 and 3 would come from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

APPENDIX B

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

[‡] “Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State--

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

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

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

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

[§] For the purposes of schools that may be added to Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III, “Title I eligible” schools may be schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or schools that are Title I participating (i.e., schools that are eligible for and do receive Title I, Part A funds).

^{**} Certain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II rather than Tier III. In particular, certain Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I may be in Tier II if an SEA receives a waiver to include them in the pool of schools from which Tier II schools are selected or if they meet the criteria in section I.A.1(b)(ii)(A)(2) and (B) and an SEA chooses to include them in Tier II.



Definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools

Tier I. Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is:

1. Among the lowest-achieving 5 percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring

Or

2. Is a high school that has not had a graduation rate of 60 percent or greater in any of the past three years.

Tier II. Any high school that is eligible for but did not receive Title I funds that is:

1. Among the lowest-achieving 5 percent of high schools

Or

2. Has not had a graduation rate of 60 percent or greater in any of the past three years.

High schools are defined as schools serving grades 9-12.

Academic achievement is measured by performance on Arizona's standards-based test, the AIMS using the "all students" category.

Graduation rates are measured using a four-year, adjusted cohort graduation rate. Cohort years 2007, 2008, and 2009 were used in the determination.

Determining the lowest-achieving 5 percent. Arizona ranked schools using the Single Percentage Method defined in federal guidance using current year test results (p5). This ranked schools by the percentage of students scoring proficient on the AIMS. Arizona also ranked schools by lack of progress. Lack of progress was measured as the average annual change in the percentage of students scoring proficient on AIMS over the past three years. A school's final ranking was determined by averaging the two ranks, giving each rank equal weight, using the following formula:

$$\text{Final Rank} = \frac{\text{Rank Percent Proficient} + \text{Rank Lack of Progress}}{2}$$

Exceptions. Schools identified as credit recovery were not included on the list. To be identified as credit recovery, a school had to have met the state Board's definition of an alternative school, and to have identified itself through its publicly posted mission statement on its school report card as a credit recovery school.

District Name	LEA NCES#	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate	Newly Eligible
Cedar Unified District	401810	White Cone High School	040181002544	X			X	
Florence Crittenton Services of	400144	Crittenton Youth Academy	040014401717	X			X	
Gadsden Elementary District	403240	Gadsden Elementary School	004032400250	X				
Imagine Charter Elementary at Camelb	400445	Imagine Elementary at Camelback	040044502676	X				
Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified	403950	Baboquivari High School	040395000310	X			X	
James Sandoval Preparatory High	400332	James Sandoval Preparatory High School	040033202165		X		X	
Kingman Unified School District	400295	Mt Tipton Elementary School	040029500149	X			X	
Legacy Education Group	400423	East Valley High School	040042302525		X			
OMEGA SCHOOLS d.b.a. Omega Acade	400101	La Puerta High School	040010103091	X				
Peach Springs Unified District	406120	Peach Springs School	040612000502	X				
Pima Prevention Partnership dba	400367	Pima Partnership School, The	040036702303	X			X	
San Carlos Unified District	406960	San Carlos Intermediate / Rice Primary	040696001656	X				
San Carlos Unified District	406960	San Carlos Junior High School / San Carlos High Schoo	040696000526	X				
Seligman Unified District	407630	Seligman High School	040763000668		X			
Tucson Unified District	408800	Howenstine High School	040880001450		X			
Tucson Unified District	408800	Project More High School	040880001508		X			
Whiteriver Unified District	409160	Canyon Day Junior High School	040916000952	X				
Whiteriver Unified District	409160	Alchesay High School	040916000005	X				
Whiteriver Unified District	409160	Seven Mile School	040916002190	X				

* Rice Primary was combined with San Carlos Intermediate and was served with 2009 SIG Funds

** San Carlos High School was combined with San Carlos Jr. High and was served with 2009 Funds

District Name	LEA NCES#	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate	Newly Eligible	Tier I Achieve	Tier I Grad Rate
Academy of Arizona	0400234	Academy of Arizona - Main	040023402024			X				
Academy of Building Industries, Inc.	0400414	Academy of Building Industries	040023402412			X				
Academy with Community Partners	0400276	Academy with Community Partners	040027601841	X			X			1
Agua Fria Union High School Dist	0400450	Agua Fria High School	040045000001			X				
Aguila Elementary District	0400480	Aguila Elementary School	040048000002			X				
Ajo Unified District	0400520	Ajo High School	040052003063	X					1	
Akimel O'Otham Pee Posh Charter	0400404	Akimel O'Otham Pee Posh (3rd and 4th)	040040401993			X				
Alhambra Elementary District	0400600	Andalucia Middle School	040060000302			X				
Alhambra Elementary District	0400600	R E Simpson School	040060000015			X				
American Charter Schools Foundat	0400618	South Pointe High School	040061803095			X				
Amphitheater Unified District	0400680	Amphitheater High School	040068000032			X				
Amphitheater Unified District	0400680	Amphitheater Middle School	040068000020			X				
Amphitheater Unified District	0400680	Helen Keeling Elementary School	040068000026			X				
Apache Junction Unified District	0400790	Four Peaks Elementary School	040079000041			X				
Arizona Call-a-Teen Youth Resour	0400057	Arizona Call-a-Teen Center for Excel	040005700784			X				
Ash Fork Joint Unified District	0400910	Ash Fork Elementary School	040091000047			X				
Ash Fork Joint Unified District	0400910	Ash Fork High School	040091001059			X				
Ash Fork Joint Unified District	0400910	Ashfork Middle School	040091000048			X				
Avondale Elementary District	0400960	Lattie Coor	040096000051			X				
Balsz Elementary District	0401050	Balsz School	040105000054			X				
Balsz Elementary District	0401050	Brunson-Lee Elementary School	040105003142			X				
Balsz Elementary District	0401050	David Crockett School	040105000055			X				
Balsz Elementary District	0401050	Orangedale Jr. High Prep	040105000057			X				
Bicentennial Union High School District	0401160	Salome High School	040116000062			X				
Bradley Academy of Excellence, Inc.	0400609	Bradley Academy of Excellence	040060903117			X				
Blueprint Education	0400636	Hope High School	040063603108			X				
Buckeye Elementary District	0401380	Buckeye Middle School	040138002492			X				
Buckeye Elementary District	0401380	Buckeye Primary	040138002491			X				
Bullhead City School District	0401500	Bullhead City Jr High School	040150000085			X				
Career Success Schools	0400219	Career Success High School - Copper	040021903137			X				
Career Success Schools	0400219	Career Success High School - Main Ca	040021902011			X				
Cartwright Elementary District	0401680	Charles W. Harris School	040168000091			X				
Cartwright Elementary District	0401680	Desert Sands Middle School	040168000092			X				
Cartwright Elementary District	0401680	Estrella Middle School	040168000093			X				
Cartwright Elementary District	0401680	Frank Borman Middle School	040168000094			X				
Cartwright Elementary District	0401680	G. Frank Davidson	040168001709			X				
Cartwright Elementary District	0401680	Heatherbrae School	040168000096			X				
Cartwright Elementary District	0401680	Marc T. Atkinson Middle School	040168002005			X				
Cartwright Elementary District	0401680	Peralta School	040168000102			X				
Cartwright Elementary District	0401680	Raul H. Castro Middle School	040168002904			X				
Cartwright Elementary District	0401680	Sunset School	040168000105			X				
Casa Grande Union High School Di	0401740	Casa Grande Union High School	040174000113			X				
Casa Grande Union High School Di	0401740	Desert Winds High School	040174001629			X				
Center for Academic Success, Inc.	0400016	Center for Academic Success #4	040001602442			X				
Center for Academic Success, Inc.	0400016	Center for Academic Success, The #2	040001600481			X				
Cesar Chavez Learning Community,	0400253	Aztlan Academy	040025302208			X				

District Name	LEA NCES#	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate	Newly Eligible	Tier I Achieve	Tier I Grad Rate
Cesar Chavez Learning Community,	0400253	Cesar Chavez Middle School	040025301867			X				
Chandler Unified District	0401870	Erie Elementary School	040187000127			X				
Chandler Unified District	0401870	Galveston Elementary School	040187000128			X				
Chinle Unified District	0401940	Canyon De Chelly Elementary School	040194000136			X				
Chinle Unified District	0401940	Chinle Elementary School	040194000135			X				
Chinle Unified District	0401940	Chinle High School	040194000137			X				
Chinle Unified District	0401940	Chinle Junior High School	040194000138			X				
Clifton Unified District	0402110	Clifton High School	040211000150	X			X			1
Colorado City Unified School District	0400021	El Capitan Public School	040002101276			X				
Coolidge Unified District	0402320	Coolidge High School	040232000158			X				
Coolidge Unified District	0402320	Heartland Ranch Elementary	040232002800			X				
Coolidge Unified District	0402320	HoHoKam Elementary School	040232001534			X				
Coolidge Unified District	0402320	West Elementary School	040232000164			X				
CPLC Community Schools dba Calli	0400114	Calli Olin High School	040011401616	X			X			1
CPLC Community Schools dba Calli	0400114	Hiaki High School	040011402554	X					1	
CPLC Community Schools dba Tolte	0400382	Toltecali High School	040038202331	X			X			1
Crane Elementary District	0402400	Centennial Middle School	040240001976			X				
Crane Elementary District	0402400	Crane Middle School	040240000014			X				
Creighton Elementary District	0402430	Excelencia School	040243001999			X				
Creighton Elementary District	0402430	Gateway School	040243001704			X				
Creighton Elementary District	0402430	William T Machan Elementary School	040243000181			X				
Douglas Unified District	0402530	Ray Borane Middle School	040253000194			X				
Dysart Unified District	0402690	El Mirage School	040269000199			X				
Dysart Unified District	0402690	Thompson Ranch Elementary	040269002402			X				
Dysart Unified District	0402690	Valley Vista High School	040269002684			X				
E.Q. Scholars, Inc.	0400142	Scholars Academy, The	040014201807			X				
E-cademie, A Charter School	0400412	E-cademie	040041202410			X				
EDGE School Inc. The	0400078	Edge High School - Himmel Park	040007801006			X				
Eloy Elementary District	0402790	Curriel School	040279000207			X				
Eloy Elementary District	0402790	Eloy Intermediate School	040279001060	X					1	
Employ-Ability Unlimited, Inc.	0400133	Desert Pointe Academy	040013301888			X				
Espiritu Community Development C	0400052	Esperanza Montessori Academy	040005202451			X				
Flagstaff Unified District	0402860	Coconino High School	040286000212			X				
Flagstaff Unified District	0402860	Flagstaff Middle School	040286000216			X				
Flagstaff Unified District	0402860	Leupp Public School	040286000219	X					1	
Flagstaff Unified District	0402860	Mount Elden Middle School	040286000214			X				
Florence Unified School District	0402920	Florence K-8	040292000227			X				
Florence Unified School District	0402920	Walker Butte K-8	040292002210			X				
Flowing Wells Unified District	0403010	Flowing Wells Junior High School	040301000232			X				
Fowler Elementary District	0403060	Fowler Elementary School	040306000240			X				
Fowler Elementary District	0403060	Western Valley Middle School	040306003085			X				
Friendly House, Inc.	0400102	Friendly House Academia Del Pueblo E	040010201582			X				
Ft Thomas Unified District	0403200	Fort Thomas Elementary School	040320000248			X				
Gadsden Elementary District	0403240	Arizona Desert Elementary	040324001806			X				
Gadsden Elementary District	0403240	Cesar Chavez Elementary	040324003066			X				
Gadsden Elementary District	0403240	Desert View Elementary	040324003116			X				

District Name	LEA NCES#	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate	Newly Eligible	Tier I Achieve	Tier I Grad Rate
Gadsden Elementary District	0403240	Rio Colorado Elementary School	040324001213			X				
Gadsden Elementary District	0403240	San Luis Middle School	040324001101			X				
Gadsden Elementary District	0403240	Southwest Jr. High School	040324002388			X				
Ganado Unified School District	0403290	Ganado High School	040329000252			X				
Ganado Unified School District	0403290	Ganado Middle School	040329000254			X				
Genesis Academy	0400124	Genesis Academy	040012401589			X				
Gila Bend Unified District	0403310	Gila Bend High School	040331000256	X					1	
Gila County Regional School Dist	0400419	Globe Education Center	040041902473			X				
Glendale Elementary District	0403420	Desert Spirit	040342002281			X				
Glendale Elementary District	0403420	Don Mensendick School	040342000270			X				
Glendale Elementary District	0403420	Glendale American School	040342000262			X				
Glendale Elementary District	0403420	Glendale Landmark Middle School	040342000269			X				
Glendale Elementary District	0403420	Isaac E Imes School	040342000267			X				
Glendale Elementary District	0403420	Melvin E Sine School	040342000268			X				
Global Education Foundation	0400146	Tucson Academy of Leadership & Arts	040014601780			X				
Globe Unified District	0403500	High Desert Middle School	040350002422			X				
Ha:an Educational Services	0400147	Ha:an Preparatory & Leadership School	040014701787			X				
Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified	0403950	Baboquivari Middle School	040395000311			X				
Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified	0403950	Indian Oasis Primary School	040395000312	X					1	
Intelli-School, Inc.	0400061	Intelli-School - Paradise Valley	040006101742			X				
Ira H. Hayes Memorial Applied Le	0400312	Ira H. Hayes High School	040031202216	X			X			1
Isaac Elementary District	0403960	Alta E Butler School	040396000314			X				
Isaac Elementary District	0403960	Esperanza Elementary School	040396001542			X				
Isaac Elementary District	0403960	Isaac Middle School	040396000315			X				
Isaac Elementary District	0403960	Joseph Zito Elementary School	040396000319			X				
Isaac Elementary District	0403960	Morris K. Udall Escuela de Bellas Ar	040396001876			X				
Isaac Elementary District	0403960	Moya Elementary	040396002282			X				
Isaac Elementary District	0403960	P T Coe Elementary School	040396000317			X				
Isaac Elementary District	0403960	Pueblo Del Sol Middle School	040396000650			X				
Kayenta Unified District	0404060	Kayenta Middle School	040406001161			X				
Kingman Unified School District	0400295	Kingman High School	040029500881			X				
Laveen Elementary District	0404290	Maurice C. Cash Elementary School	040429000342			X				
Littlefield Unified District	0404410	Beaver Dam Elementary	040441001302			X				
Littleton Elementary District	0404440	Country Place Elementary	040444002497			X				
Littleton Elementary District	0404440	Quentin Elementary School	040444002435			X				
Maricopa County Regional District	0403860	Tumbleweed Transitional Learning Center	040386002365			X				
Maricopa Unified School District	0404720	Maricopa Elementary	040472000371			X				
Maricopa Unified School District	0404720	Maricopa High School	040472000372			X				
Maricopa Unified School District	0404720	Maricopa Wells Middle School	040472001468			X				
Mcnary Elementary District	0404860	Mcnary Elementary School	040486000376			X				
Mesa Unified District	0404970	Brimhall Junior High School	040497000108			X				
Mesa Unified District	0404970	Carson Junior High School	040497000380			X				
Mesa Unified District	0404970	Emerson Elementary School	040497000384			X				
Mesa Unified District	0404970	Fremont Junior High School	040497000387			X				
Mesa Unified District	0404970	Hawthorne Elementary School	040497000389			X				
Mesa Unified District	0404970	Kino Junior High School	040497000396			X				

District Name	LEA NCES#	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate	Newly Eligible	Tier I Achieve	Tier I Grad Rate
Mesa Unified District	0404970	McKellips Learning Center	040497000578			X				
Mesa Unified District	0404970	Mesa Junior High School	040497000405			X				
Mesa Unified District	0404970	Powell Junior High School	040497000410			X				
Mesa Unified District	0404970	Smith Junior High School	040497002110			X				
Mesa Unified District	0404970	Taylor Junior High School	040497001234			X				
Mexicayotl Academy, Inc.	0400150	Mexicayotl Charter School	040015001793			X				
Mohave Accelerated Learning Cent	0400280	Mohave Accelerated Learning Center	040028002186			X				
Mountain English Spanish Academy, A Public Charter Sch	0400379	Mountain English Spanish Academy of Flagstaff (M.	040037902316			X				
Murphy Elementary District	0405400	Alfred F Garcia School	040540000445			X				
Murphy Elementary District	0405400	Arthur M Hamilton School	040540000446			X				
Murphy Elementary District	0405400	William R Sullivan Elementary School	040540000447			X				
New Visions Academy, Inc.	0400313	New Visions Academy	040031302222			X				
Nogales Unified District	0405530	Nogales High School	040553000455			X				
Nogales Unified District	0405530	Pierson Vocational High School	040553001552			X				
North Star Charter School, Inc.	0400303	North Star Charter School, Inc.	040030302181			X				
Northern Arizona Academy for Career Development, Inc.	0400077	Northern AZ Academy for Career Dev. - Taylor	040007700943			X				
Northern Arizona Academy for Career Development, Inc.	0400077	Northern AZ Academy for Career Dev. - Winslow	040007700918			X				
Omega Alpha Academy	0400284	Omega Alpha Academy	040028402095			X				
OMEGA SCHOOLS d.b.a. Omega Acade	0400101	Oasis High School	040010101885	X						1
OMEGA SCHOOLS d.b.a. Omega Acade	0400101	Omega Academy	040010101580			X				
OMEGA SCHOOLS d.b.a. Omega Acade	0400101	S. Sturgeon Middle School	040010103090			X				
Osborn Elementary District	0405670	Osborn Middle School	040567000461			X				
PACE Preparatory Academy, Inc.	0400266	PACE Preparatory Academy	040026602368			X				
Page Unified District	0405820	Desert View Elementary School	040582001078			X				
Page Unified District	0405820	Page Middle School	040582000468			X				
Paradise Valley Unified District	0405930	Greenway Middle School	040593000130			X				
Paradise Valley Unified District	0405930	Palomino Intermediate School	040593003104			X				
Paradise Valley Unified District	0405930	Vista Verde Middle School	040593001218			X				
PAS Charter, Inc., dba Intelli-S	0400364	Intelli-School - Metro Center	040036400804			X				
Payson Unified District	0406070	Payson Center for Success High School	040607001823			X				
Pendergast Elementary District	0406210	Pendergast Elementary School	040621000506			X				
Peoria Unified School District	0406250	Country Meadows Elementary School	040625001982			X				
Phoenix Advantage Charter School	0400109	Phoenix Advantage Charter School	040010901592			X				
Phoenix Elementary District	0406300	Mary Mcleod Bethune School	040630000518			X				
Phoenix Elementary District	0406300	Silvestre S Herrera School	040630000531			X				
Phoenix Elementary District	0406300	Thomas A Edison School	040630000521			X				
Phoenix School of Academic Excel	0400153	Learning Institute, The	040015301902			X				
Phoenix Union High School Distri	0406330	Alhambra High School	040633000538			X				
Phoenix Union High School Distri	0406330	Camelback High School	040633000540			X				
Phoenix Union High School Distri	0406330	Carl Hayden High School	040633000541			X				
Phoenix Union High School Distri	0406330	Central High School	040633000542			X				
Phoenix Union High School Distri	0406330	Cesar Chavez High School	040633001882			X				
Phoenix Union High School Distri	0406330	Maryvale High School	040633000549			X				
Phoenix Union High School Distri	0406330	North High School	040633001244			X				
Phoenix Union High School Distri	0406330	South Mountain High School	040633000552			X				
Phoenix Union High School Distri	0406330	Trevor Browne High School	040633000554			X				

District Name	LEA NCES#	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate	Newly Eligible	Tier I Achieve	Tier I Grad Rate
Pima County Board of Supervisors	0400201	Pima Vocational High School	040020102069			X				
Pinon Unified District	0400023	Pinon Elementary School	040002301352			X				
Pinon Unified District	0400023	Pinon Middle School	040002301355			X				
PPEP & Affiliates	0400083	PPEP TEC - Celestino Fernandez Learn	040008301011			X				
PPEP & Affiliates	0400083	PPEP TEC - Cesar Chavez Learning Cen	040008301016			X				
PPEP & Affiliates	0400083	PPEC Tec - Robles Junction Learning Center	040008302557			X				
PPEP & Affiliates	0400083	PPEP TEC - Raul H. Castro Learning Center	040008301015			X				
Presidio School	0400081	Presidio High School	040008101010			X				
Red Mesa Unified District	0406870	Red Mesa Elementary School	040687000141	X						1
Red Mesa Unified District	0406870	Red Mesa High School	040687000142			X				
Red Mesa Unified District	0406870	Red Mesa Junior High School	040687000206			X				
Red Mesa Unified District	0406870	Round Rock Elementary School	040687000143			X				
Riverside Elementary District	0407020	Kings Ridge School	040702002487			X				
Roosevelt Elementary District	0407080	Bernard Black Elementary School	040708002498			X				
Roosevelt Elementary District	0407080	Cesar E Chavez Community School	040708000605			X				
Roosevelt Elementary District	0407080	Ed and Verma Pastor Elementary School	040708001879			X				
Roosevelt Elementary District	0407080	John R Davis School	040708001144			X				
Roosevelt Elementary District	0407080	Rose Linda School	040708000607			X				
Roosevelt Elementary District	0407080	Percy L Julian School	040708000599			X				
Roosevelt Elementary District	0407080	T G Barr School	040708000582			X				
Roosevelt Elementary District	0407080	V H Lassen Elementary School	040708000593			X				
Roosevelt Elementary District	0407080	Valley View School	040708001100			X				
Sacaton Elementary District	0407200	Sacaton Elementary	040720000621			X				
Sacaton Elementary District	0407200	Sacaton Middle School	040720001176	X						1
Saddle Mountain Unified School D	0407170	Ruth Fisher Elementary School	040717000620			X				
Sanders Unified District	0406740	Sanders Elementary School	040674000572	X						1
Sanders Unified District	0406740	Sanders Middle School	040674001043			X				
Sanders Unified District	0406740	Valley High School	040674001142			X				
Santa Cruz Valley Union High Sch	0407530	Santa Cruz Valley Union High School	040753000638			X				
SC Jensen Corporation, Inc. dba	0400363	Intelli-School	040036302300			X				
Scottsdale Unified District	0407570	Sierra Vista Academy	040757002117			X				
Scottsdale Unified District	0407570	Supai Middle School	040757000661			X				
Sierra Summit Academy	0400297	Sierra Summit Academy	040029702096	X			X			1
Somerton Elementary District	0407890	Somerton Middle School	040789000698			X				
South Pointe Public Charter Junior High School	0400227	South Pointe Junior High School	040022702017			X				
Southgate Academy, Inc.	0400259	Southgate Academy	040025902080			X				
Stanfield Elementary District	0408130	Stanfield Elementary School	040813000705			X				
StarShine Academy	0400416	StarShine Academy	040041602374			X				
Sunnyside Unified District	0408170	Apollo Middle School	040817000706			X				
Sunnyside Unified District	0408170	Challenger Middle School	040817001613			X				
Sunnyside Unified District	0408170	Chaparral Middle School	040817001148			X				
Sunnyside Unified District	0408170	Desert View High School	040817001438			X				
Sunnyside Unified District	0408170	Los Amigos Elementary School	040817001386			X				
Sunnyside Unified District	0408170	Los Ranchitos Elementary School	040817000731			X				
Sunnyside Unified District	0408170	Sierra Middle School	040817001149			X				
Sunnyside Unified District	0408170	Sunnyside High School	040817000743			X				

District Name	LEA NCES#	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate	Newly Eligible	Tier I Achieve	Tier I Grad Rate
Tempe Accelerated Public Charter	0400387	Tempe Accelerated High School	040038701735			X				
Tempe School District	0408310	Connolly Middle School	040831000768			X				
Tempe School District	0408310	Fees Middle School	040831001107			X				
Tertulia: A Learning Community	0400062	Tertulia Pre-College Community Inter	040006201598			X				
Tertulia: A Learning Community	0400062	Tertulia Pre-College Community Prima	040006200811	X					1	
Tolleson Elementary District	0408490	Arizona Desert Elementary School	040849001705			X				
Tolleson Elementary District	0408490	Porfirio H. Gonzales Elementary Scho	040849001477			X				
Tolleson Union High School Distr	0408520	Copper Canyon High School	040852002416			X				
Tuba City Unified District	0408680	Eagles Nest Intermediate School	040868000813			X				
Tuba City Unified District	0408680	Tuba City Alternative School	040868001822			X				
Tuba City Unified District	0408680	Tuba City Junior High School	040868000814	X					1	
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Cragin Elementary School	040880001269			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Davidson Elementary School	040880000878			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Drachman Primary Magnet School	040880000838			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Hohokam Middle School	040880001480			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Jefferson Park Elementary School	040880001111			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Lynn Urquides	040880000861			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Mary Meredith K-12 School	040880001606	X					1	
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Maxwell Middle School	040880000867			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Myers-Ganoung Elementary School	040880000871			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Naylor Middle School	040880000872			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Richey Elementary School	040880000877			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Robison Elementary School	040880000880			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Safford Engineering/Technology Magne	040880000886			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Southwest Alternative High School	040880001772			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Southwest Alternative Middle School	040880000979			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Teenage Parent Program - TAPP	040880001509			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Valencia Middle School	040880000972			X				
Tucson Unified District	0408800	Wakefield Middle School	040880000901			X				
Vechij Himdag Alternative School	0400207	Vechij Himdag MashchamakuD	040020702215			X				
Washington Elementary School Dis	0409060	Cholla Middle School	040906000921			X				
Washington Elementary School Dis	0409060	Mountain View Elementary School	040906000932			X				
Washington Elementary School Dis	0409060	Palo Verde Middle School	040906000935			X				
Washington Elementary School Dis	0409060	Roadrunner Elementary School	040906000937			X				
Washington Elementary School Dis	0409060	Shaw Butte School	040906000941			X				
Washington Elementary School Dis	0409060	Sunnyslope Elementary School	040906000944			X				
Wellton Elementary District	0409090	Wellton Elementary School	040906000948			X				
Whiteriver Unified District	0409160	Cradleboard School	040916001768	X					1	
Whiteriver Unified District	0409160	Whiteriver Elementary	040916000951			X				
Willcox Unified District	0409250	Willcox Middle School	040925000958			X				
Window Rock Unified District	0409430	Dine Bi'Olta (Immersion School)	040943002447			X				
Window Rock Unified District	0409430	Tse'Hootsooi Elementary School	040943002764			X				
Window Rock Unified District	0409430	Tsehootsooi Middle School	040943000968			X				
Winslow Unified District	0409460	Winslow High School	040946000975			X				
Youngtown Public Charter School	0400277	Youngtown Public Charter School	040027702167			X				
Yuma Elementary District	0409600	Fourth Avenue Junior High School	040960000985			X				

District Name	LEA NCES#	School Name	School NCES#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Graduation Rate	Newly Eligible	Tier I Achieve	Tier I Grad Rate
Yuma Elementary District	0409600	Pecan Grove Elementary School	040960000993			X				
Yuma Elementary District	0409600	R Pete Woodard Jr High School	040960000994			X				
Yuma Union High School District	0409630	Cibola High School	040963001388			X				
Yuma Union High School District	0409630	Kofa High School	040963000996			X				
Yuma Union High School District	0409630	Yuma High School	040963000997			X				
			000000000281	Number of Title I Schools in School Improvement, Corrective Action or Restructuring					14	6

Vision Charter School, Inc.	400160	Vision Charter School	040016001779		X					
Tucson Unified District	408800	Rincon High School	040880001446		X					
Saddle Mountain Unified School District	407170	Tonopah Valley High School	040717002483		X					
Tucson Unified District	408800	Palo Verde High Magnet School	040880001263		X					
Santa Cruz Valley Unified District	407520	Rio Rico High School	040752001036		X					

Within the Tier II pool of schools, none of the high schools met the criteria for graduation rate.

Arizona Department of Education

School Improvement Grant 1003(g) LEA Application for Tier I and Tier II

LEA APPLICATION COVER PAGE

LEA/Charter Holder Name:	NCES ID#	CTDS#	Entity ID
Superintendent:	Email:		
Federal Programs Director:	Email:		
LEA/Charter Holder Contact Information			
Mailing Address:			
Telephone number:			
Fax:			

School Board President _____ Date _____

Superintendent Signature _____ Date _____

Federal Programs Director Signature _____ Date _____

Arizona Department of Education

School Improvement Grant LEA Application for Tier I and Tier II

DIRECTIONS: There are 3 STEPS to this application process:

- **Step 1:** LEA teams work to complete this application form. This part consists of Sections A through J or K depending on the LEA's choice to conduct Early Implementation activities. *(Approval from SI Team required to move to Step 2)*
- **Step 2:** – Complete Section L – complete detailed action plan for implementation of plan components for the 2010-2011 school year on ALEAT. *(This section needs to be approved before moving to Step 3)*
- **Step 3:** – Complete Section M – detailed budget information needs to be completed using forms provided

IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS

School Name	NCES ID#	CTDS#	Entity ID#	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III

A. LEA'S ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL'S NEEDS

With data and information available to you, analyze the needs of each of your Tier I and Tier II schools. The goal is for your LEA's Leadership team to carefully analyze and interpret all data in order to accurately and completely assess the needs of your Tier I and/or Tier II schools. The knowledge gained during this investigative and analytical phase will be the basis for your decision as to which of the four intervention models should be implemented in your schools. The guiding questions to consider as the LEA Leadership analyzes and interprets data are: Where are we now?; and How did we get to this place?

Where are we now?

A.1. Who are we? (as an LEA/charter holder, school, staff, and community)

- Provide a brief description of the LEA and each school to be served using School Improvement Grant funds. Explain how the LEA and school(s) are organized; describe the characteristics of the student population, the teaching and administrative staff; and discuss the level of community involvement and parent engagement.

A.2 How do we do operate and do business at the LEA/charter holder and school levels?

- Based on the description in A.1, provide a brief description of the climate, culture, values and beliefs that are part of the LEA and schools.

A.3 How are our students doing?

- Provide detailed summary of the student data for each Tier I and Tier II schools.

B. DESCRIPTION OF LEA'S CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT

LEA/charter holder demonstrates that it has the capacity to implement the plan and 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 required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

Behavior for successful restructuring of persistently low achieving schools	What are the strengths/actions taken? What is in place?	What are the weaknesses/challenges?	What changes will be made and/or actions taken to address the weaknesses/challenges and improve on the strengths?
LEADERSHIP FOCUSED ON RESULTS			
Policies and practices have been identified that will enable schools to implement the selected intervention(s) fully and effectively with operational flexibility granted to the principal			
LEA/charter holder has a comprehensive evaluation plan for retaining highly effective administrators, teachers, and support staff and removing ineffective staff			
LEA/charter holder has a comprehensive plan for recruiting highly effective administrators, teachers and			

support staff			
LEA/charter holder consists of individuals having knowledge of the district and expertise in school improvement who are willing to make dramatic changes to improve student learning			
The LEA/charter holder is involving community/parents in the restructuring process including communicating current reality, new vision, buy in, and addressing resistors			
The LEA/charter holder has a culture of high expectations for student achievement including established vision, mission, and goals which address student achievement			
Evidence of shared leadership at the LEA and school levels			
FOCUSED STRATEGY FOR IMPROVING INSTRUCTION WITH CLEAR EXPECTATIONS OF CLASSROOM PRACTICE			

Use of guaranteed and viable curriculum that is aligned to the current Arizona Academic Standards			
Policy and/or procedures to review and evaluate standards-based core/supplemental programs are in place			
A framework/model that defines effective instruction has been developed and is clearly communicated			
The LEA/charter holder has a professional development plan which includes job-embedded PD that specifically addresses and targets instructional needs			
The LEA/charter holder has a teacher supervision process in place which includes procedures for measuring quality instruction and student engagement that includes walk-throughs and timely feedback			
A comprehensive/balanced assessment system is in place including screening, formative, progress monitoring, and summative assessments			

USE OF DATA AND EVIDENCE TO DRIVE DECISIONS AND REVISE STRATEGIES			
The LEA/charter holder has a comprehensive data warehouse system that allows for the collection of student data down to individual student performance			
The LEA/charter holder has a system in place to train and support teachers in using data to drive instruction and all staff members are held accountable for increased student achievement			
The LEA/charter holder has a systematic process enabling teachers to collaborate during the work day to use data to make programmatic and instructional decisions for the purpose of improving instruction			
PROVISION OF RESOURCES TO IMPLEMENT CONTINUOUS SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ACTION			

STEPS			
LEA has a system with clearly defined procedures for effectively recruiting, selecting and evaluating external providers, as necessary, to address identified needs.			
The LEA/charter holder has prioritized the reallocation of resources (Title I, Title II, M & O, Special Ed.) to schools in improvement including personnel, funding, programming, etc.			

C. ROOT CAUSES

How did we get to this place?

Based on the information from Section A and Section B, examine possible reasons for current level of performance. The LEA/charter holder must determine the root causes from the results. This requires the LEA to move from problem identification to problem solving.

C.1 Provide the conclusions the LEA/charter holder has reached, based on the analyzed data from the previous sections (A-Data Analysis & B-Capacity and Commitment) and examine possible reasons for the current level of performance.

- Include the data used for analysis, the observations, findings, and conclusions reached by the team
- Conclusions need to be aligned and supported by data / evidence from sections A & B
- Utilize the “5 Why’s” to examine Root Causes

Summarize information from Section A:	Conclusions:
Summarize information from Section B:	Conclusions:
Based on these conclusions, identify root causes:	

C.2 Based on the conclusions and root causes in C1, identify the student, school and system strengths and needs.

<i>Student Strengths</i>	<i>Student Needs</i>	<i>School Strengths</i>	<i>School Needs</i>	<i>System Strengths</i>	<i>System Needs</i>

Based on the conclusions and root causes in C1, identify the LEA/charter holder and school barriers.

<i>School Barriers</i>	<i>LEA / Charter Holder Barriers</i>

C.3 Outline the action steps the district will take to address the needs and barriers identified in C.2.

--

C.4 Identify the intervention model that is chosen for each Tier I and/or Tier II school. Provide a comprehensive justification for choosing this model. Align the needs and barriers (C.2) and action steps (C.3) with the required strategies of the chosen intervention model. How will student achievement be improved by this model?

Model Selected:	
Justification:	
Required Strategies of Selected Model (attend to all)	Needs / Barriers / Action Steps

How will student achievement be improved by this model?

D. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

D.1 Identify each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school the LEA *commits to serve* and identify the model that the LEA/charter holder will use in each Tier I and Tier II school. (The model is identified after the team analyzes the data, identifies the schools’ needs and examines LEA capacity to serve the school.)

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION MODEL CHOSEN			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

D.2 If the LEA/charter holder is not applying to serve each Tier I and/or Tier II school, the LEA/charter holder must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each school:

D.3 Prioritize, by need, the district's TIER III schools:

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID#	AYP Designation	Area of Need(s) Based on 2009 AIMS Assessment

E. LEA/CHARTER HOLDER'S ACCOUNTABILITY

E.1 Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in reading, math and graduation rate (High Schools only) and additional goals as needed that have been established in order to monitor the Tier I and Tier II schools. Using analysis of data completed in Sections A & B, complete the following for each Tier I and/or Tier II school being served:

Goal Area	SMART Goals (SY 2011 – 2012)	Baseline (Most Recent AIMS Data)
Reading		
Math		
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)		
Other Focus Areas as Needed		
Other Focus Areas as Needed		

For each goal	Progress Monitoring of Goals (Include Intermediate Benchmarks)		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	
Reading			

Math			
Graduation Rate (for High Schools only)			
Other Focus Areas as Needed			
Other Focus Areas as Needed			

E.2 Describe the LEA/charter holder’s plan for supporting increased student achievement through the implementation of the chosen intervention model.

- **How is the LEA/charter holder supporting school leadership in meeting student achievement goals?**
- **How is the LEA/charter holder supporting school leadership in implementing the action steps of the chosen model?**

E.3 Describe the LEA/ charter holder’s plan for monitoring progress of student achievement and the implementation of the chosen intervention model.

- **How is the LEA/charter holder holding school leadership accountable for meeting student achievement goals?**
- **How is the LEA/charter holder holding school leadership accountable for implementing the action steps of the chosen model?**

Outline the process for monitoring the implementation of each intervention model strategy.

List each required strategy for your intervention model:	Progress Monitoring of Intervention Strategies (Include Intermediate Benchmarks)		Person(s) Responsible
	Process	Timeline	

E.4 Using the prioritized list developed in D.2, provide a detailed description of the support that the LEA will provide for each Tier III school. Include the interventions provided by level of need.

School	Level of Need			Describe LEA Support (Internal and/or External) Funded and non-Funded support	Timeline
	Highest	Medium	Lowest		

E.5 Describe the annual goals the LEA has established in order to hold accountable your Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

Goal Area	Goals	Baseline	Progress Monitoring Plan		Person Responsible
			Process	Timeline	
Reading/Language Arts					
Math					
Graduation Rate					

F. BUDGET

F. Using the Budget Excel spreadsheet, provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA/charter holder will use each year to –

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

An LEA's budget must cover the period of availability (3 years) and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

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

****Attach LEA/charter holder budget as an appendix.**

G. SUSTAINABILITY

G. Describe the plan for sustaining these efforts after the funding period ends. Address the following in the plan: funding sources, hiring practices, professional development, changes in policies and practices.

1. Complete the chart below to show how, over the next five years, the LEA/charter holder will be able to continue or increase its own funding to support the positions/programs generated by the School Improvement Grant (SIG) beyond its duration. Possible funding sources to consider may include: M&O, Title I, II III, IDEA, 21st CCLC, etc. Also, designate in the chart if the program or position is not expected to continue beyond the grant. Examples are provided in the guidance document.

Personnel/Program	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5

2. Describe the rationale for eliminating/maintaining original SIG funded personnel/program identified in the above chart.
3. Describe how the LEA will integrate new staff into the established transformation or turnaround model at the school.
4. Describe how the LEA will ensure that the transfer of knowledge (programmatic, vision, culture, intent, etc.), policies and procedures will survive any change in leadership and or staffing positions.

H. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

By indicating with a mark on the below items, the _____ LEA or charter holder name _____ fully and completely assures that it will:

- Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, it will include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements

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

Arizona Department of Education has applied, through its SEA level application, for all of the Waivers offered for the School Improvement Grant. If Arizona receives approval for these waivers, all waivers automatically apply to any LEA/charter holder in the state.

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

_____ LEA or charter holder _____ will implement the below marked waivers:

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model. School(s): _____

- Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold. School(s): _____

J. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: The LEA/charter holder must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement intervention models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

J. Before submitting its application for School Improvement Grant, the LEA/charter holder must consult with all relevant stakeholders.

The LEA/charter holder has consulted with the following stakeholders:

K. Pre-Implementation: The LEA/charter holder *may* use SIG funds towards early implementation activities that will increase probability of strong implementation of the model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year.

K. Early Implementation Action Plan (Optional)

If LEA chooses to conduct Early Implementation activities, complete your action plan below for each component.

**There is not a penalty to LEAs that choose not to conduct Early Implementation activities on the Rubric Scoring.

Staffing

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget	Evaluation

Instructional Programs and Curriculum Alignment

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget	Evaluation

Professional Development and Support

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget	Evaluation

Assessment Systems and Accountability Measures

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget	Evaluation

Rigorous Review of External Providers

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget	Evaluation

Culture and Climate

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget	Evaluation

Family and Community Engagement

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Budget	Evaluation

STEP 2: COMPLETE PLANNING TEMPLATE ON ALEAT

L. The LEA/charter holder must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take during the 2010-2011 school year to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II schools identified in the LEA's application.

To be completed in ALEAT Plan

STEP 3: COMPLETE BUDGET ON GRANTS MANAGEMENT

M. The LEA/charter holder must complete the budget information on ADE's Grant Management System.

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.

AREA	Total Points Possible		Minimum Points Needed for Approval	
	With Early Implementation	Without Early Implementation	With Early Implementation	Without Early Implementation
A – Analysis of School Needs	30	30	27	27
B – Analysis of LEA Capacity and Commitment	85	85	78	78
C – Root Causes	35	35	32	32
D – School’s to Be Served	15	15	12	12
E – LEA’s Accountability	35	35	31	31
F – Budget	20	20	18	18
G – Sustainability	20	20	18	18
K – Pre-Implementation (optional)	65		59	
Total	305	240	275	216

Sections H, I and J will not be evaluated using a rubric score. These three sections of the LEA Application are scored as a Yes or No. If a No is scored, the application is considered incomplete and returned to the LEA for completion.

LEA applications must meet the minimum points for each area for approval. In addition, applications must score in the Fully Addressed or Partially Addressed indicators to be approved. Applications that meet the minimum points but receive a rubric score in Not Addressed, specifically in LEA Capacity, will not be approved.

Rubric points to be assigned for each component of the LEA application during the review process:

Fully Addressed

5 – All items addressed

4 – May be missing 1 component, but it is recognized and inclusion addressed

Partially Addressed

3 – Components addressed but with little detail or connectedness

2 – Missing a number of components

Not Addressed

1 – Nothing in place but an indication that a plan is needed to address issue

0 – Nothing in place and no indication of plan

A. LEA’S ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL NEEDS

Fully Addressed

Partially Addressed

Not Addressed

1. LEA description includes a detailed description of location characteristics, demographic information, size and composition of staff, and community resources disaggregated by school.	1. LEA description includes an adequate description of location characteristics, demographic information, size and composition of staff, and community resources disaggregated by school.	1. LEA description does not include a description of location characteristics, demographic information, size and composition of staff, and community resources disaggregated by school.
2. Culture and Climate of LEA and schools are thoroughly described. Includes references to mission, vision, values and beliefs. Strengths as well as challenges are described.	2. Culture and Climate of LEA and schools are adequately described. Includes limited references to mission, vision, values and beliefs. Strengths are described but not challenges.	2. Culture and Climate of LEA and schools are loosely described. Includes no references to mission, vision, values and beliefs. Neither strengths nor challenges are described.
3. Data analysis was done using multiple sources of data (student achievement, school process, perceptions and demographics). Reports & documents are attached.	3. Data analysis was done using a couple of sources of data (student achievement, school process, perceptions and demographics). Reports & documents are attached.	3. Data analysis was not complete.
4. Data trends were identified using data from 2008, 2009, and 2010. Data was used to identify the needs of each Tier I and Tier II School. Reports & documents are attached.	4. Data trends were identified using data. Some data was used to identify the needs of each Tier I and Tier II School. Reports & documents are attached.	4. Data was not used to identify the needs of each Tier I and Tier II schools.
5. Needs assessment was completed by LEA team using provided process and protocols. Included classroom observations, surveys, and principal/teacher interviews. Site visit was conducted.	5. Needs assessment was completed using process and protocols. Some items were not gathered. Site visit conducted.	5. Needs assessment was not completed by LEA.
6. A detailed description of the student learning (observations) of each Tier I and Tier II school to be served is provided (based on site visit classroom walkthroughs).	6. An adequate description of the student learning (observations) of each Tier I and Tier II school to be served is provided (based on site visit classroom walkthroughs).	6. No description of the student learning (observations) of each Tier I and Tier II school to be served was provided.

B. EVALUATION OF LEA CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT

	Fully Addressed:	Partially Addressed:	Not Addressed:
LEADERSHIP FOCUSED ON RESULTS			
1.a All necessary modifications to policies, procedures and practices related to decision-making, staffing, governance, use of data, staff evaluation, professional development, parent-community involvement are formalized,	1.a Necessary modifications to some policies, procedures and practices related to decision-making, staffing, governance, use of data, staff evaluation, professional development, parent-community involvement are	1.a Necessary modifications to policies, procedures and practices have not been made or approved at any level, and are not ready to implement.	

approved at all levels, clearly communicated and are ready to implement.	approved at all levels, communicated and are almost.	
1.b Multiple sources of data are used to recruit, retain, evaluate and/or remove administrators, teachers and support staff.	1.b A few sources of data, including student achievement data, are used to recruit, retain, evaluate and/or remove staff.	1.b Little or no data is included in the recruitment, retention, evaluation, and/or removal of administrators, teachers and support staff.
1.c LEA consists of individuals having knowledge and experience with implementing dramatic changes in district structures, culture, policies, and process; recent implementation of research-based instructional, data, and assessment strategies; changes and improvements that are recognized system-wide and sustainable; process for use of incentives for Tier I and Tier II schools.	1.c LEA consists of individuals with some knowledge and experience with changes in district structures, culture, policies, and process; recent implementation of research-based strategies; improvements that are recognized system-wide; beginning process for use of incentives for Tier I and Tier II school.	1.c LEA consists of individuals with limited knowledge and experience with changes in district that addresses only some structures, policies, and process; limited implementation of research-based strategies; few improvements that are recognized system-wide; no process for use of incentives for Tier I and Tier II school.
1.d Stakeholder representatives are completely involved in the decision-making process. Their input is sought frequently and continually. An effective system and process for ongoing communication with stakeholders is established.	1.d Stakeholder representatives are somewhat involved in the decision-making process. Their input is sought. A system and process for ongoing communication with stakeholders is being established.	1.d Stakeholder representatives are not involved in the decision-making process. Their input is not sought. The system and process for ongoing communication with stakeholders is ineffective or not established.
1.e LEA has an established culture of high expectations for student achievement that is promoted by the LEA's mission and vision. Policies and practices are established to continue a culture of continuous improvement, data literacy and collaboration. The LEA has an existing process to monitor the LEA/School culture.	1.e LEA is working to create a culture of high expectations for student achievement. The LEA's mission and vision is being updated and revised. Policies and practices are being evaluated to include a culture of continuous improvement, data literacy and collaboration. The LEA is developing a process to monitor the LEA/School culture.	1.e LEA does not have a culture of high expectations for student achievement. The LEA does not have a mission and vision. Policies and practices do not promote a culture of continuous improvement, data literacy and collaboration. The LEA does not have a process to monitor the LEA/School culture.
1.f Leaders are focused on student achievement. There are multiple shared leadership opportunities. Leaders facilitate decision-making with data. LEA has a vigorous process for	1.f Leaders are somewhat focused on student achievement. There are a few shared leadership opportunities. Some leaders facilitate decision-making with and without data. LEA has a process for developing	1.f Leaders are not focused on student achievement. There are no shared leadership opportunities. Leaders do not facilitate decision-making with data. LEA does not have a process for

developing instructional leaders.	instructional leaders.	developing instructional leaders.
FOCUSED STRATEGY FOR IMPROVING INSTRUCTION WITH CLEAR EXPECTATIONS OF CLASSROOM		
2.a LEA has a written curriculum with essential standards that is aligned to Arizona Academic Standards for each grade level. LEA has a process for monitoring implementation at the school level. LEA provides teachers with a complete set of pacing guides.	2.a LEA has a curriculum that is aligned to Arizona Academic Standards for each grade level. LEA has a limited process for monitoring implementation at the school level. LEA provides teachers with limited pacing guides.	2.a LEA has a curriculum that is aligned to Arizona Academic Standards for each grade level. LEA does not have a process for monitoring implementation at the school level. LEA does not provide teachers with pacing guides
2.b Policies and procedures are in place to review and evaluate most or all curricular areas addressing alignment to standards and both core and supplemental and ensure instructional resources are current/up-to-date, and sufficient in quantity.	2.b Policies and procedures are in place, but are incomplete and don't address both core and supplemental and procedures are followed inconsistently.	2.b There are neither policies nor procedures in place for the regular review of any curricular areas.
2.c A framework defining effective instruction (based on current and best practice), aligned with curriculum and assessment, is developed and communicated to all stakeholders.	2.c Work has begun around effective instruction, but limited framework has been developed.	2.c No framework or common understanding of effective instruction has been developed.
2.d Effective job-embedded professional learning is provided for all teachers. The primary objective is building teacher capacity to implement effective instructional strategies that ensure student success. Professional learning is a priority budget item. Professional learning is planned, aligned and leads to increased student learning. Staff-wide conversations focus on systemic changes and continuous improvement.	2.d Job-embedded professional learning is provided for all teachers. The primary objective is building teacher capacity to implement effective instructional strategies that ensure student success. Professional learning is somewhat planned and sometimes leads to increased student learning. Some staff conversations focus on changes and continuous improvement.	2.d Job-embedded professional learning is not provided for all teachers. Professional learning is not planned. Staff conversations do not focus on continuous improvement.
2.e The LEA has a well-defined, process for monitoring and	2.e The LEA has a process for monitoring and evaluating the	2.e The LEA does not have a process for monitoring and evaluating the

evaluating the effectiveness of instruction including the use of research-based strategies, implementation fidelity, adjustments made based on data, and the impact of learning.	effectiveness of instruction that includes one or more of the following: use of research-based strategies, implementation fidelity, adjustments made based on data, or the impact of learning.	effectiveness of instruction.
2.f The LEA has a documented, clearly defined and communicated framework for a comprehensive and balanced assessment system including classroom (daily, weekly/monthly, unit), interim/benchmark (screening and quarterly), and statewide (annual) assessments being used and how the results help to make programmatic and instructional decisions.	2.f The LEA has some components of a comprehensive/balanced assessment in place and used for programmatic and instructional decision-making.	2.f The LEA does not have evidence of any components of a comprehensive/ balanced assessment system in place.
USE OF DATA AND EVIDENCE TO DRIVE DECISIONS AND REVISE STRATEGIES		
3.a The LEA has a comprehensive data system that allows for the collection of student data down to the individual student level. There is a systematic reliance on data as a basis for decision-making at all levels of the system throughout the school year. LEA facilitates conversations to improve the effectiveness of instructional practices on students' learning. LEA and school goals are set based on present levels of performance along with grade level standards. Changes are based on the analysis of data and the educational needs of students. Professional development is based on the instructional needs of teachers.	3.a The LEA has a data system that allows for the collection of student data down to the classroom level. There is a reliance on data for decision-making throughout the school year. LEA facilitates some conversations to improve instructional practices. Changes are based on data and the educational needs of students. Professional development is somewhat based on the instructional needs of teachers.	3.a The LEA does not have a data system for the collection of student performance data. There is not a reliance on data for decision-making. LEA does not facilitate conversations to improve instructional practices. Changes are not based on data and the educational needs of students. Professional development is not based on the instructional needs of teachers.
3.b A formal system is in place to train and support teachers in using data (from balanced assessment system) to drive instruction which includes formal and information professional development and is	3.b An informal system for training and supporting teachers in the use of data is in place .	3.b No system is defined for training and supporting teachers in the use of data and no time for teachers to meet to hold data discussions has been set-up.

differentiated for new to district teachers.		
3.c The LEA has an effective system that is part of a formal policy providing for weekly teacher collaboration time during the work day in order for teachers to work in vertical and horizontal teams for the purpose of improving instruction, including a structure for data discussions.	3.c The LEA has identified time for teacher collaboration which may include time for teachers to hold data discussions, but it is not part of a formal policy and may not be provided consistently.	3.c There is no time set for teacher team collaboration or opportunity for data discussions.
PROVISION OF RESOURCES TO IMPLEMENT CONTINUOUS SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ACTION STEPS		
4.a LEA has a plan to recruit, select and evaluate external providers. Specific goals of the relationship with the external partner, measurable expectations and criteria for selection have been developed along with a plan to build capacity that includes a gradual release exit strategy.	4.a Has plan, goals, measurable expectations and selection criteria are in place, but are general.	4.a No evidence of plan, goals, measurable expectations or selection criteria.
4.b All funding sources that the school is eligible for are considered when developing the LEA plan (Title I, IDEA, etc.).	Some funding sources that the school is eligible for are considered when developing the LEA plan (Title I, IDEA, etc.).	No contract has been developed.

C. ROOT CAUSES

Fully Addressed:	Partially Addressed:	Not Addressed:
1a. Conclusions LEA draws are aligned with data summary. Conclusions are based on analyzed data, observations and findings.	1a. Conclusions LEA draws are somewhat aligned with data summary. Conclusions are somewhat based on analyzed data, observations and findings.	1a. Conclusions LEA draws are not aligned with data summary. Conclusions are not based on analyzed data, observations and findings.
1b. LEA identifies all the root causes based on the analyzed data. There is clear evidence that the LEA has made these determinations based on all data available.	1b. LEA identifies most root causes based on the analyzed data. There is some evidence that the LEA has made these determinations based on data available.	1b. LEA identifies few root causes. There is no evidence that the LEA has made these determinations based on any data.

1c. LEA has thoroughly described the policies, procedures and practices that might be contributing to a lack of student progress.	1c. LEA has described the practices that might be contributing to a lack of student progress.	1c. An inadequate description of the practices that might be contributing to a lack of student progress was provided.
2. LEA thoroughly describes the identified strengths, needs, and barriers of entities (students, school, systems, and district/LEA) and provides a detailed plan to address all strategies of the chosen model	2. LEA describes the identified strengths, needs, and barriers of some entities and provides a plan to address all strategies of the chosen model	2. Inadequate description of the identified strengths, needs, and barriers of the systems and does not provide a plan to address all strategies of the chosen model
3. LEA's plan to address the barriers and needs includes delineated action steps, a process to monitor progress, and an evaluation process.	3. LEA's plan to address the barriers and needs includes some action steps, and a loosely defined process to monitor progress.	3. LEA's plan does not address the barriers and needs.
4a. LEA provides comprehensive justification for choice of intervention model that includes data, team observations and findings. There is a clear match of the school's needs to the strategies of the model.	4a. LEA provides a justification for choice of intervention model that may include data, team observations and findings. There is a vague match of the school's needs to the strategies of the model.	4a. LEA provides a limited justification for choice of intervention without data, observations, or findings mentioned. There is no clear match of the school's needs to the strategies of the model.
4b. A detailed description of how students' learning needs will be improved by the model chosen was provided.	4b. An adequate description of how students' learning needs will be improved by the model chosen was provided.	4b. An inadequate description of how students' learning needs will be improved by the model chosen was provided.

D. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

Fully Addressed:	Partially Addressed:	Not Addressed:
1. Tier I and Tier II schools to be served are listed along with the intervention model the LEA has chosen.	1. Some Tier I and Tier II schools to be served are listed but one or more schools don't have a model chosen.	1. Tier I and Tier II schools to be served are not listed.
2. LEA provides a complete list of Tier III schools that are prioritized based on school needs.	2. LEA provides a list of Tier III schools that are prioritized based on unknown variables.	2. LEA does not provide a prioritized list with rationale of Tier III schools.
3. LEA provides a thorough and detailed explanation of the schools' needs and reason for their priority.	3. LEA provides an explanation of the schools' needs and general reasons for their priority.	3. LEA provides a limited explanation of the schools' needs and general reasons for their priority.

E. LEA'S ACCOUNTABILITY

Fully Addressed:	Partially Addressed:	Not Addressed:
1a. Annual goals set for Tier I and/or Tier II school in the areas of reading, math and/or graduation rate are: established using baseline data, achievable as well as rigorous, and set to close achievement and performance gaps.	1a. Annual goals set for Tier I and/or Tier II school in the areas of reading, math and/or graduation rate are: achievable and established using baseline data.	1a. Annual goals set for Tier I and/or Tier II school in the areas of reading, math and/or graduation rate are not achievable nor based on baseline data.
1b. Goals for Tier I and/or Tier II schools include a comprehensive plan for monitoring (including intermediate benchmarks), timeline for monitoring, and person responsible.	1b. Goals for Tier I and/or Tier II schools include a plan for monitoring, timeline for monitoring, and person responsible.	1b. Goals for Tier I and/or Tier II schools include a limited plan for monitoring.
2. LEA provides a detailed support plan to be provided to schools based on the specific needs of the schools. Plan includes type and level of support, frequency, alignment to need, time line (with intermediate benchmarks), and an evaluation procedure.	2. LEA provides a support plan to be provided to schools based on the needs of the schools. Plan includes type of support, time line, and an evaluation procedure.	2. LEA provides a limited support plan to be provided to schools that is not based on the needs of the schools. Plan does not include: type and level of support, frequency, alignment to need, time line (with intermediate benchmarks), and an evaluation procedure.
3a. Plan includes clear consequences for achieving and not achieving the set goals.	3a. Plan includes ambiguous consequences for achieving and not achieving the set goals.	3a. Plan does not include consequences for achieving and not achieving the set goals.
3b. The LEA's plan is fully aligned to the needs of the school, addresses the root causes for not making progress and addresses all required strategies of the chosen intervention model. Plan includes type and level of support, frequency, alignment to need, time line (with intermediate benchmarks), and an evaluation procedure.	3b. The LEA's plan is aligned to the needs of the school, slightly addresses the root causes for not making progress, and includes some of the required a few of the strategies of the chosen intervention model. Plan includes type of support, time line, and an evaluation procedure.	3b. The LEA does not have technical assistance plan for the school that addresses the causes for not making progress and/or the required a few of the strategies of the chosen intervention model. Plan does not include: type and level of support, frequency, alignment to need, time line (with intermediate benchmarks), and an evaluation procedure.

4. Annual goals set for Tier III schools in reading, math and/or graduation rate are: established using baseline data, achievable as well as rigorous, and set to close achievement and performance gaps.	4. Annual goals set for Tier III schools in reading, math and/or graduation rate are: achievable and established using baseline data.	4. Annual goals set for Tier III schools in reading, math and/or graduation rate are not achievable nor based on baseline data.
5. Goals for Tier III schools include a comprehensive plan for monitoring (including intermediate benchmarks), timeline for monitoring, and person responsible.	5. Goals for Tier III schools include a plan for monitoring, timeline for monitoring, and person responsible.	5. Goals for Tier III schools include a limited plan for monitoring.

F. ANALYSIS OF BUDGET

Fully Addressed:	Partially Addressed:	Not Addressed:
1. A well documented process is in place for wise and informed use of funds that focuses on student achievement, budget is clearly communicated, demonstrates expenditure of sufficient resources, including time, personnel, funding, and technology using many funding sources. Comprehensive three year budget for LEA and schools is submitted using the provided template.	1. A process is in place that contains some of the elements necessary for development of an adequate budget. Three year budget for LEA and schools is submitted using the provided template.	1. No elements necessary for an adequate budget are evident. Budget for LEA and schools are submitted.
2. Budget fully addresses the allocation of resources to completely implement all of the intervention model components including Pre-Implementation if chosen. Aligned with school goals, sufficient professional development dollars, evidence of funding for LEA capacity building.	2. Budget addresses the allocation of resources to implement all of the intervention model components. Budget is loosely aligned with school goals, some professional development and LEA capacity building dollars provided.	2. Budget does not address the allocation of resources to implement the intervention model components. Budget lacks sufficient information to determine adequacy.
3. LEA prioritizes resources (i.e.; provide financial incentives) to provide extensive funding for the recruitment, training and retention of highly effective staff.	3. Some funds are allocated to support recruitment, training and retention of highly effective staff.	3. No evidence that funds are being allocated to support recruitment, training and retention of highly effective staff.
4. Funding supports research-based practices, materials and programs; supports school goals; improvement of instructional opportunities; extended learning; and implementing interventions.	4. Funding supports most, but not all of the following: research-based practices, materials and programs; supports school goals; improvement of instructional opportunities; extended learning;	4. There is not a clear relationship between funding items and research, loosely addresses goals, improvement of instruction or extended learning.

	and implementing interventions.	
--	---------------------------------	--

G. SUSTAINABILITY PLANS

Fully Addressed:	Partially Addressed:	Not Addressed:
1. All components of the chart are completed with specific funding sources. The components are appropriate and realistic. The chart shows LEA moving away from SIG support.	1. Some components of the chart are completed with specific funding sources. Some components are appropriate and realistic. The chart shows LEA reliance on SIG support.	1. The chart is incomplete or does not identify specific funding sources. The chart shows LEA relying primarily on SIG funding.
2. The rationale is clearly stated. The reduction or elimination of personnel /program will be based on data supporting the feasibility for the decision.	2. The rationale is unclear. Plan for confirming the decision to reduce or eliminate the personnel/program is vague.	2. Rationale is missing or not reasonable. No plan for confirming the decision is stated.
3. The plan for ensuring new staff integration is detailed and includes professional development, mentoring, induction, timelines and on going support.	3. The integration plan is missing some important aspects, but is viable.	3. There is no plan or it is underdeveloped.
4. The LEA details specific actions for archiving, distributing and maintaining important documents, files, policies and procedures which relate to programs, vision and intent. Evidence of cross-training and shared responsibilities exists.	4. The LEA has incomplete plans for archiving, distributing and maintaining important documents, files, policies and procedures which relate to programs, vision and intent. Cross training or shared responsibilities are limited.	4. The LEA has no plans for archiving, distributing and maintaining important documents, files, policies and procedures which relate to programs, vision and intent. Cross training or shared responsibilities are missing.

K. PRE-IMPLEMENTATION (Optional)

Fully Addressed:	Partially Addressed:	Not Addressed:
1. All components of the Early Implementation Plan are completed. Action steps are delineated, persons responsible are identified, timeline is stated and viable (enough time is allowed for completion of early implementation items prior to the school year), budget is appropriate and reasonable, and evaluation includes benchmarks for achievement and/or completion.	1. Most components of the Early Implementation Plan are completed. Action steps, persons responsible are identified, timeline is stated and viable, budget is appropriate and reasonable, and evaluation. Plans are general, some details are left out.	1. Components of the Early Implementation Plan are incomplete. Action steps, persons responsible, timeline, budget, and evaluation are missing details. Plan is general and/or unfocused.
2a. Action steps for staffing include:	2a. Most components are	2a. Limited components are included.

<p>recruit and hire an effective principal who has turnaround skills to implement the intervention model and/or a proven track record of turning around a school. Resume for principal demonstrates possession of skills. Multiple stakeholders (with educational expertise) are included in the screening and hiring of turnaround principal. Operational flexibility is defined by LEA.</p>	<p>included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>
<p>2b. Action steps for staffing include: recruit and hire leadership team and or instructional staff who possess skills to implement the intervention model and/or a proven track record of effectiveness at a previous school. Resumes demonstrate skills. Responsible parties for screening and hiring include multiple stakeholders with educational expertise.</p>	<p>2b. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>2b. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>
<p>2c. Action steps for staffing include: process for evaluating the strengths and areas of need of current or remaining staff to implement the intervention model. Teacher evaluations, observations and classroom data used to make decisions related to retention of current staff members.</p>	<p>2c. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>2c. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>
<p>3a. Action steps for instructional programs and curriculum alignment include: alignment of curriculum with AZ State Academic Standards, development of curriculum (maps and pacing guides), identification and purchase of research-based instructional materials, and allocation of collaborative planning time during school day in 2011-2012 master calendar.</p>	<p>3a. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>3a. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>

<p>3b. Action steps for instructional programs and curriculum alignment include: data analysis of end of year data, data-based instructional planning for next year, and creation of student assessments aligned to curriculum, and allocation of collaborative planning time during school day in 2011-2012 master calendar.</p>	<p>3b. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>3b. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>
<p>4a. Action steps for professional development and support include: a comprehensive, detailed plan for professional development during the months leading up to the beginning of the 2011-2012 SY. Plan includes: training for staff on new or revised instructional programs, effective instructional practices, expectations of the SIG, staff evaluation systems, assessment systems and measures.</p>	<p>4a. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>4a. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>
<p>4b. Action steps for professional development and support include: instructional support such as coaching, mentoring, common planning time, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice provided to returning instructional staff.</p>	<p>4b. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>4b. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>
<p>4c. Action steps for professional development and support include: development of school calendar to establish common planning time, increased student learning time, and professional development days as needed.</p>	<p>4c. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>4c. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>

<p>5. Actions steps for assessment systems and accountability measures include: develop or purchase and pilot a comprehensive assessment system that includes all types of data along with a data system for reporting. Types of data to include summative, benchmark, screening, diagnostic and progress monitoring. Create Data Walls with Baseline and current student data.</p>	<p>5. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>5. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>
<p>6. Action steps for rigorous review of external providers includes: process for recruiting, screening, selecting, and evaluating external providers to assist with planning for the implementation of an intervention model.</p>	<p>6. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>6. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>
<p>7. Action steps for building positive healthy culture and climate include: plan for sharing information with school staff about the School Improvement Grant process, staff involvement in decision making, application, goals, vision and expectations, in collaboration with staff, revise/rewrite mission and vision to align with SIG goals, engage in trust building activities, facilitate the creation of learning communities with new staff and leaders to promote a culture of learning.</p>	<p>7. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>7. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>
<p>8. Action steps for family and community engagement include: community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, develop school improvement plans in line with model selected, survey students and parents to gauge their needs, create a parent & community</p>	<p>8. Most components are included. Plan contains some specificity; however some details are left out. Parts of plan are not focused on target.</p>	<p>8. Limited components are included. Plan is general; most details are left out and not focused on target.</p>

communication plan, communicate to parents and community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers through press releases, newsletters, newspapers, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines or direct mail.		
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

CRITERIA FUNDING MATRIX
SCHOOL INTERVENTION GRANT 3-YEAR BUDGET REQUEST

LEA / CHARTER NAME:

TOTAL 3-YEAR BUDGET: \$ -

TURNAROUND / TRANSFORMATION MODELS:

Criteria – Required			LEA & All Participating Schools			
Criteria – Required	Explanation	Allowable Budget Items	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
(i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates 	Turnaround Principal stipend. Approved Intervention and Supplemental core materials, expository and narrative classroom and library books, and research-based instructional software.				\$ -
(ii) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; • Select new staff; 	Instructional Interventionist /Academic Coach				\$ -
(iii) Implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May include financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions 	Teacher stipends for willingness to work in high-need school. Performance-based stipends for teachers and administrators.				\$ -
(iv) Provide staff with ongoing, high quality, job-embedded professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be aligned with school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies. 	Targeted professional development for teachers, administrators and Leadership Team to attend ADE-approved trainings, including registration fees and related travel. Substitute teachers to enable local professional development days.				\$ -
(v) Adopt a new governance structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May include, but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Require school to report to a new “turnaround office” in the LEA or SEA. o Hire a “turnaround leader” who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer. o Enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA for added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability. 	LEA School Improvement Coordinator to facilitate and oversee implementation of LEA’s school improvement plan and site-based support/activities at Tier I, II & III schools.				\$ -
(vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive assessments for screening, diagnosis, monitoring progress that inform instructional decisions. • Must be research-based and “vertically aligned” from one grade to the next and aligned with State academic standards. 	Approved Assessments and Supplemental Assessments of comprehension-related student skills. Annual fee for processing student data.				\$ -
(vii) Continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources of student data include formative, interim, and summative assessments. 	Assessment Coordinator / Data Entry Specialist				\$ -
(viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased learning time” means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Instruction in core academic subjects. o Instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education. o Teacher collaboration, planning, and professional development within and across grades and subjects. 	Teacher salary stipends for before- and after-school tutoring, intersession and summer school instructional programs. Substitute Teachers to enable teacher collaborative time days. Stipends for teachers for team planning, lesson design, data analysis, preparation of common assessments, review of instructional strategies. Full-day kindergarten or prekindergarten programs.				\$ -
(ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community- based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students’ social, emotional, and health needs 	Behavior Interventionist / Parent Engagement Specialist to work with family involvement action teams (FIAT). Summer transition programs or freshman academies. IGA/Contract/Partnership to provide identified need-based support services to students.				\$ -
TOTAL			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

**CRITERIA FUNDING MATRIX
SCHOOL INTERVENTION GRANT 3-YEAR BUDGET REQUEST**

LEA / CHARTER NAME:

RESTART MODEL:

			LEA & All Participating Schools			
Criteria – Required	Explanation	Allowable Budget Items	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Convert or close school and reopen under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organizaion (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.	A restart school must enroll, within the grades it serves, all former students who wish to attend the school.	May include same Allowable Budget Items as the Turnaround/Transformation Models and any other costs that are reasonable and necessary to implement the model; Each budget item requested will be reviewed based on the merit of the LEA's comprehensive SIG implementation plan.				\$ -

CLOSURE MODEL:

			LEA & All Participating Schools			
Criteria – Required	Explanation	Allowable Budget Items	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
LEA Closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. Schools must be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include but not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.	LEA may use SIG funds to pay certain reasonable and necessary costs associated with closing a Tier I or Tier II school	Parent and community outreach and or meetings, transition services to parents and students, student and parent orientation activities. Other reasonable and necessary costs to implement model; Each budget item requested will be reviewed based on the merit of the LEA's comprehensive SIG implementation plan.		NA	NA	\$ -

LEA / CHARTER NAME

School Improvement Grant (SIG) Budget Summary

		LEA SIG 1003(g) Budget Totals		School Budgets			LEA Budget
				School #1 Name	School #2 Name	School #3 Name	
Instruction 1000							
Salaries	6100	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Employee Benefits	6200		-		-		-
Purchased Professional Services	6300		-		-		-
Purchased Property Services	6400		-		-		-
Other Purchased Services	6500		-		-		-
Supplies	6600		-		-		-
Other Expenses	6800		-		-		-
Sub-total		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Support Services 2100, 2200, 2600 - 2900							
Salaries	6100	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Employee Benefits	6200		-		-		-
Purchased Professional Services	6300		-		-		-
Purchased Property Services	6400		-		-		-
Other Purchased Services	6500		-		-		-
Supplies	6600		-		-		-
Other Expenses	6800		-		-		-
Sub-total		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Support Services - Admin 2300, 2400, 2500							
Salaries	6100	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Employee Benefits	6200		-		-		-
Purchased Professional Services	6300		-		-		-
Purchased Property Services	6400		-		-		-
Other Purchased Services	6500		-		-		-
Supplies	6600		-		-		-
Other Expenses	6800		-		-		-
Sub-total		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Indirect Cost							
Restricted Indirect Cost Rate	6910	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Capital Outlay							
Property	6700	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Total		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-

^{1/} Footnotes:

School #1 Name

School SIG 1003(g) Budget and Line Item Detail Descriptions

<u>Line Item</u>		School SIG 1003(g) Budget		Line Item Detail Descriptions / Explanations
Instruction 1000				
Salaries	6100	\$	-	
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$	-	
Support Services 2100, 2200, 2600 - 2900				
Salaries	6100	\$	-	
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$	-	
Support Services - Admin 2300, 2400, 2500				
Salaries	6100	\$	-	
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$	-	
Indirect Cost				
Restricted Indirect Cost Rate	6910	\$	-	
Capital Outlay				
Property	6700	\$	-	
Total		\$	-	

^{1/} Footnotes:

School #2 Name

School SIG 1003(g) Budget and Line Item Detail Descriptions

<u>Line Item</u>		School SIG 1003(g) Budget	<u>Line Item Detail Descriptions / Explanations</u>	
Instruction 1000				
Salaries	6100	\$ -		
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$ -		
Support Services 2100, 2200, 2600 - 2900				
Salaries	6100	\$ -		
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$ -		
Support Services - Admin 2300, 2400, 2500				
Salaries	6100	\$ -		
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$ -		
Indirect Cost				
Restricted Indirect Cost Rate	6910	\$ -		
Capital Outlay				
Property	6700	\$ -		
Total		\$ -		

^{1/} Footnotes:

School #3 Name

School SIG 1003(g) Budget and Line Item Detail Descriptions

<u>Line Item</u>		<u>School SIG 1003(g) Budget</u>	<u>Line Item Detail Descriptions / Explanations</u>
Instruction 1000			
Salaries	6100	\$ -	
Employee Benefits	6200		
Purchased Professional Services	6300		
Purchased Property Services	6400		
Other Purchased Services	6500		
Supplies	6600		
Other Expenses	6800		
Sub-total		\$ -	
Support Services 2100, 2200, 2600 - 2900			
Salaries	6100	\$ -	
Employee Benefits	6200		
Purchased Professional Services	6300		
Purchased Property Services	6400		
Other Purchased Services	6500		
Supplies	6600		
Other Expenses	6800		
Sub-total		\$ -	
Support Services - Admin 2300, 2400, 2500			
Salaries	6100	\$ -	
Employee Benefits	6200		
Purchased Professional Services	6300		
Purchased Property Services	6400		
Other Purchased Services	6500		
Supplies	6600		
Other Expenses	6800		
Sub-total		\$ -	
Indirect Cost			
Restricted Indirect Cost Rate	6910	\$ -	
Capital Outlay			
Property	6700	\$ -	
Total		\$ -	

^{1/} Footnotes:

LEA / CHARTER NAME

LEA SIG 1003(g) Budget and Line Item Detail Descriptions

<u>Line Item</u>		LEA SIG 1003(g)		Line Item Detail Descriptions / Explanations
		Budget		
Instruction 1000				
Salaries	6100	\$	-	
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$	-	
Support Services 2100, 2200, 2600 - 2900				
Salaries	6100	\$	-	
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$	-	
Support Services - Admin 2300, 2400, 2500				
Salaries	6100	\$	-	
Employee Benefits	6200			
Purchased Professional Services	6300			
Purchased Property Services	6400			
Other Purchased Services	6500			
Supplies	6600			
Other Expenses	6800			
Sub-total		\$	-	
Indirect Cost				
Restricted Indirect Cost Rate	6910	\$	-	
Capital Outlay				
Property	6700	\$	-	
Total		\$	-	

^{1/} Footnotes:

dist code	dist name	schl code	School	
78884	Cesar Chavez Learning Community,	79587	Aztlan Academy	Closed
4403	Tucson Unified District	6277	Southwest Alternative High	CR
4455	Vechij Himdag Alternative School,	5952	Vechij Himdag MashchamakuD	CR
4400	Northern Arizona Academy for Career	5650	Northern AZ Academy for Career	CR
85807	StarShine Academy	80475	StarShine Academy	CR
85514	E-cademie, A Charter School	85515	E-cademie	CR
79953	PAS Charter, Inc., dba Intelli-School	5530	Intelli-School - Metro Center	CR
4332	Genesis Academy	5504	Genesis Academy	CR
4240	Scottsdale Unified District	79644	Sierra Vista Academy	CR
4457	Nogales Unified District	5961	Pierson Vocational High School	CR
4403	Tucson Unified District	6272	Teenage Parent Program - TAPP	CR
4420	Pima County Board of Supervisors	6057	Pima Vocational High School	CR
79878	Tempe Accelerated Public Charter	6349	Tempe Accelerated High School	CR
87600	Gila County Regional School District	87602	Globe Education Center	CR
79047	Career Success Schools	79129	Career Success High School - Main	CR
4453	Casa Grande Union High School	5950	Desert Winds High School	
4197	Tuba City Unified District	78916	Tuba City Alternative School	CR
4400	Northern Arizona Academy for Career	5652	Northern AZ Academy for Career	CR
4191	Center for Academic Success, Inc.	4802	Center for Academic Success, The	CR
4431	PPEP & Affiliates	87681	PPEC Tec - Robles Junction	CR
79047	Career Success Schools	81126	Career Success High School -	CR
4431	PPEP & Affiliates	5873	PPEP TEC - Celestino Fernandez	CR
79085	Southgate Academy, Inc.	79091	Southgate Academy	CR
80989	American Charter Schools Foundation	80990	South Pointe High School	CR
4431	PPEP & Affiliates	5878	PPEP TEC - Cesar Chavez Learning	CR
4431	PPEP & Affiliates	5877	PPEP TEC - Raul H. Castro	CR
4158	Chinle Unified District	4737	Chinle High School	
79701	North Star Charter School, Inc.	79702	North Star Charter School, Inc.	CR
6369	Ha:san Educational Services	5872	Ha:san Preparatory & Leadership	CR
81041	Blueprint Education	81042	Hope High School	CR
4352	Intelli-School, Inc.	10746	Intelli-School - Paradise Valley	CR
85540	Academy of Building Industries, Inc.	85541	Academy of Building Industries	CR
4157	Ganado Unified School District	4728	Ganado High School	
4159	Red Mesa Unified District	4741	Red Mesa High School	
4442	Coolidge Unified District	5916	Coolidge High School	
4229	Clifton Unified District	4905	Clifton High School	Closed
4346	Arizona Call-a-Teen Youth Resources,	5520	Arizona Call-a-Teen Center for	CR
79503	Omega Alpha Academy	79505	Omega Alpha Academy School	CR
4156	Sanders Unified District	4724	Valley High School	
4454	Santa Cruz Valley Union High School	5951	Santa Cruz Valley Union High	
79068	PACE Preparatory Academy, Inc.	80437	PACE Preparatory Academy	CR
4406	Amphitheater Unified District	6055	Amphitheater High School	
4471	Ash Fork Joint Unified District	6103	Ash Fork High School	
4507	Yuma Union High School District	6189	Yuma High School	
4421	EDGE School Inc. The	5860	Edge High School - Himmel Park	CR
6360	E.Q. Scholars, Inc.	6204	Scholars Academy, The	CR
4286	Phoenix Union High School District	5438	Camelback High School	

4407	Sunnyside Unified District	5827	Sunnyside High School	
4286	Phoenix Union High School District	5443	South Mountain High School	
4507	Yuma Union High School District	6190	Kofa High School	
4407	Sunnyside Unified District	5826	Desert View High School	
4286	Phoenix Union High School District	5436	Alhambra High School	
4286	Phoenix Union High School District	5440	Carl Hayden High School	
4288	Tolleson Union High School District	85810	Copper Canyon High School	
79951	SC Jensen Corporation, Inc. dba Intelli-	79952	Intelli-School	
79498	Mohave Accelerated Learning Center	79510	Mohave Accelerated Learning	
4286	Phoenix Union High School District	5437	Trevor Browne High School	
6375	Employ-Ability Unlimited, Inc.	10799	Desert Pointe Academy	
6379	Phoenix School of Academic	10814	Learning Institute, The	
4286	Phoenix Union High School District	5441	Maryvale High School	
4196	Page Unified District	4832	Page High School	
4507	Yuma Union High School District	6191	Cibola High School	
79598	Kingman Unified School District	5595	Kingman High School	
4286	Phoenix Union High School District	5442	North High School	
4286	Phoenix Union High School District	78847	Cesar Chavez High School	
4441	Maricopa Unified School District	5910	Maricopa High School	
4192	Flagstaff Unified District	4820	Coconino High School	
4286	Phoenix Union High School District	5439	Central High School	
4457	Nogales Unified District	5962	Nogales High School	
4387	Winslow Unified District	5604	Winslow High School	
4453	Casa Grande Union High School	5948	Casa Grande Union High School	
79234	New Visions Academy, Inc.	10856	New Visions Academy	
4289	Agua Fria Union High School District	5454	Agua Fria High School	
4243	Dysart Unified District	88417	Valley Vista High School	
4515	Bicentennial Union High School	6203	Salome High School	
4209	Payson Unified District	10822	Payson Center for Success High	
4370	Colorado City Unified District	5567	El Capitan Public School	
4425	Presidio School	5865	Presidio High School	
4234	Maricopa County Regional District	80410	Tumbleweed Transitional	

SI10	PCT PASS 2010	avg growth	RANK	grade served	HS	TI status 10	pla9	rank pct	rank growth
RI	13.58	-1.96	40	9-12	1	yes		3	105
SIY1	16.67	-5.73	7	9-12	1	yes		4	28
RI	17.78	3.49	112	9-12	1	yes		7	237
SIY2	22	-9.73	4	9-12	1	yes		13	6
SIY1	22.52	-1.24	56	1-12	1	yes		14	130
CA	22.92	3.23	115	9-12	1	yes		15	233
CA	23.33	-6.82	8	9-12	1	yes		17	18
SIY2	23.6	-6.06	9	9-12	1	yes		18	25
SIY1	24.19	-7.91	6	6-12	1	yes		19	12
CA	25.37	1.05	95	9-12	1	yes	1	21	191
SIY2	25.88	-6.66	10	7-12	1	yes		23	20
SIY1	26.26	-4.65	21	9-12	1	yes		24	42
SIY1	27.38	-4.73	20	9-12	1	yes		25	40
SIY2	29.41	-3.82	28	9-12	1	yes		29	57
SIY1	30.22	-0.89	73	9-12	1	yes		31	143
SIY2	31.07	-0.16	86	9-12	1	yes		32	165
SIY1	31.58	11.25	170	9-12	1	yes		36	268
SIY2	31.82	-5.52	23	9-12	1	yes		37	31
CA	32.58	-4.55	27	9-12	1	yes		41	45
SIY1	33.33	-5	26	9-12	1	yes		43	39
SIY1	33.33	-1.98	58	9-12	1	yes		43	104
SIY2	33.51	2.2	127	9-12	1	yes		44	213
CA	33.82	-2.29	52	1-12	1	yes		49	93
SIY1	34.2	-1.49	72	9-12	1	yes		51	121
SIY2	34.52	3.47	156	9-12	1	yes		52	236
SIY1	34.78	-0.47	96	9-12	1	yes		54	158
SIY1	35.29	-1.02	81	9-12	1	yes		56	139
SIY1	36.84	-3.46	46	9-12	1	yes		61	67
SIY1	37.59	2.83	154	9-12	1	yes		63	223
SIY1	37.7	9.92	186	9-12	1	yes		64	265
SIY1	38.46	-3.4	50	9-12	1	yes		69	69
SIY1	38.78	0.43	114	9-12	1	yes		70	178
RP	39.51	-4.73	42	9-12	1	yes		77	40
CA	41.04	0.05	126	9-12	1	yes		87	169
RI	41.2	-3.89	55	9-12	1	yes		89	55
SIY1	41.38	6.22	203	9-12	1	yes		90	256
SIY2	42.25	7.64	214	9-12	1	yes		97	261
RP	42.37	-3.86	64	1-12	1	yes		99	56
RP	43.06	2.94	185	9-12	1	yes	1	101	226
SIY2	44.91	-4.42	66	9-12	1	yes		110	46
SIY1	45.45	2.73	190	9-12	1	yes		114	221
SIY2	45.97	-5.23	61	9-12	1	yes		120	32
SIY1	46.08	0.91	179	9-12	1	yes		123	188
RP	48.18	-3.21	89	9-12	1	yes		132	74
SIY1	48.72	-5.19	70	9-12	1	yes		135	34
SIY1	48.91	-8.05	59	7-12	1	yes		137	10
CA	49.65	-2.09	113	9-12	1	yes		147	99

CA	49.78	-1.46	137	9-12	1	yes		149	123
SIY2	49.96	-2.03	121	9-12	1	yes		150	102
SIY2	50.3	-2.27	116	9-12	1	yes		153	95
RP	50.32	3.31	233	9-12	1	yes		154	235
SIY2	50.36	-1.3	150	9-12	1	yes		155	129
SIY2	50.74	-1.58	138	9-12	1	yes		157	117
SIY1	52.47	-6.77	83	9-12	1	yes		176	19
SIY2	52.94	0.28	216	9-12	1	yes		182	176
SIY1	53.61	-2.07	157	6-12	1	yes		189	100
RP	54.85	-0.57	210	9-12	1	yes		197	156
SIY1	55.88	-10.81	91	9-12	1	yes		204	5
CA	55.93	-4.39	120	7-12	1	yes		205	47
CA	55.98	-0.99	204	9-12	1	yes		206	140
SIY2	55.99	-1.2	194	9-12	1	yes		207	131
RP	57.4	-3.08	166	9-12	1	yes		219	80
CA	58.18	-1.17	218	9-12	1	yes		227	133
RI	58.25	-3.59	160	9-12	1	yes		228	63
SIY1	58.26	1.63	255	9-12	1	yes		229	204
SIY2	58.9	-1.88	201	9-12	1	yes		235	109
CA	59.5	-3.51	168	9-12	1	yes		238	65
RP	59.89	0.76	254	9-12	1	yes		242	185
SIY2	60.91	-2.28	196	7-12	1	yes		246	94
SIY1	60.93	-0.4	246	9-12	1	yes		247	161
SIY2	63.36	-3.91	174	9-12	1	yes		255	53
SIY1	65	12.19	294	9-12	1	yes		262	270
SIY2	66.86	0.73	265	9-12	1	yes		269	184
SIY2	69.44	-1.6	232	9-12	1	yes		272	116
SIY1	70.07	1.99	281	9-12	1	yes		273	210
SIY1	73.91	6.96	296	9-12	1	yes		278	257
SIY1	79.06	0.56	269	1-12	1	yes		279	179
SIY2	82.31	2.38	286	1-12	1	yes		282	215
SIY1	100	0	264	8-12	1	yes		283	168

rank mean	PERCENT
54	13.42%
16	2.35%
122	37.58%
9.5	1.34%
72	18.79%
124	38.59%
17.5	2.68%
21.5	3.02%
15.5	2.01%
106	31.88%
21.5	3.36%
33	7.05%
32.5	6.71%
43	9.40%
87	24.50%
98.5	28.86%
152	57.05%
34	7.72%
43	9.06%
41	8.72%
73.5	19.46%
128.5	42.62%
71	17.45%
86	24.16%
144	52.35%
106	32.21%
97.5	27.18%
64	15.44%
143	51.68%
164.5	62.42%
69	16.78%
124	38.26%
58.5	14.09%
128	42.28%
72	18.46%
173	68.12%
179	71.81%
77.5	21.48%
163.5	62.08%
78	22.15%
167.5	63.76%
76	20.47%
155.5	60.07%
103	29.87%
84.5	23.49%
73.5	19.80%
123	37.92%

136	45.97%
126	40.60%
124	38.93%
194.5	78.19%
142	50.34%
137	46.31%
97.5	27.85%
179	72.48%
144.5	52.68%
176.5	70.47%
104.5	30.54%
126	40.27%
173	68.46%
169	65.10%
149.5	55.70%
180	73.15%
145.5	53.69%
216.5	85.57%
172	67.45%
151.5	56.38%
213.5	85.23%
170	65.77%
204	82.55%
154	58.39%
266	98.66%
226.5	88.93%
194	77.85%
241.5	94.30%
267.5	99.33%
229	90.27%
248.5	95.97%
225.5	88.59%

distcode	distname	schlcode	School	tselect
4403	Tucson Un	80037	Direct Link II	TierII-i
79047	Career Suc	80430	Career Success High School - Glendale	TierII-i
4235	Mesa Unifi	4966	Riverview High School	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	79314	Museum School for the Visual Arts	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	6264	Project More High School	TierII-i
4508	Az-Tec Hig	6192	AZTEC High School	TierII-i
4430	Vision Cha	5871	Vision Charter School	TierII-i
78868	Sonoran D	78869	Sonoran Desert School	TierII-i
79379	Yavapai Ac	79380	Yavapai County High School	TierII-i
87349	Legacy Edi	87350	East Valley High School	TierII-i
4431	PPEP & Af	5880	PPEP TEC - Colin L. Powell Learning Center	TierII-i
4472	Seligman L	6105	Seligman High School	TierII-i
10879	Mountain F	10885	Mountain Rose Academy	TierII-i
4405	Flowing We	6054	Sentinel Peak High School	TierII-i
4235	Mesa Unifi	88420	Crossroads	TierII-i
90136	Camp Verc	90137	South Verde Technology Magnet	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	5767	Howenstine High School	TierII-i
4254	Saddle Mo	85819	Tonopah Valley High School	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	5760	Rincon High School	TierII-i
81050	Choice Edu	79219	Sequoia School for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing	TierII-i
79461	Primavera	79463	Primavera Technical Learning Center	TierII-i
4320	Salt River F	90159	Salt River Accelerated Learning Academy	TierII-i
4422	Tucson Yo	90286	ACE Charter High School	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	5758	Palo Verde High Magnet School	TierII-i
4458	Santa Cruz	5966	Rio Rico High School	TierII-i
4235	Mesa Unifi	78933	Superstition High School	TierII-i
4228	Duncan Un	4903	Duncan High School	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	5756	Catalina High Magnet School	TierII-i
4242	Chandler L	90027	Ken 'Chief' Hill Learning Academy	TierII-i
81029	Canyon Rc	81030	Canyon Rose Academy	TierII-i
79218	Telesis Cer	78857	Telesis Preparatory Academy	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	5759	Pueblo High Magnet School	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	6271	Pass Alternative High School	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	5764	Tucson Magnet High School	TierII-i
4439	Mammoth-	5904	San Manuel High School	TierII-i
4329	Sequoia Cl	90324	Sequoia Choice - Village	TierII-i
4170	Willcox Uni	4757	Willcox High School	TierII-i
4431	PPEP & Af	5882	PPEP TEC - Victor Soltero Learning Center	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	5757	Cholla High Magnet School	TierII-i
4403	Tucson Un	5763	Santa Rita High School	TierII-i
4193	Williams U	4823	Williams High School	TierII-i
81103	Career Suc	81104	Career Success High School - Mesa	TierII-i
90201	Educational	90202	EdOptions High School	TierII-i
4510	Parker Unif	6197	Parker High School	TierII-i
89788	Imagine Pr	89789	Imagine Preparatory at Superstition	TierII-i
4443	Apache Jun	5925	Apache Junction High School	TierII-i
4286	Phoenix Ur	79617	Suns-Diamondback Education Academy	TierII-i
4397	Blue Ridge	5648	Blue Ridge High School	TierII-i
79000	Southern A	79028	Southern Arizona Community High School	TierII-i
79131	Shelby Sch	79132	Shelby School, The	TierII-i
89914	Daisy Educ	80974	Sonoran Science Academy - Phoenix	TierII-i

4235 Mesa Unifi	4981 Westwood High School	TierII-i
4241 Paradise V	5107 North Canyon High School	TierII-i
4391 Snowflake	5618 Snowflake High School	TierII-i
4393 Show Low	79646 White Mountain Institute	TierII-i
4468 Bagdad Un	6089 Bagdad High School	TierII-i
4470 Camp Verc	6100 Camp Verde High School	TierII-i
4195 Fredonia-M	4828 Fredonia High School	TierII-i
4445 J O Combs	89859 Combs High School	TierII-i
6364 Accelerate	5891 Accelerated Learning Laboratory	TierII-i
4284 Buckeye U	79376 Estrella Foothills High School	TierII-i
4235 Mesa Unifi	78917 Skyline High School	TierII-i
4469 Humboldt U	6097 Bradshaw Mountain High School	TierII-i
4421 EDGE Sch	6058 Edge High School - Sahuarita	TierII-i
4235 Mesa Unifi	4983 Dobson High School	TierII-i
4405 Flowing We	5791 Flowing Wells High School	TierII-i
6355 Ideabanc, I	10733 AmeriSchools College Preparatory Academy - Tucson	TierII-i
4431 PPEP & Af	5884 PPEP TEC - John David Arnold Learning Center	TierII-i
89869 AZ Compa	89870 AZ Compass Prep School	TierII-i
4209 Payson Un	4860 Payson High School	TierII-i
4403 Tucson Un	88059 Aztec Desert Vista	TierII-i
4368 Lake Hava	5565 Lake Havasu High School	TierII-i
4392 Heber-Ove	5625 Mogollon High School	TierII-i
4438 Ray Unific	5900 Ray High School	TierII-i
79578 Pan-Ameri	79579 Pan-American Charter School	TierII-i
4286 Phoenix Ur	88407 Phoenix Union Bioscience High School	TierII-i
4235 Mesa Unifi	78932 East Valley Academy	TierII-i
87600 Gila Count	90038 Biyaagozhoo Center	TierII-i

	PCTPASS2010	Rank Pct Pass	avggrowth	Rank growth	Mean Rank
CR	15.38	1	-13.15	6	4
CR	16.22	2	-19.39	5	4.5
CR	20	4	-11.04	7	7.5
CR	27.27	7	-19.7	4	9
2009	26.24	6	-7.58	12	12
CR	20.45	5	-5.88	18	14
2010	42.31	19	-22.33	2	20
CR	40	16	-6.47	16	24
CR	44.9	22	-9.47	8	26
2009	47.32	26	-8.72	10	31
CR	43.75	20	-5.21	23	31.5
2009	50.82	30	-21.65	3	31.5
CR	40.5	17	-3.98	31	32.5
CR	32	9	-1.05	48	33
CR	44	21	-4.53	28	35
CR	28.33	8	0	58	37
2009	36.57	14	-1.06	47	37.5
2010	49.69	27	-5.33	21	37.5
2010	50.8	29	-6.02	17	37.5
CR	17.19	3	6.62	73	39.5
CR	33.33	10	0	59	39.5
CR	33.33	11	0	60	41
CR	33.33	12	0	61	42.5
2010	53.34	36	-7.26	14	43
2010	54.53	38	-7.55	13	44.5
	46.05	23	-1.98	44	45
	55.24	40	-6.76	15	47.5
	47.13	25	-0.97	50	50
	35	13	9	76	51
	42.25	18	1.13	67	51.5
	60.34	46	-7.64	11	51.5
	51.04	33	-2.26	40	53
	38.3	15	14.34	77	53.5
	58.8	45	-5.56	19	54.5
	62.08	50	-8.89	9	54.5
	46.43	24	0	62	55
	56.74	42	-4.8	26	55
	50.88	31	-1.03	49	55.5
	51.91	34	-2	43	55.5
	55.91	41	-4.48	29	55.5
	60.61	47	-5.56	20	57
	54.55	39	-2.54	37	57.5
	50	28	0	63	59.5
	58.65	44	-3.84	32	60
	58.33	43	-2.69	35	60.5
	63.84	53	-4.34	30	68
	51.02	32	6.62	74	69
	67.17	57	-5.12	24	69
	52.59	35	2.27	70	70
	54.17	37	2.09	69	71.5
	67.35	59	-4.7	27	72.5

61.87	49	-0.48	54	76
65.5	54	-1.24	45	76.5
66.74	56	-2.05	42	77
	77	-50	1	77.5
69.67	61	-2.93	34	78
63.79	52	-0.5	53	78.5
67.24	58	-2.25	41	78.5
61.63	48	0	64	80
74.67	70	-5.25	22	81
73.96	69	-5.08	25	81.5
71.33	66	-2.65	36	84
70.28	62	-1.1	46	85
63.64	51	4.55	72	87
76.02	72	-3.01	33	88.5
71.24	65	-0.71	52	91
79.04	73	-2.32	38	92
66.67	55	8.34	75	92.5
68.42	60	0.24	65	92.5
71.77	68	-0.92	51	93.5
80	75	-2.31	39	94.5
71.43	67	-0.29	56	95
70.31	63	0.47	66	96
70.73	64	1.55	68	98
75.26	71	-0.27	57	99.5
94.18	76	-0.46	55	103.5
79.29	74	4.28	71	109.5
	78		78	117

Gradrate2009	Gradrate2008	Gradrate2007
0	0	0
33	14	10
0	11	7
50	8	67
21	22	26
19	19	16
80	70	88
45	35	41
47	24	37
48	66	52
57	62	73
67	54	75
52	46	64
60	43	34
5	25	0
65	53	72
61	69	48
79	79	84
67	25	0
50	0	33
89	90	94
81	74	67
0	21	20
84	86	91
82	83	86
0		
52	41	74
93	93	93
83	81	84
67	45	38
91	93	94
82	76	66
79	87	89
33	33	55
80	79	83
83	85	89
76	83	82
5	0	6
90	90	88
67	65	66
23	28	32
85	79	80
67	72	59

76	82	78
85	85	85
92	83	89
76	57	61
88	96	87
86	80	82
96	95	93

89	88	86
85	88	86
78	82	76
25	42	31
83	83	85
92	89	89
89	89	82
24	40	47

82	77	77
64	68	47
75	70	70
85	86	92
77	85	76

71	65	52
----	----	----

School Improvement Grant - Windows Internet Explorer

http://www.azed.gov/schooleffectiveness/SI/

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPERINTENDENT TOM HORNE

Search
Site Index Click Here

Home SAIS Common Logon

School Effectiveness School Improvement Grant 1003(g)

Public Notice

November 30, 2010
School Improvement Grant Waiver Memo
School Improvement Grant Waivers

To submit public comment, please email Cindy.Richards@azed.gov

School Improvement Grant Awards

- [Summary of Awards](#)

School Improvement Grant LEA Applications

Eligible Schools Definition

- [Tier I & Tier II](#)
- [Tier III](#)

List of Eligible Schools

- [Tier I & Tier II](#)
- [Tier III](#)

Documents

- [LEA Application](#)
- [SIG Guidance to LEAs for Completing the Budget and Budget Example](#)
- [SIG Budget Template](#)
- [FY 2009 Chart of Account Matrix Update](#)

start | Local intranet | 100% | 3:33 PM

Comments on Waivers

From: JFULLER [<mailto:JFULLER@WUSD.US>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 12:59 PM
To: Richards, Cindy
Subject: SIG Waivers

The Whiteriver Unified School District supports all four waivers that the Arizona Department of Education is proposing to the USDOE. Removal of those restrictions will enable us to be more flexible in meeting the academic needs of our students.

Jeffrey A. Fuller, Superintendent

Whiteriver Unified School District

P.O. Box 190

Whiteriver, Arizona 85941

Ph# 928-338-4842

Fax# 928-338-5124

From: Dawson, Edwin [<mailto:EdwinD@susd12.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 9:01 AM
To: Richards, Cindy
Cc: Betten, Pam
Subject: Waivers

Good morning Cindy.

If I am reading the Tier II high school waiver correctly you are proposing that AZ include in the Tier II schools not only high schools who were eligible but were not receiving Title I funding, but high schools receiving title I funding that are in their second year and beyond of AYP consequences. If that is the case you have my support.

Peace

ejd

ED DAWSON, PH.D., DIRECTOR OF TITLE I PROGRAMS

Sunnyside Unified School District #12

2238 E. Ginter Rd., Tucson, AZ 85706

(520) 545-2018 (o)

(520) 269-9240 (c)

edwind@susd12.org

From: Wendy Ong [<mailto:Wendy.Ong@irahhayes.org>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 8:55 AM

To: Richards, Cindy

Subject: SIG WAIVERS

Hi Cindy,

The main waiver that Ira Hayes would apply for would be #4, waiving section 421 (b) to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEA's to September 30, 2014. Thank you.

Wendy Ong, Ed. D

Ira H. Hayes High School

Director of School Improvement

P.O.Box 10899

Bapchule, AZ. 85121

520-315-5100 ext 101

520-315-5115 (fax)

wendy.ong@irahhayes.org

From: Sullivan, Janet [<mailto:Janet.Sullivan@wesdschools.org>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 8:23 AM

To: Richards, Cindy

Subject: SIG Waivers

Cindy,

We agree with the waiver requests outlined in the Nov. 30 memo from Angela Denning.

I do have a question...we applied for 1003(g) SIG funds for one of our schools, but as the school is a Tier III school and not high on the list (fortunately), we were not funded. The school did implement the turnaround model. I'm assuming the waivers, specifically number 2, only apply to funded schools? Just thought I'd ask!

Janet

Janet Sullivan, Assistant Superintendent for Academic Services
Washington Elementary School District
4650 W Sweetwater Ave ph # 602-347-2820
Glendale, AZ 85304 fax 602-347-2708
janet.sullivan@wesdschools.org