

APPLICATION COVER SHEET  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

<p>Legal Name of Applicant: Iowa Department of Education</p>	<p>Applicant's Mailing Address: Grimes State Office Building 400 E 14<sup>th</sup> Street Des Moines, IA 50319-0146</p>
<p>State Contact for the School Improvement Grant</p> <p>Name: Paul Cahill</p> <p>Position and Office: Title I Administrative Consultant</p> <p>Contact's Mailing Address: Grimes State Office Building 400 E 14<sup>th</sup> Street Des Moines, IA 50319-0146</p> <p>Telephone: (515)281-3944</p> <p>Fax: (515)242-6025</p> <p>Email address: paul.cahill@iowa.gov</p>	
<p>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Kevin Fangman, Acting Director</p>	<p>Telephone: (515) 281-3436</p>
<p>Signature of the Chief State School Officer:</p> <p>X <i>Kevin Fangman</i></p>	<p>Date: 12/3/10</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>	

# School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

---

**State Name: IOWA**



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](mailto: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](mailto: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**

Legal Name of Applicant: Iowa Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: Grimes State Office Building 400 E 14 <sup>th</sup> Street Des Moines, IA 50319-0146
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant  Name: Paul Cahill  Position and Office: Title I Administrative Consultant  Contact's Mailing Address: Grimes State Office Building 400 E 14 <sup>th</sup> Street Des Moines, IA 50319-0146  Telephone: (515)281-3944  Fax: (515)242-6025  Email address: paul.cahill@iowa.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Kevin Fangman, Acting Director	Telephone: (515) 281-3436
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X	Date: 12/3/10
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.	

# 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.**

<b>SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS</b>	<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 checked="" 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 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	
<b>SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
<b>SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
<b>SECTION C: CAPACITY</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
<b>SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
<b>SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as FY 2009	<input type="checkbox"/> Revised for FY 2010
<b>SECTION E: ASSURANCES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
<b>SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
<b>SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
<b>SECTION H: WAIVERS</b>	<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:**

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=1974&catid=497&Itemid=1503](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1974&catid=497&Itemid=1503)

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 <sup>1</sup>

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		

<sup>1</sup> “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.

**EXAMPLE:**

<b>SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS</b>							
<b>LEA NAME</b>	<b>LEA NCES ID #</b>	<b>SCHOOL NAME</b>	<b>SCHOOL NCES ID#</b>	<b>TIER I</b>	<b>TIER II</b>	<b>TIER III</b>	<b>GRAD RATE</b>
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:**

**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.**

The LEA must determine what the current reality is for each applicant school by gathering multiple sources of data into the analysis of the needs to assist the school to determine the intervention to be implemented for each Tier I and Tier II school.

Name of School:	Tier:
Areas to analyze, if available, as part of a comprehensive needs assessment	LEA’s summary and conclusion of its analysis of each of the areas considered in the needs assessment
1. Curriculum and Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iowa Core essential concepts and skills</li> <li>• Alignment between assessments and curricula</li> <li>• Assessment data from other district-wide assessments</li> <li>• Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)/Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED) for the past 3 years, including subgroup breakdown</li> </ul>	
2. Schedule and Classroom <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School vision and mission</li> <li>• School Safety</li> <li>• Summary data for attendance, truancy and school mobility rate</li> <li>• Climate surveys, if available</li> </ul>	
3. Administration and staffing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher-student ratios</li> <li>• Supplemental Support</li> <li>• Use of Iowa Professional Development Model</li> <li>• Implementation data from professional development activities</li> </ul>	
4. Student and parent involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iowa Youth Survey data</li> </ul>	

- Evidence of parent/community involvement in school

The LEA must establish a clear relationship between the specific needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the application and the respective intervention chosen. The application must address the needs for the LEA and the school in relation to the applicable intervention by considering factors that may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The leadership skills, training and experiences needed to drive school improvement efforts
- The optimal assignment of staff to meet students needs.
- The operational flexibility to recruit and retain qualified staff.
- LEA supports in place to sustain implementation of the selected intervention.
- Other funding resources that must be brought into alignment with the selected intervention.

**Needs Analysis (5 points maximum possible)**

The following framework will be used by the SEA to evaluate the LEA application with respect to the needs assessment and analysis as well as the selection of the intervention model

Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting	Points
1	Little or no relevant data has been provided and/or the analysis of needs is minimal. The fit between the need of the school and the model chosen is minimal.	1	
3	Needs identified and some analysis conducted. A general fit between the needs of the school and the model chosen has been conducted.	1	
5	Analysis is evident and needs are clearly and explicitly written. The fit between the needs of the school and the model chosen is specifically and conclusively demonstrated..	1	

**(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.**

The LEA must address the following:

Capacity Factors	Model(s)
Staff has been identified with the credentials and capability to implement the selected intervention.	All
The ability of the LEA to serve the overall number of Tier I and/or Tier II schools identified on the application has been addressed.	All
The LEA has described the procedure for monitoring the actions and activities identified in the plan including the frequency and fidelity of the professional development, the opportunities for teachers to collaborate, as well as the use of formative data to assure increase in student performance	All
<p>A commitment to support the selected intervention has been indicated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*The teachers' union (required by Iowa SF 2033)</li> <li>* The local school board</li> <li>*Parents</li> </ul>	All
A detailed and realistic timeline demonstrating that the LEA has the ability to get the basic elements of its selected intervention up and running by the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year.	All
A strategic planning process has already taken place that successfully supported the selection and implementation of the intervention.	All
The LEA's ability to recruit new principals with the ability to implement the select intervention.	Turnaround, Transformation
Plans to and barriers from adding at least an hour of additional instruction time per day, or alternative/extended school-year calendars that add time beyond the additional hour of instruction time per day for each identified Tier I or Tier II school to be served by the application have been outlined	Turnaround, Restart Transformation
The ability of the LEA to successfully align resources to the	Turnaround, Restart

actions identified in the plan for full and effective implementation of the intervention and to ensure sustainability.	Transformation
A description of a governance structure in described that includes an LEA-based Turnaround Officer(s) or Turnaround Office that will be responsible for taking an active role in the day-to-day management of turnaround efforts at the school level and for coordinating with the IDE.	Turnaround, Restart, Transformation
The availability of a Charter School Operator appropriate to the needs of the school to be served.	Restart
Access to and geographic proximity of higher achieving schools, including but not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.	School Closure

**Capacity** (10 points maximum possible)

Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting
1	The LEA has not described the support it will provide each Tier I and II school in its implementation of the chosen intervention model. The LEA has not addressed capacity criteria.	2
3	The LEA has described the support it will provide each Tier I and II school in its implementation of the chosen intervention model, but is inconsistent or weak and does not address all capacity criteria.	2
5	The LEA has demonstrated in a strong and convincing manner that it has the capacity to fully and effectively implement the intervention model it has chosen and addresses all capacity criteria.	2

**(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).**

The LEA will be required to submit a separate budget for each identified Tier I and Tier II school that will allow for a detailed assessment as to whether sufficient funds have been requested and appropriately budgeted to implement the selected intervention model. Due to the funding needed to fully and effectively implement one of the intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school in the State,. With the exception of the school closure model (one-year funding request only), the assessment of sufficiency of funds will be guided primarily by the demonstrated needs of the LEA to allow them to serve each Tier I and Tier II school.

LEAs will be asked to describe their needs to implement the selected intervention model(s), and they will also be asked to identify relevant areas of alignment with other federal, state and local funding sources.

The LEA budget 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.
3. A separate budget must be submitted for each school for each year of the three year grant period.
4. The budget must be planned as a minimum of \$50,000 not to exceed 2 million dollars per year per school.
5. The SIG portion of school closure costs may be lower than the amount required for the other models and will **be granted for only one year**.
6. 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.

**Budget** (10 points maximum possible)

Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting	Points
1	The applicant does not adequately describe how funds will be distributed or support school improvement activities.	2	
3	The description of funding distribution and the funding of some activities is included. Equitable distribution and utilization is not clear.	2	

5	The applicant has clearly described how funds will be equitably distributed, will support school improvement activities, and will be utilized for implementation of the intervention model.	2	
---	---	---	--

**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.**

The Iowa Department of Education’s (IDE) School Improvement Grant application for LEAs will require the LEA to not only identify which of the four intervention models each Tier I and Tier II school will engage, but to describe the specific actions the LEA will take to implement the required elements of the specified intervention model. The

LEA will also be required to provide a timeline of action for each of the required elements and associated actions. In this regard, LEA applications will be judged in each of the following areas:

- a. The inclusion of actions for each element of the intervention model,
- b. The extent of LEA and school support and resource committed to the intervention model,
- c. The extent to which the actions promote and support full and effective implementation of each required element,
- d. A timeline for actions that is reasonable in supporting effective implementation while promoting an aggressive engagement of action
- e. The extent to which parents and community, school staff (administrative, instructional and staff), and other stakeholders were engaged in the planning and decision making process, and
- f. The adjustments to specific LEA and school policy, procedure and practice to accommodate, support and sustain the intervention model.

LEAs serving a Tier III school must identify actions that the LEA will take to implement a corrective action plan developed in concert with the Iowa State School Support team.

This corrective action plan will include many of the above actions.

\*\*The chart below will assist the LEA in assuring that the required activities are addressed for each intervention model selected for a Tier I or Tier II school, as well as- allowing the LEA to identify the permissible activities they plan to use.

**THE FOUR INTERVENTION MODELS**

REQUIRED LEA Activities	TURN-AROUND	TRANS-FORMATION	RESTART	CLOSURE
Replace Principal (except those hired previously as part of turnaround or transformation effort)	✓	✓		
Operational flexibility (calendar, time, budget, staffing)	✓	✓		
Replace >50% of Staff using "locally adopted competencies"	✓			
Close & reopen under Charter School Operator/CMO/EMO			✓	
Close the school and send students to nearby schools - including but not limited to charter schools or new schools				✓
Rigorous, transparent and equitable teacher and leader evaluation systems using student growth in significant part AND other measures AND designed with teacher/leader input	permissible	✓		
Identify/reward effective personnel & remove ineffective personnel	permissible	✓		
High-quality, ongoing, job-embedded, instructionally aligned professional development	✓	✓		
Financial incentives, career opportunities and flexible work conditions	✓	✓		
New governance structure	✓	permissible		
Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned	✓	✓		
Promote the use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students	✓	✓		
Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time	✓	✓		
Socio-emotional and community supports	✓			
Ongoing family and community engagement	permissible	✓		

Ongoing intensive technical assistance from LEA, SEA or external partner	permissible	✓		
---	-------------	---	--	--

✓ **REQUIRED**

**THE FOUR INTERVENTION MODELS**

<b>PERMISSIBLE Activities*</b>	<b>TURN- AROUND</b>	<b>TRANS- FORMATION</b>
New school model (e.g. themed, dual language)		see below re:"thematic learning academies"
Additional compensation to attract and retain staff		
System to measure impact of professional development		
Ensure that school is not required to accept teacher without mutual consent of teacher and principal regardless of teacher seniority		
Periodic reviews of curriculum		
Response to Intervention model		
Additional supports to address students with disabilities and English language learners		
Using and integrating educational technology		
Increasing opportunities for advanced coursework, AP, IB, STEM, early college, dual enrollment, <b>thematic learning academies</b>		
Summer transition or freshman academies (middle to high school)		
Graduation rate improvement reforms		
Early warning systems for at-risk youth		
Partner with organizations, clinics, agencies, etc. to meet students' social, emotional, health needs		

Extend or restructure school day		
Implement approaches to improve school climate and discipline		
Full-day kindergarten or pre-K		
Per-pupil school-based budget formula weighted by student needs		

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

Each LEA will be required to document the process it used or will use to secure external providers if appropriate to its proposed actions. The following factors will be used to determine the extent to which an LEA used or will use a credible process for making its decision(s) regarding external providers:

- a. The LEA’s rationale for engaging an external provider.
- b. The specific service that is being secured through an external provider
- c. The number of external providers considered.
- d. The qualifications of each external provider considered for delivering the expected service.
- e. The experience of each external provider considered in delivering the expected service.
- f. The evidence base for the specific service of each external provider considered.

**(3) Align other resources with the interventions.**

LEA applications will need to describe how other federal, state and local fiscal resources will be used to promote and support the implementation of each school’s plan described in the LEA application. Specifically, an LEA will need to identify the specific funding source, the amount of resource being committed to assure full and effective implementation of the interventions, and how each of the other funding sources supports the implementation and follow through of specific actions. The SEA will conduct on-site quarterly reviews at each SIG funded school, as part of the monitoring visit the school will need to be able to demonstrate the alignment described in their approved application. Schools not able to demonstrate alignment will be given a deadline for developing the alignment with other interventions or risk losing their SIG grant.

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

An LEA will need to reflect in its analysis of the current status of the school, its students, staff, and programs and services, the process it used to review current practices and policies and the extent to which a practice or policy conflicts with or compromises effective and full engagement and implementation of the required elements and actions of

the selected intervention model. If practices and policies are identified that conflict with or compromise the implementation of any required elements of the selected intervention model, then the LEA and school will need to specify the actions to be taken and the timeline for the actions. The SEA will conduct on-site quarterly review visits at each SIG funded school to check for full implementation of the approved intervention model.

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

Each LEA will be required to delineate a plan for sustaining the reform undertaken in each school. This plan will need to address the following:

- a. Commitment of other federal, state and local resources to maintain the intervention model and its required elements.
- b. Mentoring and training actions for staff new to the school.
- c. Specific actions to assure that the hiring process for affected schools support the continuation of focus and action consistent with the intervention model and the associated actions
- d. Specific strategic training aimed at refreshing, renewing and updating staff knowledge about and foundations of the intervention model and its required elements, and the specific actions and expectations that promote and support the intervention model.
- e. Strategic actions that will be taken to maintain high levels of community and parent understanding and engagement with the school, and
- f. Evaluation strategy that is aligned to desired outcomes and goals (both student and system), data rich with designated time and process for analyzing data, and includes a specific process for decision making and determining actions.

Each approved SIG application requires LEAs to describe their sustainability measures, these will be review with LEA during the on-site quarterly reviews conducted at each approved school. Also, LEAs have been required to expend less funds annually over the course of the the three award period to assist them in providing more LEA resources to sustain efforts after the funding cycle ceases.

**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 period<sup>2</sup> 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.*)

<sup>2</sup> "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:**

**1. Review of LEA proposed pre-implementation budget of activities to be carried out during the pre-implementation period.**

The Iowa Department of Education (IDE) School Improvement Grant application will require an LEA submitting an application to complete a budget form and narrative that will require them to justify any pre-implementation activities and associated costs. The budget may include expenditures for pre-implementation activities, but it is not required.

**2. Evaluation of LEA proposed pre-implementation activities to determine if activities and expenditures are allowable.**

The Iowa Department of Education (IDE) will allow LEA applicants to request SIG funding for pre-implementation activities in the spring and/or summer prior to full implementation for the 2011-2012 school year for the following:

**Family and Community Engagement:** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases,

newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.

**Rigorous Review of External Providers:** Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity (see C-5); or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model (see H-19a).

**Staffing:** Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.

**Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.

**Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.

**Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.

LEA applicants for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) must provide a breakdown of each pre-implementation activity and associated cost as part of the LEA application process. Pre-implementation activities will be reviewed by the SEA to insure that activities are necessary to allow the applicant to fully implement the selected intervention model in the Fall of 2011. Pre-implementation activities are not limited to the suggested activities listed above, but the LEA must be able to provide justification for any pre-implementation expenditure as part of the school budget narrative.

**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:**

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

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

I. The Iowa Department of Education (IDE) will evaluate any "lack of capacity" claim by an LEA to implement one of the four required intervention models in an identified Tier I school. IDE will consider the preponderance of the following circumstances as demonstrating a lack of capacity:

1. Lack of qualified staff that have the capability to implement one of the four intervention models.
2. Inability to recruit new principals to implement the turnaround and transformational models,
3. Lack of ability to contract with a high quality Charter School non-profit or for-profit organization to implement the restart model.
4. Lack of support of the teacher union with respect to staffing and/or teacher evaluation requirements. Senate File 2033 requires that an LEA with a Persistently Lowest-Achieving School (PLAS) negotiate with its teacher union representatives and jointly agree upon an intervention model and sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) before an application is submitted for a School Improvement Grant.

5. The lack of commitment of the local school board to eliminate barriers and to facilitate full and effective implementation of the models.
6. Lack of ability to sustain reform efforts in the model.
7. Inability to formalize an adequate timeline for the full implementation of the selected model.

The IDE will require that evidence be submitted to verify any “lack of capacity” claim by an LEA to implement one of the four required intervention models in an identified Tier I school. If after examining the evidence, the IDE believes that an LEA has more capacity than it demonstrates, the IDE will require the LEA to modify its School Improvement Application.

**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:**

**Timeline**

- **November 30, 2010** Preliminary notification of PLA schools
- **December 3, 2010** Submit Iowa's SIG application to US Department of Education for approval  
(includes preliminary list of PLA schools)
- **January 5, 2011** Release of final list of PLA schools and LEA SIG application to eligible Tier I and Tier II schools (45 day timeline on agreement of Memorandum of Understanding {SF 2033} starts)
- **January 21, 2011** LEAs planning to submit a SIG application must file an "Intent to Apply" with the IDE
- **February 19, 2011** End of 45 day period to agree to a Memorandum of Understanding agreement between school district and local teachers' union
- **February 24, 2011** End of 5 day period to select a mediator
- **March 26, 2011** End of mediation period
- **March 30, 2011** SIG application due to IDE
- **April 8, 2011** LEAs notified of SIG application funding

**Implementation will begin Fall 2011**

**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.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> 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 and timeline for approving LEA applications.

- a. LEAs will be required to submit a complete application to the Department by March 30, 2011. The Department will review the applications and notify LEAs no

later than April 8, 2011, of the status of their applications so that districts with approved applications will be able to implement their actions during the 2011-2012 school year. Each application will be reviewed by a team of readers who will be trained to read and score the applications and who, as a team, will make a recommendation for action to the Department's administrative consultant responsible for Title I. The Title I administrative consultant will make a recommendation for action to PK-12 Administrative Team, which will make the final decision.

- b. Readers will be trained to use the scoring guide included in Part 2 of this application and will arrive at a team recommendation for each application reviewed. The recommendations will be presented in writing to the Title I administrative consultant. In order to receive funds, an application will need to receive a score that at least meets the threshold of acceptance as identified in Part 2 of this application.
- c. Funding decisions will be made by the PK-12 Administrative Team. Funding decisions for applications determined to deserve School Improvement Grant funds will be made using the following procedure:
  - a. The funding level for each application with a request for Tier I funding will be determined.
    - a. First by the rank order of applications using the overall reader score
    - b. Next, depending on the availability of funds the funding level for each application with a request for Tier II funding will be determined. Tier II schools must have priority over Tier III schools regardless of scores on the LEA School Improvement Grant application. (See page 26)
    - c. Finally, if funds are available the funding level for each application with a request for Tier III funding will be determined.

Anticipating that there will be insufficient funds to support all applications with Tier II and Tier III requests, funding decisions will be based on the following criteria:

- b. Rank order of applications using the overall reader score.
- c. Intervention model selected
- d. Number of subject areas identified as failing to meet annual Adequate Yearly Progress targets.
- e. Number of years identified as "school in need" under NCLB and proficiency rates over the last three years.
- f. School enrollment
- g. Coordination of resources and supports from the LEA

**(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.**

- a. Each LEA submitting an application with Tier I and Tier II schools will need to identify the annual goals for reading/language arts and mathematics for each Tier

I and Tier II school. Each goal will need to clearly identify the metric that will be used to determine progress and the measure or measures that will be used to determine progress.

- b. Renewal decisions for the grant program will be based on 2 factors: (1) the extent to which the annual goals are being accomplished and (2) the extent to which the LEA and school have followed through in implementing the model and actions described in the application. Each LEA will be required to submit an annual report that (a) documents progress on the annual goals for each school, (b) describes the extent to which the intervention model and associated actions for each school have been implemented, and (3) identifies any remedial actions that will be taken to correct deficiencies in implementation. Schools failing to make at least 75% of the stated target for each annual goal and failing to implement the intervention model and associated actions according to timelines established in the LEA application will be considered “at-risk” of losing its School Improvement Grant funds. The designation of the “at-risk” status will prompt a Level II onsite visit by a Department team to determine: (1) whether the LEA and school commitment and ability to deliver on the intervention model and associated actions is appropriate and effective, (2) whether the LEA and school can engage its proposed remedial action to address deficiencies in implementation, and (3) whether the remedial actions need to be changed or other remedial actions taken. Following the onsite visit, the team will submit a written report to the Title I administrative consultant documenting the team’s findings and recommending whether the LEA and school are positioned to correct implementation deficiencies. The PK-12 Administrative Team will make the final decision regarding continued use of School Improvement Grant funds by the LEA and school.

- (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.**

The process described for LEA’s with Tier I and Tier II schools in (2) above will be used for Tier III schools.

- (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.**

- a. Members of the Iowa State School Support Team will be assigned to each LEA receiving School Improvement Grant funds to conduct onsite visits once a semester to each LEA. The purpose of the onsite visit will be to document LEA and school progress in implementing the intervention model and associated actions according to the established timeline and whether any deficiencies exist in LEA and school commitment and support. The outcome of an onsite visit will be the submission of a

Technical Assistance Report to the Title I administrative consultant who will review the findings and determine whether any follow up actions need to be taken.

- b. Each LEA receiving School Improvement Grant funds will be required to submit an annual report that (1) documents progress on the annual goals for each school, (2) describes the extent to which the intervention model and associated actions for each school have been implemented, and (3) identifies any remedial actions that will be taken to correct deficiencies in implementation. The annual report and Technical Assistance Reports will be reviewed by a team of Department personnel to determine whether any specific follow up actions need to be taken with an LEA and its school(s).

**(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.**

Funding decisions will be made by the PK-12 Administrative Team. Funding decisions for applications determined to deserve School Improvement Grant funds will be made using the following procedure:

- a. The funding level for each application with a request for Tier I funding will be determined first.
- b. Next, the funding level for each application with a request for Tier II funding will be determined. Tier II schools must have priority over Tier III schools regardless of scores on the LEA School Improvement Grant application. (See page 24)
- c. Finally, depending on the availability of funds, the funding level for each application with a request for Tier III funding will be determined.

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

The following factors will be considered in scoring and making decisions regarding the funding of Tier III schools:

- a. First by the rank order of applications using the overall reader score
- b. Number of years identified as “school in need” under NCLB,
- c. Number of subject areas identified,
- d. School enrollment,
- e. LEA commitment to support implementation, and
- f. Coordination of resources and supports from the LEA

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

The Department will not be taking over any Tier I or Tier II schools.

**(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention**

**model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.<sup>2</sup>**

The Department will not be providing services directly to any Tier I or Tier II schools in the absence of a takeover.

---

<sup>2</sup> If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

## E. ASSURANCES

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:**

The Iowa Department of Education (IDE) will reserve an amount equal to five percent of its School Improvement Grant to conduct the following activities:

1. Review and approve LEA School Improvement Grant applications.
2. Monitor of LEA implementation of approved applications.
3. Ensure that LEAs implement one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II schools that it commits to serve.
4. Ensure that school improvement activities are implemented in each Tier III school that an approved LEA commits to serve with School Improvement Grant funds.
5. Review school level reports on student achievement and leading indicators.
6. Provide technical assistance on the implementation of required components in the model selected by each school that the LEA commits to serve.
7. Assist in providing student achievement information and analysis from to LEAs.
8. Provide research and professional development on effective interventions and instructional models to LEAs through the use of the State Support Team.
9. Evaluate data submitted and use of data to provide technical assistance.

**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

**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** Iowa 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]** 30.

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** 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** 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:**

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

**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:

7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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
<b>Tier I</b>	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools.” <sup>§</sup>	Title I eligible <sup>**</sup> 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"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier II</b>	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"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two consecutive years.</li> </ul>
<b>Tier III</b>	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I. <sup>††</sup>	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"> <li>• in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; <u>or</u></li> <li>• have not made AYP for two years.</li> </ul>

<sup>§</sup> “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.

<sup>\*\*</sup> 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).

<sup>††</sup> 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.

# LEA

## Grant Application

for

*Federal School Improvement Funds*

Deadline for Submission:

Grant application must be delivered or received by

March 30, 2011

4:30 p.m.

*NOTE: A separate application must be submitted for each school in your LEA for which you are requesting funding*

Iowa Department of Education  
Grimes State Office Building  
400 E 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146

## **Program Description**

### **Purpose**

The School Improvement Grant Program, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, provides funding through State Education Agencies to local education agencies (LEAs) with the lowest-achieving schools with the greatest need for the funds and demonstrating the strongest commitment to use the funds to raise significantly the achievement of their students.

### **Eligibility**

School improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are a State's persistently-lowest achieving Title I schools in need of assistance (SINA). Tier II schools are a State's persistently-lowest achieving secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in need of improvement that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools (Tier III schools).

In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of the four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

### **Uses of Funds**

This is a three-year grant. Awards to recipients will be made on an annual basis; therefore, the applicant budget must reflect income and expenditures for each of the three award years.

### **Duration**

The grant will be is a three year grant with only first year funding guaranteed. Initial funding will be available for use during the 2011-2012 school year and must be expended by September 30, 2012.

### **Non-Discrimination Statement**

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, gender, disability, religion, age, or marital status in its programs or employment practices. If you have questions or grievances related to this policy, please contact the Legal Consultant, Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146, 515-281-8661

### **Federal Guidance**

See Attached Document

### **Proposal Requirements**

***NOTE: A separate application must be submitted for each school in your LEA for which you are requesting funding***

Each proposal submitted must include:

#### **Needs Assessment and Analysis:**

The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I, II, and III school identified in the LEA's application and has selected a required Intervention Model for each Tier I and II school.

#### **Capacity:**

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 model in each of those schools. This section on capacity does not apply to Tier III only applicants.

#### **Intervention models identified:**

The LEA applying for Tier I and/or Tier II schools will identify which of the 4 intervention models (refer to enclosed chart) that it will implement in each school.

#### **Budget and Budget Narrative:**

The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention model fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application. Tier

III applicants also must describe activities to support school improvement in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds.

**External Providers:**

If applicable, recruit, screen, and select external providers and ensure their quality.

**Resource Alignment:**

Aligning other resources with the interventions.

**Describe Modifications:**

If necessary, modify LEA practices or policies to enable the LEA to implement the interventions fully and effectively

**Sustainability:**

Describe how the funded activities and/or partnership under this proposal will continue after the original period and funding have expired.

**Preparation of Application**

Listed in application criteria are the required components - in the order that they should appear for an acceptable application. The narrative sections of the proposal must be double-spaced, the font must be no smaller than 12-point, and any font style may be used.

**Intent to Apply:** If you intend to apply for this funding opportunity, send an e-mail message to Paul Cahill at [Paul.Cahill@iowa.gov](mailto:Paul.Cahill@iowa.gov) NO LATER than January 21, 2011.

**Proposal Submission**

Applicants must submit 1 original and 2 copies of the full proposal to the Iowa Department of Education (IDE). The original must include an original ink signature. To be considered for funding, proposals must be delivered or received at the DE by 4:30 p.m. on March 30, 2011. Proposals should be mailed or delivered to:

Paul Cahill, Title I Administrative Consultant  
Iowa Department of Education  
Grimes State Office Building  
400 E 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146

**Incomplete or late applications will not be considered.**  
**Fax and e-mail transmission of the complete proposal are not acceptable**

## **Review of Proposal**

As proposals are received at the Iowa Department of Education, they will be reviewed for completeness and compliance with the requirements within this Request for Proposal to determine applicant eligibility.

A review panel will be identified and trained to read and evaluate eligible applications that reflect the requirements and criteria. Members of the panel will review and score each eligible application and make recommendations to the Department's PK-12 Administrative Team. Proposals will be ranked according to final scores assigned by the reviewers. Additional factors in determining funding will include: (1) school enrollment and model selected; (2) the number of years identified as a "school in need" under NCLB, and the number of subject areas identified; (3) rank order in list of PLAS, including proficiency over the past three years; and (4) evidence of coordination of resources and supports from the LEA.

Following the review, the Department staff will contact project directors/application contact persons to discuss any required modification of the project plan.

## **Award Administration**

### **Notification**

The applicant will be notified by April 8, 2011, of the status of their proposal.

### **Right to Negotiate**

The Iowa Department of Education reserves the right to negotiate the final award within parameters of the grant.

### **Appeal Process**

Any applicant of the grant funds may appeal the denial of a properly submitted competitive program grant application or the unilateral termination of a competitive program grant to the director of the department of education. Appeals must be in writing, in the form of an affidavit, and received within ten (10) working days of the date of notice of the decision and must be based on a contention that the process was conducted outside of statutory authority; violated state or federal law, policy or rule; did not provide adequate public notice; was altered without adequate public notice; or involved conflict of interest by staff or committee members. Refer to 281 IAC r. 7.5, the legal authority for this process.

## **Application and Review Criteria**

*NOTE: All criteria must be addressed by each applicant for Tiers I, II, and III with the following EXCEPTION: Tier III schools do not have to address criteria relative to the Intervention Models or where otherwise noted.*

**Total Possible Points: 75**

### **PART I - Review Criteria:**

The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. They are:

1. Needs Assessment and Analysis
2. Capacity
3. Design and implement Intervention Models

**Note 1:** If the LEA has chosen the “Closure” Intervention Model, the LEA does not need to address Needs Assessment and Analysis or Capacity, but must instead provide the following information in addition to the Budget:

1. Timeline for closing the school
2. Notice to the community, the school, parents and staff
3. Plan for relocation of students

**Note 2:** If the LEA has chosen the “Restart” Intervention Model, the LEA must, in addition to the Needs Assessment and Analysis or Capacity, provide:

1. A description of the specific process that will be used to select a charter school operator, charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO).
2. A timeline identifying the deadline for selecting a provider, submission of the required Charter School application to the Iowa Department of Education, and the projected start date for the Restart.

- 1. Needs Assessment and Analysis:** The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school as to whether it is a Tier I, II or III school. The LEA has selected an intervention for each Tier I and II school. (Attached form must be completed)

**Needs Analysis (5 points maximum possible)**

The following framework will be used by the SEA to evaluate the LEA application with respect to the needs assessment and analysis as well as the selection of the intervention model			
Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting	Points
1	Little or no relevant data has been provided and/or the analysis of needs is minimal. The fit between the need of the school and the model chosen is minimal.	1	
3	Needs identified and some analysis conducted. A general fit between the needs of the school and the model chosen has been conducted.	1	
5	Analysis is evident and needs are clearly and explicitly written. The fit between the needs of the school and the model chosen is specifically and conclusively demonstrated..	1	

**Review Comments:**

Name of School:	Tier:
Areas to consider for analysis as part of a comprehensive needs assessment	LEA's summary and conclusion of its analysis of each of the areas considered in the needs assessment
<p>1. Curriculum and Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iowa Core essential concepts and skills</li> <li>• Alignment between assessments and curricula</li> <li>• Assessment data from other LEA-wide assessments</li> <li>• Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)/Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED) for the past 3 years, including subgroup breakdown</li> </ul>	
<p>2. Schedule and Classroom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School vision and mission</li> <li>• School Safety</li> <li>• Summary data for attendance, truancy and school mobility rate</li> <li>• Climate surveys, if available</li> </ul>	
<p>3. Administration and staffing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher-student ratios</li> <li>• Supplemental Support</li> <li>• Use of Iowa Professional Development Model</li> <li>• Implementation data from professional development activities</li> </ul>	
<p>4. Student and parent involvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Iowa Youth Survey data</li> <li>• Evidence of parent/community involvement in school</li> </ul>	

**Capacity:** 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. The LEA will describe the support it will provide each school in its implementation of the intervention model chosen. Not required for Tier III applicants. Specific criteria includes detail describing monitoring of identified professional development, teacher collaboration, use of formative data, alignment of resources, implementation timeline, ability to recruit new staff or principals in required intervention models.

**Capacity** (10 points maximum possible)

Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting	Points
1	The LEA has not described the support it will provide each Tier I and II school in its implementation of the chosen intervention model. The LEA has not addressed capacity criteria.	2	
3	The LEA has described the support it will provide each Tier I and II school in its implementation of the chosen intervention model, but is inconsistent or weak and does not address all capacity criteria.	2	
5	The LEA has demonstrated in a strong and convincing manner that it has the capacity to fully and effectively implement the intervention model it has chosen and addresses all capacity criteria.	2	

**Review Comments:**

**3. Design and implement Intervention Models:** Based on the review of the information gathered from the needs assessment and analysis of each Tier I and Tier II school in Part I, the LEA will identify which of the four intervention models it will implement in each school. The LEA will provide an implementation plan which describes the specific goals, actions or activities, timelines and indicators of progress that address the requirements outlined below for the intervention model chosen. (See attached chart of models.)

**Intervention Model Implementation Plan (15 points maximum possible)**

Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting	Points
1	No Intervention Model is identified.	3	
3	An Intervention Model is identified, but implementation is not addressed.	3	
5	An Intervention Model is identified and includes an implementation plan describing specific goals, actions or activities, timeline, and indicators of progress according to requirements.	3	

**Review Comments:**

**Part II – Review Criteria**

The actions in Part II are those 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.

- 4 Recruit, screen, and select external providers, for Tier I and II schools only, and ensure their quality:** The LEA will address the number of external providers necessary to assist with the implementation of the intervention model chosen. In addition, the qualifications, experience and documented evidence of success of the external provider in the focus area must be addressed. The LEA will describe how the external providers will develop equitable, transparent, and rigorous assistance with the implementation plan. The LEA will describe the role of the external provider. *For example*, the external providers may provide technical assistance in implementing a variety of components of the school intervention models such as helping a school evaluate its data and determine what changes are needed based on those data; providing job-embedded professional development; designing an equitable teacher and principal evaluation system that relies on student achievement; and creating safe school environments that meet students’ social, emotional and health needs.

**External Providers (10 points maximum possible)**

Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting	Points
1	There is no documented evidence of the qualifications, level of experience, or success of the external provider(s) selected.	2	
3	There is limited documented evidence of the qualifications, level of experience, or success of the external provider(s) selected.	2	
5	There is documented evidence regarding the qualifications, level of experience, and a history of successful past experience of the external provider(s) selected.	2	

**Review Comments:**

5. **Align other resources with the interventions – for Tier I and II schools only:** LEA applications will need to describe how other federal, state and local fiscal resources will be used to promote and support the implementation of each school’s plan described in the LEA application. Specifically, an LEA will need to identify the specific funding source, the amount of resource being committed to assure full and effective implementation of the interventions, and how each of the other funding sources supports the implementation and follow through of specific actions.

**Resource Alignment (5 points maximum possible)**

Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting	Points
1	Other federal, state, and local fiscal resources are not described	1	
3	A partial description and identification of other federal, state, and local resources is provided, but does not fully describe the use of those resources in the implementation of each school’s plan.	1	
5	Other federal, state and local fiscal resources are identified and their use to promote and support the implementation of each school’s plan is described. Amounts are identified for specific implementation activities or actions.	1	

**Review Comments:**

6. **Practice and Policy Modification:** If necessary, modify practices or policies, to enable the full and effective implementation of intervention (For Tier I and II schools only). An LEA will need to reflect in its analysis of the current status of the school, its students, staff, programs and services, the process it used to review current practices and policies and the extent to which a practice or policy conflicts with or compromises effective and full engagement and implementation of the required elements and actions of the selected intervention model. If practices and policies are identified that conflict with or compromise the implementation of any required elements of the selected Intervention Model, then the LEA and school will need to specify the actions to be taken and the timeline for the actions to correct such practices and policies.

**Practice and Policy Modification (15 points maximum possible)**

Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting	Points
1	Analysis and review of current practices and policies are not addressed.	3	
3	Analysis is referenced, but need for modification is not addressed.	3	
5	Analysis is clearly discussed relative to current status and the need to reduce or eliminate conflict in order to effectively and fully implement the selected Intervention Model is addressed.	3	

**Review Comments:**

7. **Sustainability: sustain the reforms after the funding period ends-**Each LEA will be required to delineate a plan for sustaining the reform undertaken in each school. This plan will need to address the following:
- a. Commitment of other federal, state and local resources to maintain the intervention model and its required elements
  - b. Mentoring and training actions for staff new to the school
  - c. Specific actions to assure that the hiring process for affected schools support the continuation of focus and action consistent with the intervention model and the associated actions

- d. Specific strategic training aimed at refreshing, renewing and updating staff knowledge about the foundations of the intervention model and its required elements, and the specific actions and expectations that promote and support the intervention model
- e. Strategic actions that will be taken to maintain high levels of community and parent understanding and engagement with the school, and
- f. Evaluation strategy that is aligned to desired outcomes and goals (both student and system), data rich with designated time and process for analyzing data, and includes a specific process for decision making and determining actions

**Sustainability (5 points maximum possible)**

Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting	Points
1	Sustainability was not addressed by the applicant.	1	
3	Some of the requirements for sustainability were addressed.	1	
5	All requirements for sustaining the reforms after the funding period ends were clearly addressed by the applicant.	1	

**Review Comments:**

8. **Budget Narrative:** The LEA’s budget narrative describes the use of sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application over the 3-year funding period. The budget may include expenditures for pre-implementation activities, but it is not required. Any pre-implementation activities must be described in the budget narrative and provide an explanation as to how activities support the implementation of the selected model. The narrative will clarify expenditures listed on the budget by describing the activities to be conducted at the LEA and school levels throughout the 3-year period of availability of those funds. Narrative must include details supporting each budget category and line item listed.

Tier III applicants also must describe activities to support school improvement and must include details supporting each budget category and line item listed.

**Budget** (10 points maximum possible)

Rubric value	Descriptor	X Weighting	Points
1	The applicant does not adequately describe how funds will be distributed or support school improvement activities. (No justification is provided for pre-implementation activities [if budgeted]).	2	
3	The description of funding distribution and the funding of some activities is included. Equitable distribution and utilization is not clear. (Alignment of pre-implementation expenditures with selected improvement model is unclear [if budgeted])	2	
5	The applicant has clearly described how funds will be equitably distributed, will support school improvement activities, and will be utilized for implementation of the intervention model. (Clear alignment of pre-implementation expenditures with selected improvement model)	2	

**Review Comments:**

## Itemized Budget

1. **Budget Form:** Applicants must use the budget provided with the application materials. The budget must align with the actions described in the application. A separate budget must be submitted for each school for each year of the three year grant period. The application may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve by \$2 million or no more than \$6 million over three years

	<b>Year 1 Budget</b>		<b>Year 2 Budget</b>	<b>Year 3 Budget</b>	<b>3- Year Total</b>
	Pre-implementation	Year 1 – Full Implementation			
<b>Personnel</b>					
Salary					
Benefits					
Expenses (Mileage, Meals, Lodging)					
<b>Professional Services</b>					
Honorarium					
Expenses (Mileage, Meals, Lodging)					
<b>Instructional Materials</b>					
<b>Supplies and Materials</b>					
<b>Other – specify:</b>					
<b>Other – specify:</b>					
<b>Administrative Costs (allowable indirect cost rate)</b>					
<b>Total</b>					

This form is a required element and must be submitted as part of the grant application  
**APPLICATION COVER SHEET**

**DUE: March 30, 2011, by 4:30 pm**

**Application for School Improvement Grant**

*NOTE: A separate application must be submitted for each school in your LEA for which you are requesting funding*

**Applying LEA** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact person**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

Fax \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_

**School building name for this application** \_\_\_\_\_

**Designation for this building: Tier I** \_\_\_ **Tier II** \_\_\_ **Tier III** \_\_\_

**Statement of Assurances**

Should a **School Improvement Grant** Award be made to the applicant in support of the activities proposed in this application, the authorized signature on the cover page of this application certifies to the Iowa Department of Education that the authorized official will:

1. Upon request, provide the Iowa Department of Education with access to records and other sources of information that may be necessary to determine compliance with appropriate federal and state laws and Use grant funds to supplement and not supplant funds from nonfederal sources.
2. If the LEA would receive a School Improvement Grant it would comply with all Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination based on race, color, national origin, sex, disability, and age.
3. Ensure that the application does not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve by \$2 million or no more than \$6 million over three years.

**School Improvement Grant assurance requirements stipulated by the U. S. Department of Education**

4. 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.
5. 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.

6. 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 regulations; organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements
7. Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

**Certification by Authorized or Institutional Official:**

The applicant certifies that to the best of his/her knowledge the information in this application is correct, that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution, and that the applicant will comply with the attached statement of assurances.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed or Printed Name of Authorized Official

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Authorized Official

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Please submit to Paul Cahill, Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building,  
400 E 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146 by March 30, 2011, 4:30 p.m.**

**Implementation Timeline**  
(Required – No points awarded)

The LEA must provide an implementation timeline that clearly identifies the occurrence of required activities over the course of the three year grant period. The timeline must delineate activities and persons responsible.

**Annual Goals for Student Achievement**  
(Required – No points awarded)

A LEA must establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's ESEA assessments (ITBS/ITED) in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it will use to monitor each Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school that receives School Improvement Grant funds. Annual goals that a LEA could set might include making at least one year's progress in reading/language arts and mathematics or reducing the percentage of students who are non-proficient on the ITBS/ITED reading/language arts and mathematics assessments by 10 percent or more from the prior year.

**Lack of Capacity**

LEAs that are not making application to serve each identified Tier I school located within the LEA must explain why it lacks the capacity to do so. Lack of Capacity will be reviewed by the SEA.

**Consultation with Relevant Stakeholders**  
(Required – No points awarded)

1. Before submitting this application for a School Improvement Grant the \_\_\_\_\_ has consulted with relevant stakeholders, including:

---

---

---

---

**Appendices**  
(Optional- No points awarded)

### **Eligibility Checklist**

Use this list to assist you in determining if you have included all necessary components of the grant application and if you have them in the order requested. This checklist does not replace the responsibility of the applicant to meet all stated requirements for application. This list will be used by Department staff to check for application eligibility.

	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
The cover page is the first page evident on the document and includes all required information.		
The signature on at least one of the copies submitted is original, not electronically or otherwise mechanically produced.		
One original and two copies are submitted.		
The application, in hard copy form, is submitted by March 30, 2011, 4:30 p.m., to Paul Cahill, Iowa Department of Education.		
An abstract is included and does not exceed two (2) pages, printed on one (1) side only.		
All components of the application are included and are in the following order: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cover Sheet</li> <li>2. Abstract</li> <li>3. Part 1               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs Assessment and Analysis</li> <li>• Capacity</li> <li>• Design and implement Intervention Model</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		

4. Part 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruit, screen, and select external providers</li> <li>• Alignment of Resources with the Interventions</li> <li>• Policy and Practice Modifications</li> <li>• Budget and Budget Narratives</li> </ul> 5. Implementation timeline 6. Annual goals for student achievement 7. Waiver request(s) 8. Consultation with relevant stakeholders 9. Appendices		
Each page, beginning with the first page <u>after</u> the Cover Sheet is <b>numbered</b> , not including Appendices.		
The application in any font size is <u>not smaller than 12-point</u> . <b>Exception:</b> tables, charts, and the Cover Sheet may be in a smaller size, but must be clear and easy to read.		
All narrative is double-spaced. Exception: the abstract, charts, and tables do not have to be double-spaced.		

**Intervention Models Chart:** The chart below will assist the LEA in assuring that the required activities for each model are addressed as well as allowing the LEA to identify the permissible activities they wish to implement.

### THE FOUR INTERVENTION MODELS

REQUIRED LEA Activities	TURN- AROUND	TRANS- FORMATION	RESTART	CLOSURE
Replace Principal (except those hired previously as part of turn-around or transformation effort)	✓	✓		
Operational flexibility (calendar, time, budget, staffing)	✓	✓		
Replace >50% of Staff using "locally adopted competencies"	✓			
Close & reopen under Charter School Operator/CMO/EMO			✓	
Close the school and send students to nearby schools - including but not limited to charter schools or new schools				✓
Rigorous, transparent and equitable teacher and leader evaluation systems using student growth in significant part AND other measures AND designed with teacher/leader input	permissible	✓		
Identify/reward effective personnel & remove ineffective personnel	permissible	✓		

High-quality, ongoing, job-embedded, instructionally aligned professional development	✓	✓		
Financial incentives, career opportunities and flexible work conditions	✓	✓		
New governance structure	✓	permissible		
Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned	✓	✓		
Promote the use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students	✓	✓		
Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time	✓	✓		
Socio-emotional and community supports	✓			
Ongoing family and community engagement	permissible	✓		
Ongoing intensive technical assistance from LEA, SEA or external partner	permissible	✓		

✓ Required

**THE FOUR INTERVENTION MODELS**

<b>PERMISSIBLE Activities*</b>	<b>TURN-AROUND</b>	<b>TRANS-FORMATION</b>
New school model (e.g. themed, dual language)		
Additional compensation to attract and retain staff		
System to measure impact of professional development		
Ensure that school is not required to accept teacher without mutual consent of teacher and principal regardless of teacher seniority		
Periodic reviews of curriculum		
Response to Intervention model		
Additional supports to address students with disabilities and English language learners		
Using and integrating educational technology		

Increasing opportunities for advanced coursework, AP, IB, STEM, early college, dual enrollment, thematic learning academies		
Summer transition or freshman academies (middle to high school)		
Graduation rate improvement reforms		
Early warning systems for at-risk youth		
Partner with organizations, clinics, agencies, etc to meet students' social, emotional, health needs		
Extend or restructure school day		
Implement approaches to improve school climate and discipline		
Full-day kindergarten or pre-K		
Per-pupil school-based budget formula weighted by student needs		

District	School	District Name	School Name	count	Tier
1737	0194	Des Moines Independent CSD	Scavo Alternative High School	21	Tier II
1218	0172	Clay Central-Everly Comm School District	Clay Central-Everly High School	28	Tier II
1359	0172	Colo-Nesco Comm School District	Colo-Nesco Senior High School	28	Tier II
2016	0109	Elk Horn-Kimballton Comm School District	Elk Horn-Kimballton High School	19	Tier II
3348	0109	Kingsley-Pierson Comm School District	Kingsley-Pierson High School	28	Tier II
3978	0172	Malvern Comm School District	East Mills High School	28	Tier II
4437	0109	Montezuma Comm School District	Montezuma High School	24	Tier II
5283	0109	Pocahontas Area Comm School District	Pocahontas Area High School	29	Tier II
5823	0109	Schaller-Crestland Comm School District	Schaller-Crestland High School	25	Tier II
6921	0109	West Bend-Mallard Comm School District	West Bend-Mallard High School	25	Tier II

LEA NAME	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	New for 2011-2012
Belmond-Klemme Comm School District	Belmond-Klemme ES (Jacobson)	190468002090			x		
Bondurant-Farrar Comm School District	Anderson ES	190507000153			x		
Boone Comm School District	Franklin ES	190513000159			x		
Burlington Comm School District	Sunnyside ES	190579000194			x		
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Metro HS	190654000259		x			
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Roosevelt MS	190654000258		x			
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Wilson MS	190654000267		x			
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Cleveland ES	190654000234			x		
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Garfield ES	190654000240			x		
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Grant Wood ES	190654000243			x		
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Harrison ES	190654000245			x		
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Hiawatha ES	190654000247			x		
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Hoover ES	190654000248			x		
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Johnson ES	190654000251			x		
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Polk ES	190654000257			x		
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Van Buren ES	190654000266			x		
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	Wilson ES	190654001490			x		
Centerville Comm School District	Lakeview ES 4-5-6	190675000280			x		
Central Decatur Comm School District	North ES	190690000816			x		
Chariton Comm School District	Van Allen ES	190705000317			x		
Clarinda Comm School District	Clarinda MS	190735000341		x			
Clarinda Comm School District	Garfield ES	190735000342			x		
Clarke Comm School District	Clarke Community ES	190741000351			x		
Clinton Comm School District	Bluff ES	190771000597			x		
Clinton Comm School District	Clinton HS	190771000370			x		
Clinton Comm School District	Jefferson ES	190771000378			x		
Clinton Comm School District	Lincoln HS	190771002028		x			
Clinton Comm School District	Lyons MS	190771000382			x		
Clinton Comm School District	Washington MS	190771000383			x		
Colfax-Mingo Comm School District	Colfax-Mingo MS	190000901976		x			x

Columbus Comm School District	Columbus Community MS	190798000398	x		
Columbus Comm School District	Roundy ES	190798000397			x
Council Bluffs Comm School District	Thomas Jefferson HS	190822000435	x		
Council Bluffs Comm School District	Bloomer ES	190822000411			x
Council Bluffs Comm School District	Carter Lake ES	190822000413			x
Council Bluffs Comm School District	Walnut Grove ES	190822000438			x
Council Bluffs Comm School District	Woodrow Wilson JHS	190822000440			x
Davenport Comm School District	Buchanan ES	190858000458			x
Davenport Comm School District	Fillmore ES	190858000463			x
Davenport Comm School District	Frank L Smart Int	190858000464	x		x
Davenport Comm School District	J B Young Int	190858000472			x
Davenport Comm School District	Jackson ES	190858000473			x
Davenport Comm School District	Jefferson ES	190858000474			x
Davenport Comm School District	Lincoln Academy of Fine Arts	190858000476			x
Davenport Comm School District	Madison ES	190858000477			x
Davenport Comm School District	Monroe ES	190858000480			x
Denison Comm School District	Broadway ES	190891002097			x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Callanan MS	190897000519	x		x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	East HS	190897000528	x		
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Hoover HS	190897000543	x		
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Lincoln HS	190897000550	x		
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	McCombs MS	190897000557	x		
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Meredith MS	190897000560	x		
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Brubaker ES	190897000746			x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Capitol View ES	190897000518			x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Carver ES	190897001596			x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Cattell ES	190897000521			x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Findley ES	190897000531	x		x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Garton ES	190897000534			x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Harding MS	190897000540	x		x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Hiatt MS	190897000516			x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Howe ES	190897000544			x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Jackson ES	190897000547			x
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	King ES	190897000556			x

Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Lovejoy ES	190897000552		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Madison ES	190897000554		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	McKinley ES	190897000559		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Monroe ES	190897000563		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Morris ES	190897000583		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Oak Park	190897000567		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Park Ave ES	190897000569		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Perkins ES	190897000570		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	River Woods ES	190897000728		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Moulton ES	190897000565		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	South Union ES	190897001472		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Stowe ES	190897000577		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Willard ES	190897000566		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Wright ES	190897000589		x	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	Windsor ES	190897000587		x	
Dubuque Comm School District	Fulton ES	190948000607		x	
Dubuque Comm School District	George Washington MS	190948000620		x	
Dubuque Comm School District	Lincoln ES	190948000614		x	
Dubuque Comm School District	Marshall ES	190948000615		x	x
Dubuque Comm School District	Prescott ES	190948001456	x		
Dubuque Comm School District	Thomas Jefferson MS	190948000612		x	
East Greene Comm School District	Rippey ES	191020000652		x	x
Essex Comm School District	Essex Junior-Senior HS	191104000683		x	
Fairfield Comm School District	Fairfield MS	191134000694		x	
Fort Dodge Comm School District	Duncombe ES	191182000722		x	
Fremont-Mills Comm School District	Fremont-Mills ES	191212000747		x	
Grinnell-Newburg Comm School District	Davis ES	191320000790		x	
Hampton-Dumont Comm School District	Hampton-Dumont MS	191347000814		x	
Hampton-Dumont Comm School District	South Side ES	191347000819		x	x
Harmony Comm School District	Harmony Junior-Senior HS	191353000828		x	
Independence Comm School District	West ES	191458000869		x	
Iowa City Comm School District	Grant Wood ES	191470000886		x	
Iowa City Comm School District	Hills ES	191470000890		x	
Iowa City Comm School District	Kirkwood ES	191470000893		x	

Iowa City Comm School District	Mark Twain ES	191470000896		x	
Iowa City Comm School District	Robert Lucas ES	191470000899		x	
Iowa City Comm School District	Roosevelt ES	191470000900		x	x
Keokuk Comm School District	Keokuk HS	191563000932	x		x
Keokuk Comm School District	Keokuk MS	191563000933	x		x
Laurens-Marathon Comm School District	Laurens-Marathon MS	191642000979	x		
Laurens-Marathon Comm School District	Laurens-Marathon ES	191642000977		x	
Lewis Central Comm School District	Lewis Central MS	191668000997	x		
Lewis Central Comm School District	Titan Hill Int	191668000994		x	
Maquoketa Comm School District	Briggs ES	191851001060		x	
Marion Independent School District	Francis Marion Int	191869000437		x	x
Marshalltown Comm School District	Marshalltown HS	191872001091	x		
Marshalltown Comm School District	Anson ES	191872001082		x	
Marshalltown Comm School District	Fisher ES	191872001086		x	
Marshalltown Comm School District	Franklin ES	191872000372		x	
Marshalltown Comm School District	Rogers ES	191872001093		x	
Mason City Comm School District	Harding ES	191878001102		x	
Mason City Comm School District	Roosevelt ES	191878001109		x	
Mormon Trail Comm School District	Mormon Trail ES	191974001158		x	x
Murray Comm School District	Murray School Murray Junior-Senio	192010001181	x		
Olin Consolidated School District	Olin Junior-Senior HS	192172001297	x		x
Orient-Macksburg Comm School District	Orient-Macksburg Senior HS	192181001299	x		
Ottumwa Comm School District	Douma ES	192211001314		x	
Ottumwa Comm School District	Wilson ES	192211001328		x	
Perry Comm School District	Perry ES	192253000051		x	
Postville Comm School District	Cora B Darling Elementary/Middle	192334001377		x	
Red Oak Comm School District	Washington Int	192400001399		x	
Saydel Comm School District	Norwoodville ES	192532001446		x	
Sergeant Bluff-Luton Comm School District	Sergeant Bluff-Luton ES	192559000726		x	
Shenandoah Comm School District	Shenandoah MS	192607001483		x	
Sioux City Comm School District	West MS	192640001534	x		
Sioux City Comm School District	Bryant ES	192640001498		x	x
Sioux City Comm School District	Everett ES	192640001507	x		
Sioux City Comm School District	Irving ES	192640001514		x	

Sioux City Comm School District	Longfellow ES	192640001518		x	
Sioux City Comm School District	Riverside ES	192640001526		x	
Sioux City Comm School District	Roosevelt ES	192640001527		x	
Sioux City Comm School District	Smith ES	192640001529		x	
Sioux City Comm School District	Whittier ES	192640001535		x	
South Tama County Comm School District	South Tama County MS	192673001557	x		
South Tama County Comm School District	South Tama County ES	192673001463		x	
Southeast Webster Grand Comm School District	Southeast Webster JHS	199901902076		x	
Spencer Comm School District	Fairview Park ES	192691001577		x	
Spencer Comm School District	Lincoln ES	192691001580		x	x
Storm Lake Comm School District	Storm Lake HS	192739001601	x		
Storm Lake Comm School District	Storm Lake MS	192739001600		x	
Twin Cedars Comm School District	Twin Cedars ES	192817001641		x	
Vinton-Shellsburg Comm School District	Shellsburg ES	192931001476		x	
Washington Comm School District	Lincoln Upper ES	193024001702		x	
Washington Comm School District	Stewart ES	193024001703		x	
Waterloo Comm School District	Bunger MS	193048000586		x	
Waterloo Comm School District	Central MS	193048002024		x	
Waterloo Comm School District	East HS	193048001714		x	x
Waterloo Comm School District	Cunningham School	193048001719	x		
Waterloo Comm School District	Edison ES	193048001715		x	
Waterloo Comm School District	Highland ES (Mckinstry)	193048001970		x	x
Waterloo Comm School District	Irving ES	193048001724	x		x
Waterloo Comm School District	Kittrell ES	193048001728		x	
Waterloo Comm School District	Lowell ES	193048001731		x	
Waterloo Comm School District	Poyner ES	193048001546		x	
West Delaware County Comm School District	Lambert ES	193090001782		x	
West Des Moines Comm School District	Crestview ES	193093001790		x	
West Des Moines Comm School District	Hillside ES	193093001188		x	
West Harrison Comm School District	West Harrison ES	193096000331		x	
West Marshall Comm School District	West Marshall MS	193108001813		x	
Westwood Comm School District	Westwood ES	193147001835		x	
Winterset Comm School District	Winterset ES	193186001856		x	

**135 Tier I + 6 Tier I = 141**

**Total number of schools in the Tier 1 pool: 141**

**7 / 141 = 4.96%**

**7 schools for 2011-2012 and 6 schools previously identified and served in 2010-2011 = 13 total Title I**

**No schools were identified due to having a graduation rate below 60%**

## TIER I SCHOOLS

LEA	LEA NCES	SCHOOL	SCHOOL	TIER I SCHOOL YR 09-10	ADDITIONAL TIER I SCHOOL YR 10-11
Davenport Comm School District	1908580	Frank L Smart Int	190858000464		IDENTIFIED
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	1908970	Findley ES	190897000531		IDENTIFIED
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	1908970	Harding MS	190897000540		IDENTIFIED
Dubuque Comm School District	1909480	Prescott ES	190948001456		IDENTIFIED
Sioux City Comm School District	1926400	Everett ES	192640001507		IDENTIFIED
Waterloo Comm School District	1930480	Cunningham School	193048001719		IDENTIFIED
Waterloo Comm School District	1930480	Irving ES	193048001724		IDENTIFIED
Waterloo Comm School District	1930480	Lincoln ES	193048001729	Received SIG	
Waterloo Comm School District	1930480	George Washington Carver Academy (Jack M Logan MS)	193048001725	Received SIG	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	1908970	North High School	190897000566	Received SIG	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	1908970	Edmunds Fine Arts Academy	190897000529	Received SIG	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	1908970	Weeks Middle School	190897000584	Received SIG	
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	1908970	Hoyt Middle School	190897000545	Received SIG	