APPLICATION COVER SHEET

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 1201 North Third Street Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Rayne Martin Position and Office: Chief, Office of Innovation Contact's Mailing Address: 1201 North Third Street Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802 Telephone: (225) 342-3534 Fax: (225) 342-1055 Email address: Rayne.Martin@LA.GOV	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Paul G. Pastorek	Telephone: (225) 342-3607
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date: December 3, 2010
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.	

School Improvement Grants Application

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

Fiscal Year 2010

CFDA Number: 84.377A

State Name: Louisiana

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

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

Paperwork Burden Statement

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Purpose of the Program

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

Availability of Funds

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

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

State and LEA Allocations

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

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

Consultation with the Committee of Practitioners

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

FY 2010 Submission Information

Electronic Submission:

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

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

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

Paper Submission:

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

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

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

Application Deadline

Applications are due on or before December 3, 2010.

For Further Information

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

FY 2010 Application Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Louisiana Department of Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: 1201 North Third Street Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Rayne Martin Position and Office: Chief, Office of Innovation Contact's Mailing Address: 1201 North Third Street Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802 Telephone: (225) 342-3534 Fax: (225) 342-1055 Email address: Rayne.Martin@LA.GOV	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Paul G. Pastorek	Telephone: (225) 342-3607
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date: April 8, 2011
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.

SECTION A: ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS	☐ 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: ☐ 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) ☐ 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 ☐ SEA elects to generate new lists	***For an SEA revising its definition of PLA schools, please select the following option:*** ☒ SEA must generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools because it has revised its definition
	☒ Lists, by LEA, of State's Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools provided	
SECTION B: EVALUATION CRITERIA	☐ Same as FY 2009	☒ Revised for FY 2010
SECTION B-1: ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	☒ Section B-1: Additional evaluation criteria provided	
SECTION C: CAPACITY	☐ Same as FY 2009	☒ Revised for FY 2010
SECTION D (PART 1): TIMELINE	☒ Updated Section D (Part 1): Timeline provided	
SECTION D (PARTS 2-8): DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	☐ Same as FY 2009	☒ Revised for FY 2010
SECTION E: ASSURANCES	☒ Updated Section E: Assurances provided	
SECTION F: SEA RESERVATION	☒ Updated Section F: SEA reservations provided	
SECTION G: CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS	☒ Updated Section G: Consultation with stakeholders provided	
SECTION H: WAIVERS	☒ 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:

Louisiana's definition of "Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools"

In defining the state's "Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools," Louisiana uses the following definitions:

1. A school that is academically unacceptable is identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. The average of two consecutive years (2009 and 2010) of combined ELA and math results on the state exam, as calculated in the state's Academic Index, define the proficiency level of each school based on the "all students" group.

3. A school's lack of progress is determined by the "all students" group wherein the group does not improve its Academic Index or graduation rate by at least 0.1 percentage points over two consecutive years (2009 to 2010).
4. Schools that have a minimum poverty rate of 35% are Title I eligible.
5. Secondary schools are defined as any school whose configuration includes the 9-12 grade range.

To define Tier I schools:

Louisiana identifies the lowest-achieving five or five percent (whichever is greater) Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring according to numbers one (1), two (2), three (3), and four (4) above. Then, Louisiana identifies all Title I secondary schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with a graduation rate less than 60% for two years according to numbers one (1), three (3), four (4), and five (5) above. Louisiana did not include any additional criteria to add Tier I schools to the list other than graduation rate data. Louisiana also did not use weighting methods to identify its Tier I schools.

Detailed steps taken to identify Tier I schools:

Step 1
Identify all public schools in Louisiana that are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status AND that have at least 35% of students eligible for free-and-reduced-price lunch: Total of 288 schools.

Step 2
Remove Title I eligible-but-not receiving schools: 1 school.

Step 3
Of the remaining 287 schools on the list, remove all schools that were designated Tier I in the FY09 SIG competition and won SIG funding: 1 school (Sarah Towles Reed Senior High School).

Step 4
Keep on the list all FY09 Tier III SIG-recipient schools that remain Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Step 5
Remove all alternative schools: 49 schools.

Step 6
Of the remaining 237 schools, average their 2009 and 2010 academic index figures. [Combine each school's reading and math assessment score for the "all students" subgroup for '09 and '10 and divide by 2.]

Step 7
Rank the 237 schools from lowest to highest based on their average academic indices.

Step 8
Identify the bottom 5%: 12 schools that have the lowest average academic indices AND did not improve

their academic indices by at least 0.1% from 2009 to 2010.

TOTAL: 12 Tier I Schools

To define Tier II schools:

Louisiana identifies the lowest-achieving five or five percent (whichever is greater) Title I eligible secondary schools not receiving Title I funds according to numbers one (1), two (2), three(3), four (4), and five (5) listed above. Then, Louisiana identifies all Title I eligible secondary schools not receiving funds with a graduation rate less than 60% for two years according to numbers one (1), three (3), four (4), and five (5) listed above. Louisiana did not include any additional criteria to add Tier II schools to the list other than graduation rate data. Louisiana also did not use weighting methods to identify its Tier II schools.

Detailed steps taken to identify Tier II schools:

Step 1
Identify all public schools in Louisiana that are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status AND that have at least 35% of students eligible for free-and-reduced-price lunch: Total of 288 schools.

Step 2
Identify Title I eligible-but-not receiving schools: Only 1 school - Calcasieu Parish Alternative School

Step 3
Remove all alternative schools: 1 school – Calcasieu Parish Alternative School

Step 4
After removing the only school on the list, there are zero Tier II schools.

TOTAL: 0 Tier II schools

R.S. 17:10.5 (Act 9 of 2003) allows the takeover of schools where an elementary or secondary school operating under the jurisdiction and direction of any city, parish, or other local public school board or any other public entity which is academically unacceptable under a uniform statewide program of school accountability established pursuant to rules adopted by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education under authority of law, shall be designated a failed school.

Currently, Louisiana's alternative schools that are identified as in need of improvement have the option of requesting a one-year transition waiver. These alternative schools have been excluded from the persistently lowest achieving list. However, these alternative schools are limited to accepting only over-aged and under-credited students. The students are not in these schools for a full academic year.

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

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

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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

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

EXAMPLE:

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

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

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

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

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

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

☐ **SEA is using the same evaluation criteria as FY 2009.**	☒ **SEA has revised its evaluation criteria for FY 2010.**

Insert response to Section B Evaluation Criteria here:

Section B, Part 1

Important notes about Louisiana's SIG application and grant-making strategy:

SIG-eligible schools

The Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) has identified 12 Tier I schools, zero Tier II schools, and 225 Tier III schools that are eligible to receive SIG funding in the FY2010 competition.

Louisiana's Tier III strategy

As approved by USDOE for the FY2009 SIG competition, LDE intends to require any Tier III SIG recipient to implement one of the four intervention models (turnaround, restart, transformation, and closure). LDE has over 200 Tier III schools, all of which are high-need, chronically low-performing schools. In order to maximize the impact of the state's approximately $45 million in SIG funding (FY09 carryover funds plus projected FY10 allocation), LDE feels strongly that an LEA should only receive SIG dollars for a Tier III school if that school demonstrates the capacity, commitment, and sustainability to implement one of these four models.

While an LEA may apply for a grant for a Tier III school, the LEA is not required to apply for any of its Tier III schools. The LEA may, at its discretion, apply for one or more Tier III schools. If an LEA has both Tier I and Tier III schools, the LEA must apply for all of its Tier I schools if it intends to apply for any of its Tier III schools.

Additionally, LEAs applying to serve a Tier III school must establish annual performance goals for student achievement on Louisiana state assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics. The LEA must also set annual goals for the Tier III school on the same nine (9) leading indicators as it would for a Tier I or Tier II school. LDE's LEA application materials address these performance goal requirements under the "Annual Performance Goals" section of the Turnaround, Transformation, and Restart applications. Also see pg. 24 of this state application.

Louisiana's grant-making process

LDE sets a high performance bar for SIG applicants and will only fund applications that propose bold, innovative intervention strategies and demonstrate significant capacity, commitment, and sustainability. To determine the FY10 SIG awardees, LDE will first score and rank its Tier I applications and prioritize funding to the Tier I schools that meet LDE's high standards. If an application for a Tier I school does not meet the minimum performance bar, the applicant will not receive funding for that Tier I school; however, Louisiana will provide intensive support and feedback to applicants prior to the official application deadline in order to help eligible LEAs

produce bold, actionable, and strategic intervention plans. After ranking the Tier I applications, LDE will then score and rank its Tier III schools. Of all of the applications that meet Louisiana's high performance bar, funding priority will be given to the Tier I applications; if funding remains after grant sizes have been determined for the successful Tier I applications, only then will LDE determine grant allocations for the successful Tier III applications.

Other

Please note that LDE did not receive any comments on its public announcement regarding its waiver requests (see pgs. 30 – 31 of this application: school improvement timeline waiver, schoolwide program waiver, and period of availability waiver), which was submitted via email and posted on the LDE website.

The SEA must describe the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to 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.

Conducting a thorough needs assessment is critical for assessing the school's "point of departure," or current performance level. Each LEA is required to conduct a needs assessment of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve and then use each school's unique needs assessment to identify an appropriate intervention model. This needs assessment may be the LANA, Scholastic Audit, Quality Review, SACS, Breaking Ranks II, High Schools That Work, or another similarly accredited needs assessment.

In Louisiana's SIG sub-grant application, the LEA is required to provide a thorough description of the school's needs assessment and link the results to the intervention model selected, and full assessment results must be attached to the application. Additionally, the LEA is asked to describe the areas of student performance most in need of improvement at the school and then diagnose the causes of the school's chronic low-performance and barriers to improvement, including causes and barriers directly linked to the LEA and the school themselves.

Using the needs assessment analysis and the school's historical performance data, the LEA must set ambitious but achievable performance goals for the school on the state's reading and mathematics assessments (and state science and history or social studies assessments, when applicable), on USDOE's nine leading indicators, and on Louisiana's Nine Priority Goals. In the sub-grant application, a school's projected performance at the end of the grant period is called its "point of arrival."

After providing a thorough assessment of the school's "point of departure" and "point of arrival," the LEA then must describe in its application the intervention model selected for the school and explain both how the intervention will address the root causes of the school's low performance and why this intervention will be successful in comparison with other school

improvement efforts that have failed in the past.

(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.

Each LEA applicant will submit to the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) one LEA-level application and a school-level application for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve. The purpose of the LEA-level application is to give applicants the opportunity to articulate LEA-wide strategies for dramatic school reform. In the scoring rubric, priority is given to LEAs that already have in place successful capacity-building initiatives in comparison with LEAs that have not begun implementing their capacity-building plans.

In order to demonstrate its capacity to implement the intervention model selected for each Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III school identified in its application, the LEA must first describe any LEA-wide improvement programs in which it participates. An LEA will receive additional points on its application if it voluntarily participates in state-sponsored improvement programs that would directly support the LEA's Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools. State-sponsored programs include LDE's Trailblazers Initiative, which is a partnership between participating LEAs and the Department that provides each LEA a combination of human capital management support, school turnaround training, and instruction improvement support. Other state-sponsored improvement programs include TAP™: The System for Teacher and Student Advancement, Louisiana School Turnaround Specialist (LSTS) Program, Louisiana State Staffing Initiative, and the High-Performing High-Poverty (HPHP) Initiative.

Each LEA applicant will also be assessed on its central office capacity to support the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve. In the sub-grant application, the LEA is asked to describe its existing or future governance structure for providing direct and efficient support to the SIG-receiving schools (e.g., has the LEA created, or will it create, a "Turnaround Office" to provide supports and services directly to the SIG-receiving schools?). The LEA must also describe the credentials, roles, and responsibilities of any existing or new LEA central office personnel who are - or will be - dedicated to serving the SIG schools.

In addition to its central office capacity, the LEA is asked to identify in the sub-grant application its existing efforts and/or future plans to attract and/or develop talented human capital to serve in its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools. LDE places particular emphasis on each LEA's strategy for replacing principals in any schools adopting the turnaround and transformation models and for replacing school staff in any turnaround schools.

If an LEA submits applications for four or more schools that meet LDE's standards for quality, LDE will conduct an additional review to determine whether the LEA has the capacity to carry out the planned interventions not just in each school, but in all of the designated schools as a group. This additional review will focus on central office capacity, human capital development strategies and budgeting, emphasizing four questions: 1) Has the LEA established an

organizational or governance structure capable of overseeing multiple intervention efforts? 2) Has the LEA staffed (or does it have plans to staff) the organizational unit responsible for turnarounds with a team that has the knowledge and capabilities needed to execute the plan? For evidence on these two questions, LDE will examine the LEA's explanation of its organizational and governance structure in its LEA-level application. 3) Do the LEA's human capital plans have the capacity to generate enough leaders and teachers for all the schools, not just individual schools? For evidence, LDE will examine the LEA's responses to the human capital questions in the LEA-level application. 4) Has the LEA budgeted sufficient resources to carry out LEA-level activities demanded by its plans? For evidence on that question, LDE will examine the LEA's responses in the Budget section of both the LEA-level and school-level applications. If an application does not contain sufficient information to answer these questions, LDE may seek additional information from the LEA. If the LDE determines that the LEA lacks the capacity to carry out interventions in all of the schools as a group, it may grant funding to the LEA for a subset of qualifying schools and invite the LEA to resubmit the additional schools' applications in subsequent funding competitions.

Important note: While an LEA may apply for a grant for a Tier III school, the LEA is not required to apply for any of its Tier III schools. The LEA may, at its discretion, apply for one or more Tier III schools. However, if an LEA has Tier III schools and Tier I or Tier II schools, the LEA must apply for all of its Tier I and Tier II schools if it intends to apply for any of its Tier III 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).

In the sub-grant application, the LEA will be scored on specific actions it proposes to take or has already taken to align other resources with the proposed interventions (e.g., Title I or other state and federal grant funding) as well as its plan for sustaining the reforms beyond the three-year SIG funding period, provided that Louisiana receives a waiver from USDOE to extend the grant period. The LEA must submit a comprehensive LEA-level budget that includes line items for salaries, employee benefits, contracted professional and technological services, other purchased services, supplies, property costs, and any other costs directly associated with implementing the schools' intervention models. The LEA must submit a budget for each of three years, with the first year of the grant period covering any pre-implementation costs, and the LEA has the option of providing an additional two-year budget indicating how it will sustain the reforms after the grant period ends.

In addition to the LEA-level budget, the applicant must also submit individual school budgets for each school it commits to serve. The school-level budget addresses the same budget categories and also gives the applicant the opportunity to include a two-year sustainability budget post the three-year grant period. The LEA also must provide a thorough narrative for each

school-level budget citing all critical expenditures needed to carry out human capital strategies, instructional program plans, governance changes, extended learning time and additional student support efforts, and accountability system development plans.

Section B, Part 2

The LEA may have taken the following actions prior to submitting its application but most likely will take them after receiving SIG funds. The 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.

In each sub-grant application, the LEA has to submit an "implementation plan" for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve. This implementation plan must address specific actions the LEA will take to implement each and every requirement of the selected intervention model. If any intervention requirements are not addressed in the implementation plan, the applicant will not be eligible to receive SIG funding. The language in the sub-grant application and the accompanying scoring rubric make it clear that the LEA may not pick and choose which intervention model requirements to implement: The intervention models **must** be implemented in full.

The sub-grant application rubric awards more points to implementation plans that anticipate making significant progress on the intervention requirements by the beginning of the 2011-12 school year. (Note: It is expected that schools implementing the closure model will spend no more than 1 year on all school closure activities.) Each school that wins SIG funding will be monitored quarterly on its progress against its implementation plan and timeline.

Supplementing the implementation plan is a series of questions that addresses the applicant's broader strategies for acting upon its intervention plan. For example, an LEA that selects the transformation model for one of its eligible schools must articulate its human capital development strategy for that particular school, how it will leverage external providers to build capacity, and how it will inform community stakeholders about critical changes taking place at the school.

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

No matter what intervention model is selected, each LEA must describe in its application if and how it will leverage external providers to manage the school's intervention effort. If an LEA contracts with an external provider to manage a school's turnaround, transformation, or closure, the LEA must describe its process for recruiting, selecting, and evaluating external partners. If the provider has already been selected, the LEA must describe the provider's roles and responsibilities at the school as well as its performance to date. Finally, the LEA must describe how the external provider is being held or will be held accountable for producing significant growth in student achievement at the SIG.

For schools adopting the restart model, the LEA is required to select a charter school operator, a Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Education Management Organization (EMO) and answer the same external provider questions required of the schools adopting the turnaround, transformation, or closure model. Additionally, the applicant must describe the termination conditions of the contract between the operator and the LEA. The LEA must also describe the "rigorous review process" it used or will use for selecting a CMO or EMO, and this process must include the following elements:

- Recruiting several potential operators
- Assessing applicants' reform plans and strategies and their alignment with the restart school's needs assessment
- Assessing applicants' history with low-performing schools
- Assessing applicants' capacity to implement the restart intervention
- Assessing applicants' human capital strategies

(3) Align other resources with the intervention.

In the sub-grant application, the LEA is asked to describe specific actions it will or has already taken to align other resources with the proposed interventions (e.g., Title I, other state or federal grant funding) as well as its plan for sustaining the reforms after the period of SIG funding ends. The applicant must provide LEA-level and school-level budgets for three consecutive years (with pre-implementation activities taking place in year 1) and has the option of providing an additional 2-year budget indicating sustainability funds.

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

Field research on school turnaround shows that building capacity at the school level requires changing operating conditions around 4 critical areas: People, time, money, and program. In the sub-grant application, the LEA is asked to describe the steps it has taken or will take to give the SIG school principals more operational autonomy over staff hiring/removals, budgeting, calendars and extended learning time, and school programs. The scoring rubric awards more points to LEAs that submit evidence to LDE that they have already changed policies and practices giving eligible schools more operational autonomies. Examples of evidence that an LEA may submit include, but are not limited to, new or amended teacher agreements and/or new or amended principal contracts.

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

The applicant must provide LEA-level and school-level budgets for three consecutive years and has the option of providing an additional 2-year budget indicating sustainability funds. In the sub-grant application, the LEA must describe its plan for sustaining the reforms after the period of SIG funding ends. In addition to describing local, state, and federal funding sources that will help sustain reform efforts, the LEA's proposed human capital building strategy is considered an integral aspect of sustainability. LEAs that participate in state-sponsored human capital

development programs, such as the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), receive additional points on their applicants based on capacity and sustainability criteria.

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[2] to help an LEA prepare for full implementation in the following school year?

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

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

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

B-1, pre-implementation activities

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

In its budget narrative, the LEA must identify pre-implementation activities it will carry out from the time it receives its grant funds to the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year. The budget template in the LEA sub-grant application allows the applicant to identify pre-implementation costs associated with employee benefits, contracted professional and technological services, other purchased services, supplies, property costs, and any other costs directly associated with preparing to implement the schools' intervention models.

An applicant's proposed pre-implementation expenses must be reasonable and necessary to carry out the activities described in the applicant's budget narrative. The bulk of an applicant's SIG program budget must be devoted to implementing the intervention model by the beginning of the 2011-12 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?*

Any proposed pre-implementation activities that do not directly address a school's

intervention model requirements and implementation plan will not be approved by LDE. Additionally, SIG funds may not be used to buy out principal or teacher contracts or to continue funding teachers who have been removed from the classroom. The applicant also may not use SIG funds to pay for activities that took place before the applicant received its grant funds; this includes the costs of any school needs assessments used to select appropriate intervention models.

An applicant's proposed pre-implementation activities may include:

- Family and community engagement to educate stakeholders about changes taking place at the SIG-receiving schools and to cultivate their ongoing support and involvement at the schools.
- Conducting a rigorous recruitment and evaluation process for external providers, especially those taking on school operating responsibilities.
- Recruiting, placing and training new school leaders and staff.
- Evaluating currently school staff based on locally adopted competencies.
- Designing and building new teacher and leader evaluation systems that incorporate student growth data.
- Evaluating and improving school instructional programs, with significant input from the school's incoming principal.
- Providing job-embedded professional development for staff and school leaders that will adequately prepare them to begin school intervention activities in the 2011-2012 school year.
- Developing an LEA data management and accountability system that will allow the LEA to consistently monitor school performance and provide ongoing feedback to schools that allow them to make informed mid-course corrections.

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:

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. The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

The LDE has designed a comprehensive rubric for the LEA-level application and for each school-level intervention model application to ensure that we are able to address capacity and adherence to the USDOE regulations governing each intervention. All Tier I, II, and III schools will be judged according to the rubric, as LEAs will submit separate applications for each school. LEA capacity will be evaluated through the quality with which it addresses each component of the LEA application and each of its school applications. If an LEA scores below LDE's acceptable level on the rubric, it will be clear that the LEA does not demonstrate capacity to implement the intervention model. If an LEA scores above LDE's acceptable level on the rubric, yet has been judged to not meet the minimum final requirements as outlined by USDOE, that LEA must submit an amendment to its plan that describes how it will meet that final requirement in order to receive funding.

If an LEA submits applications for four or more schools that meet LDE's standards for quality, LDE will conduct an additional review to determine whether the LEA has the capacity to carry out the planned interventions not just in each school, but in all of the designated schools as a group. This additional review will seek to answer four primary questions: First, has the LEA established an organizational or governance structure capable of overseeing multiple

intervention efforts? Second, has the LEA staffed (or does it have plans to staff) the organizational unit responsible for turnarounds with a team that has the knowledge and capabilities needed to execute the plan? For evidence on those two questions, LDE will examine the LEA's explanation of its organizational and governance structure in its LEA-level application. Third, do the LEA's human capital plans have the capacity to generate enough leaders and teachers for all the schools, not just individual schools? For evidence, LDE will examine the LEA's responses to the human capital questions in the LEA-level application. Fourth, has the LEA budgeted sufficient resources to carry out LEA-level activities demanded by its plans? For evidence on that question, LDE will examine the LEA's responses in the Budget section of both the LEA-level and school-level applications. If an application does not contain sufficient information to answer these questions, LDE may seek additional information from the LEA. If the LDE determines that the LEA lacks the capacity to carry out interventions in all of the schools as a group, it may grant funding to the LEA for a subset of qualifying schools and invite the LEA to resubmit the additional schools' applications in subsequent funding competitions.

It is also important to note that the SEA does not plan to take over any Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools that win SIG funding through the FY10 competition. The SEA also will not provide any direct services to schools not already under SEA-control (direct-run schools in the Recovery School District). There are eligible schools that are currently under SEA-control through the Recovery School District (RSD). The RSD will make a decision about whether to submit an LEA application and implement an intervention model in those schools.

In its application, the LEA is required to explain why it lacks capacity to serve any eligible Tier I, Tier II or Tier III schools in its jurisdiction. It is the LDE's view that an LEA claiming to not have capacity for one or more eligible schools should not be awarded funds for those schools, despite any ability on the LDE's behalf to prove otherwise. If an LEA claims to be without capacity to serve a particular school, the LDE has no confidence that any intervention plan for that school would be implemented with fidelity. For example, if an LEA applies for all of its two Tier I schools and none of its three Tier III schools, and the LDE can prove that the LEA does have the capacity to serve one or more Tier III schools, the LEA could receive SIG funding for its two Tier I schools but would not receive SIG funding for its Tier III schools.

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:

Louisiana Department of Education: FY 2010 SIG Application Approval Timeline

Dates	Activities
11/18/10; 12/1/10; 12/8/10; and 1/11/11	Webinars hosted by Louisiana's School Turnaround Office (STO) for all LEA applicants to learn about the SIG competition, the four intervention models, and the SIG sub-grant application
1/19/11; 1/25/11; and 1/26/11	In-person technical assistance meetings for LEAs to learn about successful school intervention strategies
4/11/11	STO releases USDOE-approved application to LEAs
1/31/11 – 4/11/11	STO provides ongoing, intensive technical assistance to LEA applicants
3/2/11 – 4/1/11	STO trains team of external reviewers hired to read and score all SIG applications
4/22/11	Final day to submit LEA applications to STO
4/25/11 – 5/6/11	External reviewers read, score and rank all applications submitted
5/9/11 – 5/11/11	STO analyzes reviewers' comments/scores and identifies list of finalists to escalate to LDE leadership team
5/11/11 – 5/13/11	LDE leadership team reviews finalists and selects Round 2 winners to escalate to the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE)
5/18/11	BESE approves Round 2 winners
5/19/11 – 5/20/11	STO contacts Round 2 winners and non-winners
5/23/11	STO publicly announces Round 2 winners via website, e-blast, press release, and major state newspapers

5/23/11 – 5/31/11	STO awards grant funding for “pre-implementation activities” to Round 2 LEA winners
8/31/11	STO awards grant funding to Round 2 LEA winners for Year 1 of grant period

D (PARTS 2-8). DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

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

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

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

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

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

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

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.[3]

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

☐ **SEA is using the same descriptive information as FY 2009.**	☒ **SEA has revised its descriptive information for FY 2010.**

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

(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.

Given the large numbers of persistently lowest achieving schools in Louisiana and the relative limits of School Improvement Grants, the LDE will only award funds for those Tier III schools that agree to implement one of the four intervention models required of schools in Tiers I and II. For this reason, the monitoring, review, and renewal process will be the same for all schools, no matter the tier designation. On an annual basis, the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant by looking at each school's progress on USDOE's nine leading indicators, its growth in student achievement on state assessments, and its progress toward reaching Louisiana's Nine Priority Goals. *(See Addendum for LDE's Memorandum of Understanding for LEA SIG recipients.)*

Data for the state assessment goals will be derived from the math and reading scores – as well as available science and history or social studies data – on the LEAP, *i*LEAP, GEE, and End of Course (EOC) tests administered by the Louisiana Department of Education. In the sub-grant application, LEAs are required to describe additional performance goals for each school which may be derived from Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) (including Louisiana Educational Assessment Program Alternative Assessment [LAA]), attendance and/or dropout rates, data on percent proficient, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Pre-K/Kindergarten screening tests, or other standardized assessments and unit assessments.

Performance warnings

If a SIG school shows a downward performance trend or little to no performance progress based on the state's quarterly performance monitoring and monthly field staff site visits, LDE's School Turnaround Office (STO) will issue at least one warning to the LEA and to the SIG school that the school is not making performance gains and is at risk of facing one of two possible consequences: 1) the LEA might have to select a more rigorous intervention model for the school; or 2) the LEA could lose its SIG funding for that particular school. When the performance warning is issued, the STO will tell the LEA to submit a revised SIG plan that will put the school in question on course to meet its annual state assessment goals and make progress on USDOE's 9 leading indicators.

Grant renewal decisions

Towards the end of the first grant year (July 2012) and again towards the end of the second grant year (July 2013), the STO central office staff and field staff will convene to analyze each SIG school's implementation and performance progress over the past year. The team will review each school's progress towards its **implementation timeline** in the approved SIG application, towards its **goals on USDOE's 9 leading indicators** set forth in the approved SIG application, and its **annual State assessment goals** also set forth in the approved SIG application.

LEAs and schools that do not follow their implementation plans, do not make progress towards their state assessment and leading indicator goals, and are unresponsive to state warnings and interventions are at risk of losing their SIG funding for those specific schools. However, if an LEA has been responsive to state support but struggles to improve a SIG school because the intervention model selected is not rigorous enough, the state will consider giving the LEA the option to select a different intervention model for the school and submit a new SIG application for LDE's review (e.g., if the transformation model has not brought about the dramatic changes needed in a particular school, the LEA could chose to restart the school under a CMO or EMO, or select the turnaround model and remove 50% of the staff, or close the school and send the students to higher-performing schools in the LEA). If the LEA refuses to implement a different model, the state may terminate the school's SIG funding.

(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.

See previous question.

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

The Louisiana Department of Education underwent a substantial internal reorganization during the summer of 2010. One of the results of this reorganization effort was the creation of a new "School Turnaround Office (STO)." The STO's mission is twofold: 1) To produce significant gains in student achievement within two years; and 2) To prepare LEAs and impacted schools for the longer process of transforming into high-performance organizations. The STO has the important responsibility of coordinating with other Department offices to measure and report academic progress on Louisiana's lowest-performing schools, to identify and disseminate best practices, and to change the organizational culture of the Department. Primarily, the STO is designed to build state and local capacity to turnaround persistently low-achieving schools in Louisiana to prevent the need for state intervention.

The STO currently manages all monitoring and support of the 32 school SIG recipients and their LEAs from the FY 2009 competition. It is the STO's view that "monitoring" in the traditional sense is not enough. The STO must not only ensure that LEAs receiving School Improvement Grants are meeting targets, but also provide them with the tools and knowledge necessary to do this challenging work well. STO staff both monitor and serve Tier I, II and III schools that receive SIG funds to ensure that each school is meeting annual goals for student achievement, is advancing Louisiana's Nine Priority Goals, and is making progress on USDOE's nine leading indicators.

Each SIG-receiving LEA is required to designate a SIG liaison to serve as the principal contact for the STO and to directly support and serve the LEA's SIG-receiving schools. These LEA liaisons work closely with the STO's field staff team, who are responsible for recommending policies that support district/school innovations and remove barriers to academic progress, facilitating Professional Learning Networks, and reviewing school performance data for the purpose of suggesting district-wide and school-based interventions. Each LEA's assigned STO field staff person conducts regular site visits, once per month at minimum, to provide targeted technical assistance to the LEA and each SIG-receiving school. These site visits are also an opportunity for the field staff to report back to the STO team on the progress being made on the ground and specific barriers that the LEAs and/or schools are facing. In addition to the site visits, student achievement and formal observation data are collected on a quarterly basis and analyzed by the STO and the office's field staff team.

(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.

Louisiana sets a high performance bar for SIG applicants and will only fund applications that propose bold, innovative intervention strategies and demonstrate significant capacity, commitment, and sustainability. To determine the FY10 SIG awardees, Louisiana will first score and rank its Tier I applications and prioritize funding to the Tier I schools that meet Louisiana's high standards. If an application for a Tier I school does not meet the minimum performance bar, the applicant will not receive funding for that Tier I school; however, Louisiana will provide intensive support and feedback to applicants prior to the official application deadline in order to help eligible LEAs produce bold, actionable, and strategic intervention plans. After ranking the Tier I applications, Louisiana will then score and rank its Tier III schools. Of all of the applications that meet Louisiana's high performance bar, funding priority will be given to the Tier I applications; if funding remains after grant sizes have been determined for the successful Tier I applications, only then will Louisiana determine grant allocations for the successful Tier III applications.

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

Because of Louisiana's large number of low-achieving schools, the LDE will only award funds to those Tier III schools that agree to implement one of the four intervention models required of schools in Tiers I and II. After Tier I applications have been ranked and scored and their grant

allocations determined, if funding remains LDE will determine grant awards for the highest-ranked Tier III applications that meet LDE's high performance bar.

(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.

Not applicable.

(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.

Not applicable.

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:

It is anticipated that Louisiana will receive approximately $11 million in FY 2010 SIG funding, and of that total the Louisiana Department of Education will retain 5 percent (approx. $550,000) for State-level activities to support schools and districts in their improvement efforts. The LDE has provided webinars and trainings on both the intervention models and the application process to LEA staff and their stakeholders. The LDE will enter into agreements with staff from institutions of higher learning, retired practitioners, business community members, and other external experts with experience intervening in persistently lowest-achieving schools. Additionally, the state's administrative funds will be used to provide ongoing field staff support to SIG-receiving LEAs in an effort to continually build their capacity to successfully implement these interventions.

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

Waiver 1: Tier II waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

Waiver 2: n-size waiver

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

Assurance

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

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

Waiver 3: New list waiver

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

Assurance

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

WAIVERS OF LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

ASSURANCE OF NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD – APPLIES TO ALL WAIVER REQUESTS
(Must check if requesting one or more waivers)

☒The State assures that, prior to submitting its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on its waiver request(s) and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding the above waiver request(s) to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

(1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—

- The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
- The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

(2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

(3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—

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

(4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application.

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

(6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.

(7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

(8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

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

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

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

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

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

Example:

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

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

The LEA must assure that it will—

(1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;

(2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;

(3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and

(4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

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

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

- ❑ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

- ❑ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

APPENDIX A

SEA ALLOCATIONS TO LEAS AND LEA BUDGETS

Continuing Impact of ARRA School Improvement Grant Funding in FY 2010

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

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

Maximizing the Impact of Regular FY 2010 SIG Allocations

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

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

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

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

Continuation of $2 Million Annual Per School Cap

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

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

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

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

LEA Budgets

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

1. The number of Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve and the intervention model (turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation) selected for each school.

2. The budget request for each Tier I and Tier II school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of three years. First-year budgets may be higher than in subsequent years due to one-time start-up costs.

3. The portion of school closure costs covered with school improvement funds may be significantly lower than the amount required for the other models and would typically cover only one year.

4. The LEA may request funding for LEA-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools.

5. The number of Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve, if any, and the services or benefits the LEA plans to provide to these schools over the three-year grant period.

6. The maximum funding available to the LEA each year is determined by multiplying the total number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA is approved to serve by $2 million (the maximum amount that an SEA may award to an LEA for each participating school).

SEA Allocations to LEAs

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

1. The SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.

2. An SEA may not award funds to any LEA for Tier III schools unless and until the SEA has awarded funds to serve all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.

3. An LEA with one or more Tier I schools may not receive funds to serve only its Tier III schools.

4. In making awards consistent with these requirements, an SEA must take into account LEA capacity to implement the selected school interventions, and also may take into account other factors, such as the number of schools served in each tier and the overall quality of LEA applications.

5. An SEA that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allow each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school to implement fully the selected intervention models may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.

6. Consistent with the final requirements, an SEA may award an LEA less funding than it requests. For example, an SEA that does not have sufficient funds to serve fully all of its Tier I and Tier II schools may approve an LEA's application with respect to only a portion of the LEA's Tier I or Tier II schools to enable the SEA to award school improvement funds to Tier I and Tier II schools across the State. Similarly, an SEA may award an LEA funds sufficient to serve only a portion of the Tier III schools the LEA requests to serve.

7. Note that the requirement in section II.B.9(a) of the SIG requirements, under which an SEA that does not serve all of its Tier I schools must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 SIG allocation to the following year, does not apply to FY 2010 SIG funds.

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

1. Include not less than $50,000 or more than $2 million per year for each participating school (*i.e.*, the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve and that the SEA approves the LEA to serve).

2. Provide sufficient school improvement funds to implement fully and effectively one of the four intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the SEA approves the LEA to serve or close, as well as sufficient funds for serving participating Tier III schools. An

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

3. Consistent with the priority in the final requirements, provide funds for Tier III schools only if the SEA has already awarded funds for all Tier I and Tier II schools across the State that its LEAs commit to serve and that the SEA determines its LEAs have capacity to serve.

4. Include any requested funds for LEA-level activities that support implementation of the school intervention models.

5. Apportion any FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds so as to provide funding to LEAs over three years (assuming the SEA has requested and received a waiver to extend the period of availability to September 30, 2014).

6. Use FY 2010 school improvement funds to make the first year of three-year grant awards to LEAs (unless the SEA has received a waiver of the period of availability for its FY 2010 funds). Continuation awards for years 2 and 3 would come from SIG appropriations in subsequent fiscal years.

APPENDIX B

	Schools an SEA MUST identify in each tier	Newly eligible schools an SEA MAY identify in each tier
Tier I	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(1) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools."[‡]	Title I eligible[§] elementary schools that are no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(1)(i) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" and that are: • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; or • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier II	Schools that meet the criteria in paragraph (a)(2) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools."	Title I eligible secondary schools that are (1) no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school that meets the criteria in paragraph (a)(2)(i) in the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or (2) high schools that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years and that are: • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; or • have not made AYP for two consecutive years.
Tier III	Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not in Tier I.[**]	Title I eligible schools that do not meet the requirements to be in Tier I or Tier II and that are: • in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates; or • have not made AYP for two years.

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

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

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and

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

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

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

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

This section is worth 2 out of 90 total points for the LEA SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 1A. Instructions

Each LEA applicant must complete all tabs on this spreadsheet:

1. General information
2. LEA implementation strategy
3. Assurances statement
4. LEA waivers
5. Total budget request

For each eligible school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA will complete a separate "School Application." **Note: The LEA should submit only ONE "LEA SIG Application" plus a "School SIG Application" for EACH eligible school that the LEA commits to serve.**

It is expected that the LEA will work closely with each eligible school to complete its "School Application."

For application support, see "SIG Application Instructions and Guidance" on the High-Performance Schools Initiative (HPSI) website (http://www.laturnaround.com).

Part 1B. Provide the following information:

Name of LEA	
LEA site code (also called "LEA sponsor code")	
Mailing address	
DUNS Number of LEA (required for receipt of ARRA funds)	
Name of LEA School Board President or Charter Authorizer President	
Phone #	
E-mail address	
Signature	

Name of LEA Superintendent or President	
Phone #	
E-mail address	
Signature	
Name of LEA grant contact person	
Phone #	
E-mail address	
Signature	
Name of LEA fiscal manager	
Phone #	
E-mail address	
Signature	
Number of schools in LEA's application	
Total grant amount requested by the LEA *Indicate the total amount of SIG funding requested. Note: An individual budget will be required for each school site in the "School SIG Application."*	

Part 1C. Provide the following information for each participating school (additional rows may be added):

School name	School site code	NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	INTERVENTION MODEL			
						Turnaround	Restart	Transformation	Closure

Note: An LEA that has 9 or more Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50% of those schools.

<END>

This section is worth 70 out of 90 total points for the LEA SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 2. LEA implementation strategy: Commitment, capacity, and sustainability

Please answer the following questions related to the LEA's ability to fully and effectively implement interventions in the Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve.

1. Commitment

(a) What methods did the LEA use to consult with relevant stakeholders (i.e., school leaders, school staff, teacher union leaders, parents, School Board members) regarding the LEA's SIG application and implementation of intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools (e.g., stakeholder meetings, print/web-based communication, surveys)? Include any links to web-based communications and attach to this application evidence of the LEA's stakeholder outreach efforts.

(b) Please summarize and attach to this application any evidence of support (e.g., letters or emails) for this SIG application and/or the proposed school interventions from community stakeholders, including teachers, teacher union leaders, the local School Board, school staff, and/or parents.

(c) Has the LEA modified, or will the LEA modify, any practices or policies to enable its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools to implement their interventions fully and effectively (i.e., using Louisiana's "Red Tape Waiver" and/or giving school principals autonomy over staff hiring/firing and placement, scheduling, school budgets, and/or school programs)? Attach to this application any evidence of these changes (e.g., a Red Tape Waiver form and or amended principal contracts).

(d) What recent steps has the LEA taken to change teacher contracts/agreements with respect to staff replacements, extended learning time, incentive pay systems, or other issues critical to the successful implementation of one or more intervention models in the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve? Attach evidence of negotiated contracts, Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) or similar official documentation.

(e) Has the LEA taken any steps to streamline reporting requirements and other burdensome, time-consuming policies (e.g., procurement processes) for its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools? Describe which policies have been streamlined and how the changes benefit these schools.

(f) How will the LEA's SIG plans align with or replace current school improvement initiatives in the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that the LEA commits to serve with SIG funds?

2. Capacity

(a) Does the LEA currently participate in - or have one or more eligible schools participating in - any state-sponsored improvement program, such as the Trailblazers Initiative, TAP™: The System for Teacher and Student Advancement, Louisiana School Turnaround Specialist (LSTS) Program, Louisiana State Staffing Initiative, High-Performing High-Poverty (HPHP) Initiative, LDE literacy programs, STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, & Math), CCR (College and Career Readiness)?

If so, how will the LEA leverage these initiatives to support its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools?

(b) In what ways will the LEA Superintendent/CEO ensure that the needs of the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools are the LEA's top priority? Describe how the LEA's process for responding to the SIG schools will differ from the process for responding to all other schools (e.g., will the SIG school principals have direct access to the Superintendent/CEO on a regular basis?).

(c) Describe how the LEA has reorganized - or will reorganize - its central office to dedicate specific staff as the primary point of contact and service coordinator for all Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools (e.g., build an internal "Turnaround Office" or assign case managers to each SIG school). Include descriptions of the credentials, competencies, and responsibilities of any existing or new LEA central office staff who are or will be dedicated to serving the SIG schools.

(d) What is the LEA's strategy for recruiting effective school leaders and teachers from outside the LEA to work in its lowest-performing schools? Describe any partnerships that the LEA has formed in order to build this human capital pipeline.
(e) Will the LEA *incentivize* effective ("effective" is another term for "high-potential") teachers and leaders from higher-performing schools within the LEA to work in one or more Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools? If not, will the LEA *reassign* effective teachers/leaders to the SIG schools? In your answer, describe how the LEA defines "effective teacher" and "effective school leader" and the process for selecting these teachers/leaders. Attach to this application evidence of the LEA's teacher and principal selection criteria (e.g., selection rubrics).
(f) In what ways will the LEA's human resources (HR) and academic departments work together to identify and place effective teachers in the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools? Describe an ongoing process by which the LEA's HR staff can leverage information gathered by the academic department(s) to inform staffing decisions in the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools.

(g) How will the LEA monitor and evaluate the performance of its SIG schools throughout the grant period? Describe how the LEA will use each SIG school's formative and summative performance evaluations to identify the unique resouces (money, human capital, services, programs, etc.) needed in these schools.
(h) Describe the LEA's plan for prioritizing the SIG schools' resource allocations during the first year of the grant period (i.e, 2011 - 2012) in comparison with the second and third years of the grant period (i.e., 2012 - 2014)? In other words, how will the LEA use its SIG funding to make immediate, dramatic reforms in its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools?
(i) If the LEA is not applying to serve all eligible Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, please provide a clear and logical rationale for not serving those schools (include LEA staffing, fiscal, and other resource limitations for schools not served).

3. Sustainability
(a) What specific actions will the LEA take to allocate additional dollars to its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools and align those dollars with the SIG funds requested in this application (e.g., Title I, other state or federal grant funding)? If the LEA has already taken steps to target additional funding at its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools, please describe them. [Note: An LEA may not use its SIG funds to supplant funding or services that its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools would receive in the absence of SIG dollars.]
(b) How will the LEA sustain the reforms in its Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III schools after the funding period ends?
(c) How will the LEA gather and share promising school reform practices from the SIG-receiving schools with other low-performing schools in the LEA?

<END>

This section is worth 3 out of 90 total points for the LEA SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 3. Assurances statement

The School Board President or Charter Authorizer President and LEA Superintendent or President must sign below to indicate their approval of the contents of the LEA's application.

On **<date>**, 2011 the School Board or the Charter Authorizer of **<LEA name>** (“the Board” or "the Authorizer") hereby applies for and, if awarded, accepts the 1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds requested in this application. The Board or the Authorizer certifies that, if awarded, all program and pertinent administrative requirements will be met. In addition, the Superintendent or President of **<LEA name>** agrees to the following assurances*:

- To use its SIG to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with federal SIG requirements;
- To 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 federal SIG requirements in order to monitor each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that it serves with school improvement funds;
- That if the applicant implements a restart model in a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school, it will include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, Charter Management Organization, or Education Management Organization accountable for complying with federal SIG requirements;
- To provide the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) such information as may be required, including school-level data required under section III of the federal SIG requirements, to determine if the grantee is making satisfactory progress toward achieving the goals of the grant;
- To work collaboratively with and support the efforts of other SIG-receiving LEAs to share best practices via activities including, but not limited to, participation in convenings, webinars, technical assistance meetings, and site visits to other SIG-receiving LEAs, coordination of site visits to its own SIG-receiving schools (upon request by the State), and cooperation with monitoring visitations from the State;
- To participate in state-sponsored professional development activities specifically designed to build understanding, selection, and implementation of Turnaround Models and school leader effectiveness;
- To align current and future funding sources in support of improvement goals;
- To identify and reallocate existing district funds for the purpose of sustaining the improvement work after SIG funds expire;
- To provide a district level contact whose primary responsibility is the oversight and coordination of turnaround interventions in the schools;
- To monitor and evaluate the impact of all turnaround interventions;
- To participate in any federal and/or state evaluation of the SIG program;
- To submit a revised SIG budget annually to LDE, as well as an annual financial report;
- To participate fully in on-site visits conducted by LDE to every funded Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school during the grant cycle;
- To not discriminate against anyone regarding race, gender, national origin, color, disability, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, or age; and
- To notify the community of the intent to submit a SIG application and to make public any waiver request after submission of the application.

SIGNED:

_____ _____

LEA School Board President or Charter Authorizer **LEA Superintendent or President**

Note: All assurances in this statement pertaining to Tier III schools are Louisiana-specific requirements. The assurances pertaining to Tier I and Tier II schools are requirements of the U.S. Department of Education.

<END>

This section is not scored. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 4. LEA waivers

1. The applicant must mark an "X" next to each waiver it will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement a 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, Tier II and Tier III Title-I-participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.**

Only if the LEA will not implement this waiver for each applicable school, list the names of the schools to which the waiver WILL apply:

☐ **Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I, Tier II or Tier III Title-I-participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.**

Only if the LEA will not implement this waiver for each applicable school, list the names of the schools to which the waiver WILL apply:

This section is worth 15 out of 90 total points for the LEA SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 5A. Budget instructions

LEA SIG program budget

An LEA's proposed SIG program budget should cover three (3) years of full implementation and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve. This program budget should include the amount of funding requested for LEA-level activities that will be carried out to implement the SIG requirements.

FYI: Grants allocated to winners of LDE's previous SIG competition ranged from approximately $500,000 to $1,300,000 per school for the full three-year grant period. LDE will provide additional funding allocation guidance on the School Turnaround Office website: www.laturnaround.com.

Note: Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period (May 2011 - August 2011) must be included as part of "Year 1" of the LEA's three-year budget plan. Also note that *conducting pre-implementation activities is not required but highly encouraged* by LDE.

Resource alignment and sustainability

There is space in this spreadsheet for the LEA to describe the amount of matching funds it would be willing to redirect to supplement and/or sustain SIG intervention activities. While it is not required that an LEA commit additional funds towards SIG program activities, this information will be used to evaluate the LEA's commitment to align resources during the three-year grant period and sustain reforms after the SIG grant period ends in August 2014.

School-level SIG program budget

The LEA must complete a separate budget for each school for which it hopes to receive a grant award. **A school-level budget is provided in each "School SIG Application."**

Part 5B. Program budget summary

	SIG funding					LEA matching funds (optional)							
	Year 1		Year 2	Year 3		Year 1		Year 2	Year 3	Sustainability: Post SIG grant period			
Category	**(Pre-implementation, *optional*) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011**	**(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012**	**9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013**	**9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014**	**Total SIG funding**	**(Pre-implementation) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011**	**(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012**	**9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013**	**9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014**	**9/1/2014 - 8/31/2015**	**9/1/2015 - 8/31/2016**	**Total LEA matching funds**	**Total program budget**
100 Salaries					$ -							$ -	$ -
200 Employee Benefits					$ -							$ -	$ -
300 Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs					$ -							$ -	$ -
400 Purchased Property Services					$ -							$ -	$ -
500 Other Purchased Services					$ -							$ -	$ -
600 Supplies					$ -							$ -	$ -
800 Other Objects					$ -							$ -	$ -
Subtotal - Operating Budget	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700 Property					$ -							$ -	$ -
900 Other Uses of Funds					$ -							$ -	$ -
Grand Total					$ -							$ -	$ -
LEA matching funds: % of SIG grant request												#DIV/0!	

Part 5C. Program budget detail

			SIG funding					LEA matching funds (optional)							
			Year 1		Year 2	Year 3		Year 1		Year 2	Year 3	Sustainability period			
Category	Budget Item	Description	(Pre-implementation, *optional*) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013	9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014	Total SIG funding	(Pre-implementation) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013	9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014	9/1/2014 - 8/31/2015	9/1/2015 - 8/31/2016	Total LEA matching funds	Total program budget
100 Salaries							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Salaries			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
200 Employees Benefits							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Employee Benefits			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
300 Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
400 Purchased Property Services							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Purchased Property Services			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

500 Other Purchased Services							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Purchased Services			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
600 Supplies							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Supplies			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
800 Other Objects							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Objects			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Subtotal - Operating Budgets			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700 Property							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Property			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
900 Other Uses of Funds							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Uses of Funds			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Grand Total			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

<END>

Scoring your application

Total score

The LEA applicant will submit just one LEA SIG Application and a School SIG Application for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that it commits to serve. **The LEA SIG Application is worth 90 points, and each School SIG application is worth 160 points; the LEA application plus one school application can receive up to 250 points total.** All applications submitted by one LEA will be scored by the same set of expert reviewers; however, awards will be determined on a school-by-school basis, meaning that an LEA could receive funding for one school but not another depending on the quality of each school's application.

Here's an example:
Galaxy LEA applies for SIG funding on behalf of Jupiter Elementary School, Mars Middle School, and Saturn High School. Galaxy LEA receives 80 points on its "LEA SIG Application," 150 points on the Saturn's "School SIG Application," 130 points on Mars' "School SIG Application," and 100 points on Jupiter's "School SIG Application."

Saturn's total score = 80 (LEA application) + 150 (School application) = 230 out of 250 possible points.
Mars' total score = 80 (LEA application) + 130 (School application) = 210 out of 250 possible points.
Jupiter's total score = 80 (LEA application) + 100 (School application) = 180 out of 250 possible points.

Use this rubric to assess the strength of your SIG applications as you develop them, but be sure to provide answers that honestly reflect current or projected actions.

LEA SIG Application

An LEA SIG Application is worth 90 points total:

General information - 2 points
LEA implementation strategy - 70 points
Assurances - 3 points
LEA budget - 15 points

School SIG Application

A School SIG Application is worth 160 points total. If the school will implement the turnaround, restart, or transformation model, its School SIG Application will be scored as follows:

Part 1. General information - 1 point
Part 2. Intervention strategy (Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation) - 130 points
Part 3. Annual performance goals - 9 points
Parts 4 - 5. School-level budget - 20 points

A school applying to implement the closure model will use a different scoring method because the "Annual performance goals" do not apply to this intervention model. Its School SIG Application can still receive up to 160 points and will be scored as follows:

Part 1. General information - 2 points
Part 2. Closure model - 138 points
Parts 3 - 4. School-level budget - 20 points

Note: The applicant must adddress in its implementation plan all requirements of the intervention model (turnaround, restart, transformation, or closure) selected for the school. A School SIG Application that fails to complete its "implementation plan" will receive zero (0) points for the entire application.

LEA application: 90 points total

Part 1. General information (2 points total)

The applicant provides all information requested on the "General information" tab, including signatures from the LEA Superintendent/President, LEA School Board President or Charter Authorizer President, LEA grant contact person, and LEA fiscal manager	**0 -** Applicant does not provide some or all of the information requested	**2 -** Applicant provides all information requested

Part 2. LEA implementation strategy (70 points total)

1. Commitment (22 points)

(a) Stakeholder outreach: The LEA provides a compelling description of its efforts to engage community stakeholders concerning its SIG application and provides strong evidence of its communications activities. (Evidence may include but is not limited to the following: links to web-based notices, press releases, newspaper articles, community surveys, and mass e-mail communications)	**0 -** The LEA provides a weak explanation of its stakeholder outreach efforts and no evidence that it conducted any corresponding communications activities	**1 -** The LEA provides a moderate explanation of its stakeholder outreach efforts but provides little corresponding evidence of its communications activities	**2 -** The LEA provides a strong explanation of its stakeholder outreach efforts and provides sufficient corresponding evidence of its communications activities
(b) Stakeholder support: In addition to reaching out to community stakeholders, the LEA provides strong evidence that it has received support from some or all of these stakeholders for its SIG application and/or the proposed school intervention(s). (Evidence may include but is it not limited to letters and emails of support)	**0 -** The LEA provides no evidence that it has received support from any community stakeholders for its SIG application and/or the proposed school intervention(s)	**1 -** The LEA presents evidence of a moderate amount of community stakeholder support for its SIG application and/or the proposed school intervention(s)	**3 -** The LEA presents evidence of a strong amount of community stakeholder support for its SIG application and/or the proposed school intervention(s)
(c) Operating conditions: The LEA has changed policies - and provides evidence of these changes - that will give the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve greater flexibility over four key operational areas: people, time, money, and program. (Evidence may include but is not limited to adoption of Louisiana's Red Tape Waiver or new/amended principal contracts)	**0 -** The LEA has not changed any policies or procedures needed to give the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve greater operational flexibility; nor does the LEA plan to make changes necessary to give these schools more flexibility; OR the LEA's plan is weak	**4 -** The LEA presents a compelling plan to make procedural and/or policy changes that will give the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve greater operational flexibility; however, few if any elements of this plan are currently in place	**6 -** The LEA has already made procedural and/or policy changes giving the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve greater operational flexibility, and the LEA provides compelling evidence that these changes have already taken place
(d) Contract negotiations: The LEA has recently taken steps to change teacher contracts/agreements with respect to staff replacements, extended learning time, incentive pay systems, or other issues critical to the effective implementation of the intervention models in the LEA's Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools. (Evidence may include but is not limited to new/amended teacher contracts and MOUs)	**0 -** The LEA has not made any changes to teacher contracts that will be necessary for successful implementation of the intervention models in the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools; OR the LEA claims to have made one or more critical changes to teacher contracts but provides no supporting evidence	**3 -** The LEA has successfully changed one or two critical issues in teacher contracts that will enable the LEA to implement the intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools, and the LEA submits evidence of the changes made	**5 -** The LEA has successfully changed three or more critical issues in teacher contracts that will enable the LEA to implement the intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools, and the LEA submits evidence of the changes made

(e) Reporting burdens: The LEA has taken steps to streamline reporting requirements and other burdensome, time-consuming policies/procedures and describes how these changes benefit the LEA's Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools	**0 -** The LEA has not changed any policies or streamlined any requirements for its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools; OR the LEA has made policy/procedural changes that provide no direct benefit to the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools	**2 -** The LEA has made one or more policy/procedural changes that directly reduce some but few burdens for the LEA's Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools	**4 -** The LEA has made one or more policy/procedural changes that directly reduce significant burdens for the LEA's Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools
(f) Initiative alignment: The LEA clearly describes how its SIG plan will directly align with or replace school improvement initiatives currently taking place in the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools	**0 -** The LEA has no plan for replacing school improvement intiatives or aligning them with the SIG plan; OR the LEA's alignment/replacement plan is weak	**1 -** The LEA's plan for replacing school improvement intiatives or aligning them with the SIG plan is moderate	**2 -** The LEA's plan for replacing school improvement intiatives or aligning them with the SIG plan is strong
2. Capacity (40 points)			
(a) Participation in LDE programs: The LEA - or one or more schools within the LEA - actively engages in state-sponsored improvement programs that the LEA will leverage in support of the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve. (State-sponsored programs include but are not limited to the Trailblazer Initiative, TAP, LSTS, Louisiana State Staffing Initiative, HPHP, LDE literacy programs, STEM, and CCR)	**0 -** The LEA does not currently participate in any state-sponsored LEA improvement programs that could benefit the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve	**4 -** The LEA engages in one or more state-sponsored LEA improvement programs that will directly support some but not all of the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve	**8 -** The LEA engages in one or more state-sponsored LEA improvement programs that will directly support all of the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve
(b) Prioritizing SIG schools: The LEA has a thoughtful process for ensuring that its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools are treated as the LEA's top priority; the LEA describes how the process for responding to the needs of these schools differs from the process for responding to all other schools	**0 -** The LEA has no process, or plans to establish a process, that treats the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools as a top priority; OR the LEA's process for responding to these schools is no different from the process for responding to all other schools	**2 -** The LEA has a thoughtful plan for treating the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools as a top priority; however, few aspects of this plan are currently in place	**4 -** The LEA has in place a thoughtful process for treating the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools as a top priority, and this process gives these schools direct access to the LEA Superintendent/CEO
(c) LEA reorganization: The LEA has reorganized - or will reorganize - its central office to ensure that its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools have a primary point of contact to coordinate their services	**0 -** The LEA has no plan to reorganize its central office in a way that provides the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier II schools a single point of contact and service coordinator; OR the LEA's plan is weak	**3 -** The LEA has a smart, actionable plan for reorganizing its central office in a way that will provide the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools a single a point of contact and service coordinator; however, few aspects of this plan are currently in place	**5 -** The LEA has a smart, actionable plan for reorganizing its central office in a way that will provide the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools a single a point of contact and service coordinator, and most or all aspects of this plan are currently in place
(d) Human capital pipeline: The LEA has thoughtful strategy for recruiting teachers and school leaders from outside the LEA to work in its lowest-performing schools; the LEA has formed - or is forming - partnerships with other organizations to develop this human capital pipeline	**0 -** The LEA does not have a strategy or plan for recruiting teachers and school leaders from outside the LEA to work in its lowest-performing schools; OR the LEA's plan is weak	**3 -** The LEA has a moderate strategy or plan for recruiting teachers and school leaders from outside the LEA to work in its lowest-performing schools; the LEA has not yet formed partnerships with other organizations to develop its human capital pipeline	**6 -** The LEA already has a strong plan in place for recruiting teachers and school leaders from outside the LEA to work in its lowest-performing schools; and, the LEA has formed partnerships with other organizations to develop its human capital pipeline

(e) Shifting effective staff: The LEA has a smart, actionable plan for moving effective teachers and leaders from the LEA's high-performing schools into one or more Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools; the LEA provides evidence that its selection criteria for "effective teachers and principals" are rigorous	**0 -** The LEA does not have a plan for moving effective teachers/leaders from the LEA's high-performing schools into any of the Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools; OR the LEA provides no evidence of its selection criteria for "effective teachers and principals"; OR these selection criteria are weak	**2 -** The LEA has a moderate plan for moving effective teachers/leaders from the LEA's high-performing schools into any of the Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools; OR only some of the LEA's selection criteria for "effective teachers and principals" are rigorous	**4 -** The LEA has a strong plan for moving effective teachers/leaders from the LEA's high-performing schools into any of the Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools; AND all the LEA's selection criteria for "effective teachers and principals" are rigorous
(f) HR and academic coordination: The LEA describes a smart, ongoing process wherein its human resources and academic departments will work together to identify and place effective teachers in the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools	**0 -** The LEA does not have a plan or process in place wherein its human resources and academic departments collaborate to identify and place effective teachers in the Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools; OR the LEA's plan is weak	**2 -** The LEA describes a moderate plan wherein its human resources and academic departments will collaborate to identify and place effective teachers in the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools	**4 -** The LEA describes a strong plan wherein its human resources and academic departments collaborate to identify and place effective teachers in the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools
(g) School performance and resources: The LEA describes a smart, actionable performance evaluation plan for its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools that includes using formative and summative school performance evaluations to identify each school's unique resource needs	**0 -** The LEA's plan for evaluating the performance of its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools is not linked to resource allocation decisions; OR the LEA's overall performance evaluation plan is weak	**1 -** The LEA describes a moderate plan for evaluating the performance of its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools; and these performance evaluations are somewhat linked to resource allocation decisions	**3 -** The LEA describes a strong, actionable plan for evaluating the performance of its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, and these performance evaluations are directly linked to resource allocation decisions
(h) Resource prioritization timeline: The LEA will make immediate, dramatic reforms in its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools by prioritizing SIG resource allocations during the first year of the grant period	**0 -** The LEA will not prioritize its SIG resource allocations in the first year of the grant period, thereby delaying the dramatic interventions needed in the LEA's Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools	**1 -** The LEA commits to allocating a moderate portion of its SIG resources during the first year of the grant period; some critical intervention strategies will not take place until years 2 or 3 of the grant period	**3 -** The LEA commits to allocating a significant portion of its SIG resources during the first year of the grant period in order to implement the majority of the intervention strategies in the 2011-2012 school year
(i) Lack of capacity: The LEA presents a reasonable explanation of its lack of capacity to serve one or more Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III schools that are eligible to receive SIG funding	**0 -** The LEA's presents a weak explanation for not supporting one or more of its eligible Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools	**1 -** The LEA presents a moderate explanation for not supporting one or more Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools	**3 -** The LEA's presents a strong reason for not supporting one or more Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools; OR the LEA commits to serve all eligible Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools
3. Sustainability (8 points)			
(a) Resource alignment: The LEA provides additional financial resources to its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools that will directly align with prospective SIG funding	**0 -** The LEA does not provide any additional financial resources to its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools and has no plans to do so outside of any SIG funding received	**2 -** The LEA does not currently provide any financial additional resources to its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools but has a concrete plan to do so after receiving SIG funding	**3 -** The LEA currently provides financial additional resources to its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools

(b) Longevity of reform effort: The LEA has a clear, actionable plan in place to continue intervention efforts in the Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools it commits to serve after the 3-year period of SIG funding ends	**0 -** The LEA has no clear plan for continuing the intervention efforts in its Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools		**2 -** The LEA has a moderate plan for continuing the intervention efforts in its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools after the SIG funding period ends	**3 -** The LEA has a strong plan for continuing the intervention efforts in its Tier I, Tier I, and/or Tier III schools after the SIG funding period ends
(c) Sharing promising practices: The LEA presents an actionable plan for sharing promising school reform practices learned in the SIG schools with other low-performing schools in the LEA	**0 -** The LEA has no clear plan for sharing promising school reform practices learned in the SIG schools with other low-performing schools in the LEA; OR the LEA's proposed plan is weak		**1 -** The LEA presents a moderate plan for sharing promising school reform practices learned in the SIG schools with other low-performing schools in the LEA	**2 -** The LEA presents a strong plan for sharing promising school reform practices learned in the SIG schools with other low-performing schools in the LEA
Part 3. Assurances (3 points total)				
The LEA Superintendent/President and the School Board President or Charter Authorizer President signed the statement assuring that, if the LEA receives SIG funding through this competition, the requirements of the grant will be met	**0 -** Neither party signed the assurances statement		**1 -** One party, but not both, signed the assurances statement	**3 -** Both parties signed the assurances statement
Part 5. LEA budget (15 points total)				
Match funding: The LEA commits other local, state, and/or federal funds (as allowable) directly towards the full and effective implementation of the interventions proposed for all of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that it commits to serve	**0 -** The LEA commits no matching funds	**3 -** The LEA commits in matching funds an amount greater than 0% and less than 10% of its total SIG grant request	**5 -** The LEA commits in matching funds an amount equal to or greater than 10% and less than 20% of its total SIG grant request	**8 -** The LEA commits in matching funds an amount equal to or greater than 20% of its total SIG grant request
Overall budget: The proposed SIG expenditures for this LEA are reasonable and necessary to implement fully and effectively the identified intervention in each Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III that the LEA commits to serve	**0 -** The LEA's proposed expenditures are insufficient or exaggerated for its proposed interventions		**4 -** Many but not all of the LEA's proposed expenditures are reasonable and necessary for its proposed interventions	**7 -** All of the LEA's proposed expenditures are reasonable and necessary for its proposed interventions

LEA Name	LEA NCES ID #	School Name	SCHOOL NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate
Assumption Parish	2200120	Assumption High School	220012000048		X		55.15
Assumption Parish	2200120	Belle Rose Primary School	220012000051			X	
East Feliciana Parish	2200600	Clinton Elementary School	220060000459			X	
East Feliciana Parish	2200600	East Feliciana High School	220060000465			X	65.25
East Feliciana Parish	2200600	East Feliciana Middle School	220060000461			X	
East Feliciana Parish	2200600	Jackson Elementary School	220060000464			X	
Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	F.W. Gregory Elementary School	220005402047			X	
Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Sarah Towles Reed Senior High School	220005401933	X			21.1
RSD-ADVANCE Baton Rouge	2200136	Dalton Elementary School	220013600370			X	
RSD-ADVANCE Baton Rouge	2200136	Glen Oaks Middle School	220013600377			X	
RSD-ADVANCE Baton Rouge	2200136	Pointe Coupee Central High School	220013602002			X	
RSD-Advocacy for Science and Math Education	2200132	New Orleans Charter Science and Math Academy	220013202068			X	
RSD-Akili Academy of New Orleans	2200133	Akili Academy of New Orleans	220013302071			X	
RSD-Arise Academy	2200141	Arise Academy	220014102278			X	
RSD-Benjamin E. Mays Preparatory School	2200145	Benjamin E. Mays Preparatory School	220014502266			X	
RSD-FirstLine Schools, Inc.	2200046	Arthur Ashe Charter School	220004600947			X	
RSD-FirstLine Schools, Inc.	2200046	John Dibert Community School	220004600877			X	
RSD-FirstLine Schools, Inc.	2200046	Samuel J. Green Charter School	220004600897			X	
RSD-Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP) N.O.	2200045	KIPP Central City Primary	220004502079			X	
RSD-Pride College Preparatory Academy	2200147	Pride College Preparatory Academy	220014702257			X	
RSD-ReNEW Schools	2200054	Laurel Elementary School	220005400917			X	
RSD-ReNEW Schools	2200054	Live Oak Elementary School	220005402018			X	
RSD-Success Preparatory Academy	2200144	Success Preparatory Academy	220014402283			X	
RSD-UNO New Beginnings Schools Foundation	2200043	Nelson Elementary School	220004300949			X	
RSD-UNO New Beginnings Schools Foundation	2200043	P. A. Capdau School	220004300860			X	
St. Bernard Parish	2201410	W. Smith Jr. Elementary School	220141001533			X	
Terrebonne Parish	2201740	East Houma Elementary School	220174001344			X	
Terrebonne Parish	2201740	Elysian Fields Middle School	220174001347			X	
Terrebonne Parish	2201740	Grand Caillou Elementary School	220174001350			X	
Terrebonne Parish	2201740	Oaklawn Junior High School	220174001361			X	
Terrebonne Parish	2201740	Village East Elementary School	220174001503			X	
Union Parish	2201770	Farmerville Elementary School	220177001694			X	

Site Code	LEA Name	LEA NCES ID#	School Name	School NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
1008	Acadia Parish	2200030	Crowley Middle School	220003000007			X		No
1023	Acadia Parish	2200030	Ross Elementary School	220003000021			X		No
1024	Acadia Parish	2200030	South Crowley Elementary School	220003000022			X		No
3003	Ascension Parish	2200090	Donaldsonville High School	220009000036			X	73.6	No
3002	Ascension Parish	2200090	Donaldsonville Primary School	220009000035			X		No
3015	Ascension Parish	2200090	Lowery Elementary School	220009000047			X		No
3010	Ascension Parish	2200090	Lowery Intermediate School	220009000042			X		No
4004	Assumption Parish	2200120	Belle Rose Primary School	220012000051			X		No
5004	Avoyelles Parish	2200150	Bunkie High School	220015000063			X	54.8	No
5025	Avoyelles Parish	2200150	Louisiana School for the Agricultural Sciences	220015001378			X	57.8	No
5016	Avoyelles Parish	2200150	Marksville High School	220015000073			X	55.9	No
5003	Avoyelles Parish	2200150	Bunkie Elementary School	220015000061			X		No
7002	Bienville Parish	2200210	Bienville High School	220021000091			X	73.3	No
7004	Bienville Parish	2200210	Crawford Elementary School	220021000094			X		No
8007	Bossier Parish	2200270	Bossier Elementary School	220027000118			X		No
8012	Bossier Parish	2200270	Central Park Elementary School	220027000123			X		No
9022	Caddo Parish	2200300	Fair Park College Prep High School	220030000161	X				No
9025	Caddo Parish	2200300	Green Oaks Performing Arts Academy	220030000163	X				No
9073	Caddo Parish	2200300	Woodlawn Leadership Academy	220030000212	X				No
9003	Caddo Parish	2200300	Atkins Technology Elementary School	220030000142			X		No
9004	Caddo Parish	2200300	Barret Paideia Academy	220030000143			X		No
9005	Caddo Parish	2200300	Bethune Math/Science Middle Academy	220030000144			X		No
9069	Caddo Parish	2200300	Booker T. Washington New Technology High School	220030000208			X	61	No
9007	Caddo Parish	2200300	Broadmoor Middle Laboratory School	220030000146			X		No
9011	Caddo Parish	2200300	Caddo Heights Math/Science Elementary School	220030000150			X		No
9029	Caddo Parish	2200300	Caddo Middle Career and Technology School	220030000167			X		No
9014	Caddo Parish	2200300	Central Elementary School	220030000152			X		No
9015	Caddo Parish	2200300	Cherokee Park Elementary School	220030000153			X		No
9061	Caddo Parish	2200300	E.B. Williams Stoner Hill Elem Lab School	220030000199			X		No
9028	Caddo Parish	2200300	Hillsdale Elementary School	220030000166			X		No
9017	Caddo Parish	2200300	J. S. Clark Microsociety Academy	220030000155			X		No
9101	Caddo Parish	2200300	M. J. Moore Math/Science Magnet Middle School	220030002254			X		No
9091	Caddo Parish	2200300	Midway Professional Development Center	220030001510			X		No
9071	Caddo Parish	2200300	Mrs. Eddie Jones W Shreveport Elementary Sch.	220030000210			X		No
9102	Caddo Parish	2200300	Newton Smith Visual/Performing Arts Middle School	220030002276			X		No
9044	Caddo Parish	2200300	Northside Elementary School	220030000181			X		No
9051	Caddo Parish	2200300	Queensborough Elementary School	220030000188			X		No
9052	Caddo Parish	2200300	Ridgewood Middle School	220030000189			X		No
9064	Caddo Parish	2200300	Sunset Acres Elementary School	220030000202			X		No
9075	Caddo Parish	2200300	Turner Elementary/Middle School	220030001676			X		No
9070	Caddo Parish	2200300	Werner Park Elementary School	220030000209			X		No
9072	Caddo Parish	2200300	Westwood Elementary School	220030000211			X		No

10027	Calcasieu Parish	2200330	John J. Johnson II Elementary School	220033000250			X		No
10038	Calcasieu Parish	2200330	Ray D. Molo Middle Magnet School	220033000251			X		No
10047	Calcasieu Parish	2200330	Reynaud Middle School	220033000260			X		No
10058	Calcasieu Parish	2200330	Washington/Marion Magnet High School	220033000272			X	66.5	No
68001	City of Baker School District	2200040	Baker Heights Elementary School	220004000342			X		No
68002	City of Baker School District	2200040	Baker High School	220004000344			X	63.6	No
68003	City of Baker School District	2200040	Baker Middle School	220004000343			X		No
68004	City of Baker School District	2200040	Bakerfield Elementary School	220004000345			X		No
68005	City of Baker School District	2200040	Park Ridge Elementary School	220004000410			X		No
66002	City of Bogalusa School District	2200240	Bogalusa High School	220024000103			X	63.6	No
66001	City of Bogalusa School District	2200240	Bogalusa Middle School	220024000102			X		No
66008	City of Bogalusa School District	2200240	Pleasant Hill Elementary School	220024001961			X		No
65002	City of Monroe School District	2201080	Carroll High School	220108000787			X	56.2	No
65003	City of Monroe School District	2201080	Carroll Junior High School	220108000788			X		No
65009	City of Monroe School District	2201080	Martin Luther King Jr. Middle School	220108000794			X		No
14008	Claiborne Parish	2200450	Homer Junior High School	220045000312			X		No
15002	Concordia Parish	2200480	Ferriday High School	220048000317			X	65.1	No
15003	Concordia Parish	2200480	Ferriday Junior High School	220048000318			X		No
15004	Concordia Parish	2200480	Ferriday Lower Elementary School	220048000319			X		No
15005	Concordia Parish	2200480	Ferriday Upper Elementary School	220048000321			X		No
16019	DeSoto Parish	2200510	Mansfield Elementary School PK-5	220051000623			X		No
16007	DeSoto Parish	2200510	Mansfield High School	220051000334			X	69.4	No
17045	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Istrouma Senior High School	220054000387			X	47.7	No
17088	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Tara High School	220054000434			X	55.7	No
17007	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Banks Elementary School	220054000346			X		No
17010	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Belaire High School	220054000349			X	61.7	No
17011	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Belfair Montessori School	220054000350			X		No
17015	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Broadmoor Middle School	220054000354			X		No
17016	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Broadmoor Senior High School	220054000355			X	61.4	No
17017	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Brookstown Elementary School	220054000356			X		No
17128	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Capitol Elementary School	220054000373			X		No
17020	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Capitol Middle School	220054000360			X		No
17026	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Claiborne Elementary School	220054000367			X		No
17030	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Delmont Elementary School	220054000371			X		No
17127	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	East Baton Rouge Laboratory Academy	220054002049			X	0	No
17038	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Glen Oaks Senior High School	220054000378			X	63.4	No
17044	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Howell Park Elementary School	220054000385			X		No
17047	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Jefferson Terrace Elementary School	220054000388			X		No
17050	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	LaBelle Aire Elementary School	220054000390			X		No
17132	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Mayfair Middle School	220054002272			X		No
17057	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Melrose Elementary School	220054000398			X		No
17058	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Merrydale Elementary School	220054000399			X		No
17065	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Northeast High School	220054000365			X	64	No
17068	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Park Elementary School	220054000407			X		No

17069	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Park Forest Elementary School	220054000408			X		No
17070	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Park Forest Middle School	220054000409			X		No
17073	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Polk Elementary School	220054000413			X		No
17075	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Progress Elementary School	220054000417			X		No
17124	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Scotlandville Elementary School	220054001690			X		No
17081	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Sharon Hills Elementary School	220054000425			X		No
17091	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	University Terrace Elementary School	220054000436			X		No
17120	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	White Hills Elementary School	220054001703			X		No
17101	East Baton Rouge Parish	2200540	Winbourne Elementary School	220054000446			X		No
18002	East Carroll Parish	2200570	Lake Providence Senior High School	220057000454			X	74.9	No
19014	East Feliciana Parish	2200600	East Feliciana High School	220060000465			X	58.4	No
19003	East Feliciana Parish	2200600	Clinton Elementary School	220060000459			X		No
19007	East Feliciana Parish	2200600	Jackson Elementary School	220060000464			X		No
20014	Evangeline Parish	2200630	Ville Platte High School	220063000482			X	65.7	No
21003	Franklin Parish	2200660	Fort Necessity School	220066000486			X		No
21010	Franklin Parish	2200660	Winnsboro Elementary School	220066000496			X		No
23010	Iberia Parish	2200720	Hopkins Street Elementary School	220072000514			X		No
24010	Iberville Parish	2200750	Plaquemine Senior High School	220075000543			X	57.6	No
24022	Iberville Parish	2200750	Iberville Elementary School	220075001997			X		No
25005	Jackson Parish	2200780	Jonesboro-Hodge High School	220078000555			X	75.3	No
26010	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Bonnabel Magnet Academy High School	220084000585			X	54	No
26080	Jefferson Parish	2200865	West Jefferson High School	220084000654			X	55.4	No
26074	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Catherine Strehle Elementary School	220084000648			X		No
26118	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Clancy Elementary School for the Arts	220084000590			X		No
26016	Jefferson Parish	2200865	George Cox Elementary School	220084000591			X		No
26096	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Geraldine Boudreaux Elementary School	220084001881			X		No
26051	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Grace King High School	220084000625			X	65	No
26035	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Gretna Middle School	220084000609			X		No
26099	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Harry S. Truman Middle School	220084001884			X		No
26030	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Henry Ford Middle School	220084000605			X		No
26023	Jefferson Parish	2200865	John Ehret High School	220084000598			X	63.5	No
26064	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Kate Middleton Elementary School	220084000638			X		No
26058	Jefferson Parish	2200865	L.H. Marrero Middle School	220084000632			X		No
26045	Jefferson Parish	2200865	L.W. Higgins High School	220084000620			X	60.7	No
26056	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Livaudais Middle School	220084000630			X		No
26093	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Lucille Cherbonnier Elementary School	220084001812			X		No
26061	Jefferson Parish	2200865	McDonogh #26 Elementary School	220084000635			X		No
26078	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Miller Wall Elementary School	220084000651			X		No
26082	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Myrtle C. Thibodeaux Elementary School	220084000655			X		No
26067	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Norbert Rillieux Elementary School	220084000641			X		No
26036	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Shirley Johnson/Gretna Park Elementary School	220084000612			X		No
26085	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Stella Worley Middle School	220084000658			X		No
26065	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Vic A. Pitre Elementary School	220084000639			X		No
26116	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Washington Montessori	220084000652			X		No

26088	Jefferson Parish	2200865	Woodmere Elementary School	220084001681			X		No
28004	Lafayette Parish	2200870	Alice N. Boucher Elementary School	220087000662			X		No
28010	Lafayette Parish	2200870	Carencro High School	220087000668			X	61.7	No
28014	Lafayette Parish	2200870	J.W. Faulk Elementary School	220087000672			X		No
28025	Lafayette Parish	2200870	N. P. Moss Middle School	220087001397			X		No
28027	Lafayette Parish	2200870	Northside High School	220087000686			X	62.4	No
29020	Lafourche Parish	2200900	Raceland Middle School	220090000716			X		No
33002	Madison Parish	2201050	Madison High School	220105000780			X	65.7	No
33001	Madison Parish	2201050	Madison Middle School	220105000779			X		No
34008	Morehouse Parish	2201110	Cherry Ridge Elementary School	220111000811			X		No
34001	Morehouse Parish	2201110	Henry V. Adams Elementary School	220111000804			X		No
34017	Morehouse Parish	2201110	South Side Elementary School	220111000820			X		No
35024	Natchitoches Parish	2201140	Cloutierville Elementary School	220114001930			X		No
35005	Natchitoches Parish	2201140	East Natchitoches Elementary & Middle School	220114000828			X		No
35006	Natchitoches Parish	2201140	Fairview-Alpha Elementary & Junior High School	220114000829			X		No
35015	Natchitoches Parish	2201140	George L. Parks Elementary & Middle School	220114000839			X		No
35012	Natchitoches Parish	2201140	L.P. Vaughn Elementary & Middle School	220114001617			X		No
35021	Natchitoches Parish	2201140	M.R. Weaver Elementary School	220114000845			X		No
36073	Orleans Parish	2201170	Priestley School of Architecture/Construction	220117000920			X	60.2	No
37049	Ouachita Parish	2201200	Richwood High School	220120001525			X	69.8	No
37056	Ouachita Parish	2201200	Richwood Junior High School	220120001683			X		No
39012	Pointe Coupee Parish	2201260	Rosenwald Elementary School	220168001321			X		No
39008	Pointe Coupee Parish	2201260	Upper Pointe Coupee Elementary School	220126001034			X		No
40054	Rapides Parish	2201290	Rapides Training Academy	220129000115			X	61.55	No
40001	Rapides Parish	2201290	Acadian Elementary New Vision Academy	220129001038			X		No
40045	Rapides Parish	2201290	Alma Redwine Elementary New Vision Academy	220129001083			X		No
40018	Rapides Parish	2201290	Arthur F. Smith Middle Magnet School	220129001055			X		No
40017	Rapides Parish	2201290	D.F. Huddle Elementary New Vision Academy	220129001054			X		No
40016	Rapides Parish	2201290	Horseshoe Drive Elementary New Vision Academy	220129001053			X		No
40039	Rapides Parish	2201290	Julius Patrick Elementary School	220129001075			X		No
40009	Rapides Parish	2201290	Mabel Brasher Elementary School	220129001045			X		No
40027	Rapides Parish	2201290	North Bayou Rapides Elementary New Vision	220129001063			X		No
40043	Rapides Parish	2201290	W.O. Hall Elementary School	220129001080			X		No
378001	Recovery School District-100 Black Men Capitol Charter Initiative	2200134	Capitol Pre-College Academy for Boys	220013401644	X				No
378002	Recovery School District-100 Black Men Capitol Charter Initiative	2200134	Capitol Pre-College Academy for Girls	220013401656	X				No
377003	Recovery School District-ADVANCE Baton Rouge	2200136	Pointe Coupee Central High School	220013602002	X				No
377002	Recovery School District-ADVANCE Baton Rouge	2200136	Prescott Middle School	220013600415			X		No
379001	Recovery School District-Advocacy for the Arts & Tech in N.O., Inc.	2200137	Crocker Arts and Technology School	220013702084			X		No
395007	Recovery School District-Algiers Charter Schools Association (ACSA)	2200053	Algiers Technology Academy	220005302057			X	60.6	No
395006	Recovery School District-Algiers Charter Schools Association (ACSA)	2200053	Harriet Tubman Elementary School	220005300946			X		No
395004	Recovery School District-Algiers Charter Schools Association (ACSA)	2200053	McDonogh #32Elementary School	220005300938			X		No
395005	Recovery School District-Algiers Charter Schools Association (ACSA)	2200053	O.P. Walker Senior High School	220005300972			X	72.8	No
395003	Recovery School District-Algiers Charter Schools Association (ACSA)	2200053	William J. Fischer Elementary School	220005300885			X		No
388001	Recovery School District-Broadmoor Charter School Board	2200130	Andrew H. Wilson Charter School	220013000979			X		No

390001	Recovery School District-Dryades YMCA	2200048	James M. Singleton Charter School	220004801208			X		No
399001	Recovery School District-FirstLine Schools, Inc.	2200046	Samuel J. Green Charter School	220004600897			X		No
380001	Recovery School District-Intercultural Charter School Board, Inc.	2200140	The Intercultural Charter School	220014002077			X		No
396029	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	F.W. Gregory Elementary School	220005402047			X		No
396026	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	G.W. Carver High School	220009000034	X				No
396011	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	John McDonogh Senior High School	220005400928	X				No
396002	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Joseph S. Clark Senior High School	220005400865	X				No
396045	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	New Orleans Career Academy	220005402264	X				No
396016	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Rabouin Career Magnet High School	220005400961			X	54.9	No
396004	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Walter L. Cohen High School	220005400867	X				No
396003	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Benjamin Banneker Elementary School	220005400935			X		No
396025	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Carver Elementary School	220005402050			X		No
396008	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Dr. Charles Richard Drew Elementary School	220005400974			X		No
396028	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Fannie C. Williams Elementary School	220005402062			X		No
396043	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Greater Gentilly High School	220005402275			X		No
396034	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	H.C. Schaumburg Elementary School	220005400964			X		No
396012	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	James Weldon Johnson School	220005400909			X		No
396001	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Joseph A. Craig School	220005400870			X		No
396037	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Mary D. Coghill Elementary School	220005400866			X		No
396010	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Murray Henderson Elementary School	220005400905			X		No
396009	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Paul B. Habans Elementary School	220005400900			X		No
396021	Recovery School District-LDE	2200054	Sarah Towles Reed Elementary School	220005402021			X		No
384001	Recovery School District-Miller-McCoy Academy for Math and Business	2200135	Miller-McCoy Academy	220013502067			X		No
392001	Recovery School District-New Orleans Charter Schools Foundation	2200050	McDonogh #28 City Park Academy	220005000936			X		No
385001	Recovery School District-New Orleans College Preparatory Academies	2200128	NOLA College Prep Charter School	220012802041			X		No
383001	Recovery School District-Sojourner Truth Academy, Inc.	2200138	Sojourner Truth Academy	220013802070			X		No
394003	Recovery School District-Treme Charter Schools Association	2200052	McDonogh #42 Elementary Charter School	220005200944			X		No
300002	Recovery School District-UNO New Beginnings Schools Foundation	2200043	Nelson Elementary School	220004300949			X		No
300001	Recovery School District-UNO New Beginnings Schools Foundation	2200043	P. A. Capdau School	220004300860			X	0	No
42003	Richland Parish	2201350	Delhi Elementary School	220135001097			X		No
42001	Richland Parish	2201350	Delhi High School	220135001095			X	69.1	No
42010	Richland Parish	2201350	Rayville Elementary School	220135001104			X		No
46002	St. Helena Parish	2201470	St. Helena Central High School	220147001154	X				No
46005	St. Helena Parish	2201471	St. Helena Central Elem School	220147001157			X		No
47007	St. James Parish	2201500	Romeville Elementary School	220150001166			X		No
49006	St. Landry Parish	2201560	Creswell Elementary School	220156001177			X		No
49051	St. Landry Parish	2201560	North Central High School	220156001989			X	83.8	No
49028	St. Landry Parish	2201560	North Elementary School	220156001199			X		No
49031	St. Landry Parish	2201560	Opelousas Junior High School	220156001203			X		No
49040	St. Landry Parish	2201560	South Street Elementary School	220156001896			X		No
49041	St. Landry Parish	2201560	Southwest Elementary School	220156001212			X		No
50001	St. Martin Parish	2201590	Breaux Bridge Elementary School	220159001216			X		No
51011	St. Mary Parish	2201620	Franklin Junior High School	220162001243			X		No
53048	Tangipahoa Parish	2201680	Northwood High School	220168001364			X		No

53010	Tangipahoa Parish	2201680	Hammond Junior High School	220168001305			X		No
53036	Tangipahoa Parish	2201680	Hammond Westside Primary School	220168002008			X		No
53037	Tangipahoa Parish	2201680	Hammond Westside Upper Elementary School	220168001900			X		No
53013	Tangipahoa Parish	2201680	Independence Middle School	220168001308			X		No
53015	Tangipahoa Parish	2201680	Kentwood High School	220168001310			X	74.2	No
53018	Tangipahoa Parish	2201680	Midway Elementary School	220168001313			X		No
53020	Tangipahoa Parish	2201680	Natalbany Elementary School	220168001315			X		No
53032	Tangipahoa Parish	2201680	West Side Middle School	220168001326			X		No
53033	Tangipahoa Parish	2201680	Woodland Park Early Learning Center	220168001991			X		No
54001	Tensas Parish	2201710	Tensas High School	220171001328			X	62.5	No
55013	Terrebonne Parish	2201740	Ellender Memorial High School	220174001346			X	57.4	No
55028	Terrebonne Parish	2201740	Oaklawn Junior High School	220174001361			X		No
340001	The MAX Charter School	2200126	The MAX Charter School	220012602058			X		No
56001	Union Parish	2201770	Bernice Elementary School	220177001373			X	44.4	No
60001	Webster Parish	2201890	Brown Upper Elementary School	220189001432			X		No
60002	Webster Parish	2201890	Browning Elementary School	220189001433			X		No
60010	Webster Parish	2201890	J. L. Jones Elementary School	220189001442			X		No
60021	Webster Parish	2201890	Stewart Elementary School	220189001453			X		No
61009	West Baton Rouge Parish	2201920	Port Allen Middle School	220192001548			X		No

This section is worth 2 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application.
(See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 1A. Instructions
For a Tier I, Tier II OR Tier III school, complete each of the following tabs:
1. General
2. Closure model
3. School-level budget narrative
4. School-level budget items

Part 1B. Provide the folllowing information:	
School name	
Site Code	
Mailing address	
School Principal/Leader	
Phone #	
E-mail address	
Signature	
School primary contact person (if different from School Principal/Leader)	
Phone #	
Email address	
Signature	
Eligibility tier	
Grades served	
2010-11 student enrollment	
Chosen intervention model	
Grant amount requested for this school	

<END>

This section is worth 138 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 2A. Instructions

There are 3 main parts to this section of the application:

1. Point of departure
2. Intervention strategy
3. Implementation plan

Utilize the school's needs assessment to determine its current performance level ("Point of departure"). From there, use the questions around the school's chosen intervention strategy to determine how it will reach these goals. Finally, complete the implementation plan to identify specific actions to carry out this strategy.

Part 2B. Point of departure: School needs assessment

1. Type of needs assessment conducted (e.g., LANA, Scholastic Audit, Quality Review, SACS, Breaking Ranks II, High Schools That Work, or another similarly accredited needs assessment)

2. Results of needs assessment

(a) Provide a thorough description of the results of the needs assessment and link these results to the intervention selected for this school/campus. (Summarize here and attach the full assessment results to the application.) Describe the areas of student performance most in need of improvement.

(b) Using information gathered from the school's needs assessment and other relevant data, what seem to be the root causes of the school's low-performance and barriers to improvement? (Include causes/barriers linked to the LEA and the school themselves.)

Part 2C. Intervention strategy: Closure model

1. Justification for selecting the closure model

(a) What school improvement efforts has this school undertaken in recent years that have not resulted in improved student academic performance? Explain why these efforts were not successful and why closure is the best intervention option for this school.

(b) What are the LEA's criteria for determining that this particular school needs to be closed (e.g., history of low performance, financial instability, chronic safety issues)?

(c) In concrete terms, describe how students of the closed school will benefit from leaving this school and attending other schools within or near the LEA.

(d) If the LEA has begun implementing, in whole or in part, the school closure intervention model within the last two years (i.e., during the 2009-10 school year or later) and wishes to continue or complete the intervention, describe the actions it has already taken relative to the school closure intervention model requirements.

(e) To what higher-performing schools within the LEA could the LEA send students of the closed school? List school names and briefly describe what classifies these schools as "higher-performing."

2. Human capital
(a) What will happen to the school leader and staff members who are removed from the closed school (e.g., Will they be reassigned to other schools in the LEA?)? What is the LEA's plan for transitioning these personnel out of the closed school?
(b) Describe how the LEA will evaluate the effectiveness of staff from the closed school and then use this information, including student academic performance data, to determine reassignments for those staff. How will the LEA ensure that the leader and staff from the closed school will be reassigned only if they are highly effective?
3. External capacity
(a) Will any external providers be involved in the school closure effort? If so, what is the LEA's process for recruiting, evaluating and selecting these external providers? If the LEA does not plan to contract with any external providers, explain why external providers would not add value to the school closure process.
(b) Will the LEA form, or has the LEA formed, partnerships with community stakeholders, universities, or business leaders to support the school closure process? How will these partnerships directly impact the intervention?
4. Outreach
(a) What is the LEA's plan for informing school staff, students, parents, school board members, and other stakeholders about the potential school closure? Include a thorough description of what outreach activities the LEA will conduct to reach each target audience, when the LEA will begin conducting this outreach, and the LEA's capacity to carry out these activities. If the LEA has already begun the outreach process, describe outreach efforts have taken place and what strategies have not yet been implemented.

(b) What messages will the LEA communicate to parents, school staff, and other community stakeholders regarding the reason for closing the school? How will the LEA use the school's historical performance data to drive this messaging effort?

(c) How will the LEA provide support to students looking to attend higher-performing schools within reasonable proximity to the closed school? (E.g., will the LEA set up meetings with students and their parents? Will the LEA set up school site visits?)

5. Pre-implementation activities

(a) Should this school win SIG funding, the LEA will have the opportunity to conduct "pre-implementation activities." The pre-implementation period will begin approximately in May 2011 and will end in August 2011. Describe any activities the LEA will conduct on behalf of this school in order to ensure full and effective implementation of this intervention model beginning September 2011. [Note that *carrying out pre-implementation activities is optional but highly recommended by LDE* .]

Approved "pre-implementation activities" for the closure model include but are not limited to the following:

- Family and community engagement to educate stakeholders about the school closure and to cultivate their support and involvement during the closure process.
- Conducting a rigorous recruitment and evaluation process for external providers that will be involved in the school closure.
- Other expenditures directly related to the school closure process.

6. The "big picture"

(a) Articulate how the initiatives and activities proposed in this closure application fit together as one, cohesive strategy or theory of action.

Part 2D. Implementation plan

The LEA must create a 1-year implementation plan for the requirements pertaining to each SIG-receiving school's intervention model. The LEA must also work closely with the school's leader/principal to complete this timeline.

The implementation plan should provide detailed activities on an ambitious schedule.

Write action steps in the boxes maked "activity" (use as many cells as needed and expand them to the necessary size) and mark an "x" in the cells underneath the months in order to indicate when the activities will take place.

	Activities that took place between Sept. 2009 and Feb. 2011	**Pre-Implementation Period**	**Year 1: 2011 - 2012 School Year**										
Intervention activity	***Sept. 2009 - Feb. 2011***	***May 2011 - August 2011***	*Sept.*	*Oct.*	*Nov.*	*Dec.*	*Jan.*	*Feb.*	*March*	*April*	*May*	*June*	*July - Aug.*
1. All students from the closed school will have the opportunity to enroll in higher-performing schools in the LEA, including charter schools and new schools for which performance data is not yet available. These schools are within reasonable proximity to the closed school.													
Activity 1													
Activity 2													
.													
.													
.													
.													
.													
.													
.													
Activity 10, etc													

2. Parents, students, school staff, community members, will be provided information about the school's closure and any related services or opportunities.													
Activity 1													
Activity 2													
.													
.													
.													
.													
.													
.													
.													
Activity 10, etc													
Other activities?													

<END>

This section is worth 15 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 3A. School-level budget narrative

1. Communications strategy	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the communications strategy for the eligible school. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its communications strategy.*	
Town hall meetings for community stakeholders	
Press releases, newspaper announcements, and other public notifications	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

2. School closure costs	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the LEA's proposed instructional program. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its school closure process.*	
Services to support student transitions to other, higher-performing schools (within reasonable proximity to the closed school)	
Orientation activities, including open houses, that are specifically designed for students attending a new school after their prior school closes	
Selecting and contracting with an external provider/operator to support the closure process	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

<END>

This section is worth 5 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 5A. Budget instructions

School-level program budget

As explained in the "LEA SIG Application," the applicant must complete a separate budget for each school for which it hopes to receive a grant award. The school-level program budget below applies only to the school in this particular closure application.

SIG funds may be used for "pre-implementation" activities from May 2011 through August 2011 and for "full implementation" activities from September 2011 through August 2012. If the applicant commits matching funds towards this specific school, indicate how these matching funds will be spent and during what time period(s). Note that *conducting pre-implementation activities is optional but highly recommended* by LDE.

It is highly recommended that the applicant fill out this school-level budget electronically. Formulas embedded in this spreadsheet will automatically calculate totals for you.

Part 5B. School-level program budget summary

	SIG funding			LEA matching funds (optional)			
	Year 1			Year 1			
Category	(Pre-implementation, *optional*) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	Total SIG funding	(Pre-implementation) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	Total LEA matching funds	Total program budget
100 Salaries			$ -			$ -	$ -
200 Employee Benefits			$ -			$ -	$ -
300 Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs			$ -			$ -	$ -
400 Purchased Property Services			$ -			$ -	$ -
500 Other Purchased Services			$ -			$ -	$ -
600 Supplies			$ -			$ -	$ -
800 Other Objects			$ -			$ -	$ -
Subtotal - Operating Budget	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700 Property			$ -			$ -	$ -
900 Other Uses of Funds			$ -			$ -	$ -
Grand Total			$ -			$ -	$ -

Part 5C. School-level program budget detail

			SIG funding			LEA matching funds (optional)			
			Year 1			Year 1			
Category	Budget Item	Description	(Pre-implementation, *optional*) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	Total SIG funding	(Pre-implementation) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	Total LEA matching funds	Total program budget
100 Salaries					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
Total: Salaries			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
200 Employees Benefits					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
Total: Employee Benefits			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
300 Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
Total: Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
400 Purchased Property Services					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
Total: Purchased Property Services			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

500 Other Purchased Services					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
Total: Other Purchased Services			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
600 Supplies					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
Total: Supplies			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
800 Other Objects					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
Total: Other Objects			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Subtotal - Operating Budgets			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700 Property					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
Total: Property			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
900 Other Uses of Funds					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
					$ -			$ -	$ -
Total: Other Uses of Funds			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Grand Total			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

<END>

Scoring your application

Total score

The LEA applicant will submit just one LEA SIG Application and a School SIG Application for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that it commits to serve. **The LEA SIG Application is worth 90 points, and each School SIG application is worth 160 points; the LEA application plus one school application can receive up to 250 points total.** All applications submitted by one LEA will be scored by the same set of expert reviewers; however, awards will be determined on a school-by-school basis, meaning that an LEA could receive funding for one school but not another depending on the quality of each school's application.

Here's an example:
Galaxy LEA applies for SIG funding on behalf of Jupiter Elementary School, Mars Middle School, and Saturn High School. Galaxy LEA receives 80 points on its "LEA SIG Application," 150 points on the Saturn's "School SIG Application," 130 points on Mars' "School SIG Application," and 100 points on Jupiter's "School SIG Application."

Saturn's total score = 80 (LEA application) + 150 (School application) = 230 out of 250 possible points.
Mars' total score = 80 (LEA application) + 130 (School application) = 210 out of 250 possible points.
Jupiter's total score = 80 (LEA application) + 100 (School application) = 180 out of 250 possible points.

Use this rubric to assess the strength of your SIG applications as you develop them, but be sure to provide answers that honestly reflect current or projected actions.

LEA SIG Application

An LEA SIG Application is worth 90 points total:

General information - 2 points
LEA implementation strategy - 70 points
Assurances - 3 points
LEA budget - 15 points

School SIG Application

A School SIG Application is worth 160 points total. If the school will implement the turnaround, restart, or transformation model, its School SIG Application will be scored as follows:

Part 1. General information - 1 point
Part 2. Intervention strategy (Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation) - 130 points
Part 3. Annual performance goals - 9 points
Parts 4 - 5. School-level budget - 20 points

A school applying to implement the closure model will use a different scoring method because the "Annual performance goals" do not apply to this intervention model. Its School SIG Application can still receive up to 160 points and will be scored as follows:

Part 1. General information - 2 points
Part 2. Closure model - 138 points
Parts 3 - 4. School-level budget - 20 points

Note: The applicant must adddress in its implementation plan all requirements of the intervention model (turnaround, restart, transformation, or closure) selected for the school. A School SIG Application that fails to complete its "implementation plan" will receive zero (0) points for the entire application.

School application (closure model): 160 points total

Part 1. General information (2 points total)

The applicant provides all information requested on the "General information" tab, including signatures from the School Principal/Leader and the school's primary contact person, if that contact person is not the School Principal/Leader	**0 -** Applicant does not provide some or all of the information requested	**2 -** Applicant provides all information requested

Part 2. Closure model (138 points total)

Part 2B. Point of departure (15 points)			
1; 2(a) Needs assessment: The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment such as LANA, Scholastic Audit, Quality Review, SACS, Breaking Ranks II, or High Schools That Work; from this needs assessment, the LEA identified the school's core areas for improvement	**0** - The LEA did not conduct a needs assessment of the school; OR this needs assessment was not thorough	**3 -** The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment but did not identify the school's core areas for improvement	**7 -** The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment and used the information to identify the school's core areas for improvement
2(b) Diagnosis: The LEA has identified both the root causes of the school's low-performance and the existing barriers to improvement	**0 -** The LEA did not identify either the root causes of the school's low-performance nor the barriers to improvement	**4 -** The LEA has identified causes of low-performance and barriers to improvement, but no causes/barriers are linked to the LEA or school themselves	**8 -** The LEA has identified causes of low-performance and barriers to improvement, including causes/barriers related to the LEA and school themselves
Part 2C. Intervention strategy (93 points)			
1(a) - 1(c) Justification of chosen model: The LEA presents a convincing argument in support of closing the school based on prior, unsuccessful school improvement efforts, the LEA's criteria for determining that the school requires closure, and the projected benefits to its students if the school is closed	**0 -** It is not clear from the LEA's explanation that school closure is the best course of action and/or that the school's closure will benefit its students	**5 -** The LEA presents a moderate argument for closing the school; however, the LEA does not explain why past school improvement efforts were unsuccessful	**11 -** The LEA presents a strong argument for closing the school and thoroughly explains why past school improvement efforts were unsuccessful
1(d) Steps taken to close the school: The LEA has already begun the school closure process by informing school and community stakeholders, identifying higher-performing schools that the students could attend, and/or sending students to higher-performing schools	**0 -** The LEA has not made any steps to begin the school closure process	**5 -** The LEA has begun to identify higher performing school that the students could attend, but it has not begun the critical work of communications / community outreach	**12 -** The LEA has begun the school closure process, including informing school and community stakeholders of the LEA's decision to close the school
1(e) Higher-performing schools: The LEA has already identified higher-performing schools within reasonable proximity to the school that will be closed; the LEA explains why these schools are considered "higher-performing"	**0 -** The LEA has not identified any higher-performing schools within reasonable proximity to the school that will be closed; OR it is not clear that any of these schools are actually "higher-performing"	**4 -** The LEA has identified one or more higher-performing schools within reasonable proximity to the school that will be closed; however, these schools are only slightly higher-performing than the school that will be closed	**9 -** The LEA has identified one or more higher-performing schools within reasonable proximity to the school that will be closed, and these schools are significantly higher-performing than the school that will be closed
2(a) Human capital development: The LEA has a smart, actionable strategy for managing personnel that will be removed from the closed school; this strategy involves establishing a thoughtful transition plan for those staff	**0 -** The LEA has a weak strategy for managing personnel removed from the closed school	**5 -** The LEA has moderate strategy for managing personnel from the removed school that includes some staff transition activities	**9 -** The LEA has smart, actionable strategy for managing personnel from the removed school, including a robust staff transition plan

2(b) Staff evaluation and placement: The LEA describes its criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of staff from the closed school and its plan for determining staff reassignments based on this data; the LEA's evaluation criteria include student academic performance data as one of multiple measures of effectiveness	**0 -** The LEA has a weak plan for evaluating the effectiveness of staff from the closed school; OR the LEA does not plan to use staff evaluations in determining school reassignments	**5 -** The LEA describes moderate criteria for evaluating staff and determining their reassignments; none of these criteria incorporate student academic performance data as one of multiple measures of effectiveness	**10 -** The LEA describes several, strong criteria for evaluating staff and determining their reassignments; these evaluation criteria incorporate student academic performance data as one of multiple measures of effectiveness
3(a) External capacity: The LEA is contracting with one or more high quality external providers to assist the school closure effort; or the LEA has formed partnerships with universities, business leaders, or community stakeholders to directly support the school closure intervention strategy	**0 -** The LEA has no plans to work with external providers or form other partnerships to help support the school closure intervention effort	**3 -** The LEA is contracting - or will contract - with an external provider to help implement the school closure, however the quality of the selection process described in the application is questionable; OR the LEA has formed partnerships with stakeholder groups, but it is unclear how these partnerships will directly support the school closure strategy	**6 -** The LEA is contracting - or will contract - with an external provider to implement the school closure, and LEA describes a rigorous selection process; AND the LEA has formed partnerships with one or more stakeholder groups that provide or will provide significant support for the school closure intervention
4(a) Outreach: The LEA describes a smart, actionable plan for informing school staff, students, parents, school board members, and other stakeholders community members about the potential school closure; the plan describes the LEA's proposed outreach activities, projected timelines, and its capacity to carry out the outreach effort	**0 -** The LEA has made little to no attempts to inform school staff, school students, parents, or community members about the potential school closure and has no strong plan to inform these stakeholders about the school's closure	**5 -** The LEA has made little to no attempts to inform stakeholders about the potential school closure but has a strong outreach plan for communicating with community members well before the school officiallly closes	**12 -** The LEA has already begun outreach to stakeholders regarding the potential school closure and has a strong, comprehensive plan in place for ongoing communications
4(b) Messaging: The LEA describes key messages it will use to inform different stakeholder audiences about the school closure intervention; the LEA's messaging strategy is designed to cultivate community support and/or mitigate resistance to the school closure process; and the foundation of the LEA's messages is the school's academic performance	**0 -** The LEA has not developed a thoughtful messaging strategy to cultivate community support and/or mitigate resistance to the school closure	**4 -** The LEA has developed a moderately strong messaging strategy to cultivate community support and/or mitigate resistance to the school closure; however the key messages are only loosely tied to the school's academic performance	**9 -** The LEA has developed a strong messaging strategy to cultivate community support and/or mitigate resistance to the school closure, and the key messages are rooted in the school's academic performance data
4(c) Student transfer support: The LEA describes smart, actionable steps it has taken or will take to support students looking to attend higher-performing schools within the LEA; activities may include but are not limited to: • Dedicating one or more central office staff to student transfer support services • Meeting with students and their parents to discuss transfer options • Setting up school visits for transfer students	**0 -** The LEA has not taken any steps to match students from the closed school with higher-performing schools; OR the LEA's plan to support transfer students is weak	**5 -** The LEA has taken some steps to match students from the closed school with higher-performing schools; OR the LEA presents a moderate plan to support student transfers	**10 -** The LEA has taken several steps to match students from the closed school with higher-performing schools; OR the LEA presents has a smart, actionable plan to support student transfers
6(a) Overall closure strategy: The LEA explains how the activities proposed in this school application fit together as one, cohesive strategy or theory of action	**0 -** The LEA's overall strategy or theory of action does not address any of the school closure activities proposed in this application	**3 -** The LEA presents a moderate strategy or theory of action for the school closure activities proposed in this application	**5 -** The LEA presents a thoughtful, cohesive strategy or theory of action for the school closure activities proposed in this application

Part 2D. Implementation plan (30 points) **[Reminder: If any implementation requirement of the closure model is not addressed in the implementation plan, the LEA will receive 0 points for the school's entire application.]**			
1. Enrollment in higher-performing schools: The LEA details activities it will implement that will give all students from the closed school the opportunity to enroll in higher-performing schools in the LEA, including charter schools and new schools for which performance data is not yet available; these schools are within reasonable proximity to the closed school	**0 -** The LEA does not describe detailed activities that it will implement to enroll all students from the closed school in higher-performing schools in the LEA; OR the LEA's proposed activities constitute a weak enrollment plan	**7 -** The LEA describes some activities constituting a moderate plan for enrolling all students from the closed school in higher-performing schools in the LEA	**15 -** The LEA describes several activities constituting a comprehensive plan for enrolling all students from the closed school in higher-performing schools in the LEA
2. Outreach: The LEA details activities it will carry out to inform parents, students, school staff, community members about the school's closure and any related services or opportunities; and the LEA will begin outreach efforts well before the school officially closes	**0 -** The LEA does not describe detailed activities that it will carry out to inform community stakeholders about the school's closure and related services or opportunities; OR the LEA's proposed activities constitute a weak outreach plan	**7 -** The LEA describes some activities constituting a moderate plan for informing community stakeholders about the school's closure; the LEA's outreach timeline does not give stakeholders significant time to prepare for the school's closure	**15 -** The LEA describes several activities constituting a comprehensive plan for informing community stakeholders about the school's closure and related services or opportunities; and the begins outreach to stakeholders well before the school officially closes

Parts 3-4. School budget (20 points total)			
Part 3. Budget narrative (15 points)			
Part 3A, 1. Communications: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's accountability efforts	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the communications strategy proposed	**3 -** The LEA describes some but not all critical elements of the proposed communications strategy, and these proposed expenditures are reasonable	**5 -** The LEA describes all critical elements of the proposed communications strategy, and these expenditures are reasonable
Part 3A, 2. Closure activities: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's accountability efforts	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed school closure activities	**3 -** The LEA describes some but not all critical elements of the proposed school closure activities, and these proposed expenditures are reasonable	**5 -** The LEA describes all critical elements of the proposed school closure activities, and these expenditures are reasonable
Overall, the school-level budget narrative addresses all of the core expenditures of the school's proposed intervention strategy	**0 -** The LEA's school-level budget narrative addresses none or few of the core expenditures related to its intervention	**3 -** The LEA's school-level budget narrative addresses some but not all of the core expenditures related to its intervention	**5 -** The LEA's school level-budget narrative addresses all of the core expenditures related to its intervention
Part 4. Budget detail (5 points)			
Part 4B and 4C: The proposed expenditures for this school are reasonable and necessary to implement the school's intervention model fully and effectively	**0 -** The LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are insufficient or exaggerated for its proposed intervention strategy	**3 -** Many but not all of the LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are reasonable and necessary for its proposed intervention strategy	**5 -** All of the LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are reasonable and necessary for its proposed intervention strategy

<END>

This section is worth 1 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application.
(See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 1A. Instructions
For a Tier I, Tier II OR Tier III school, complete each of the following tabs:
1. General information
2. Restart model
3. Annual performance goals
4. School-level budget narrative
5. School-level budget items

Part 1B. Provide the folllowing information:	
School name	
Site Code	
Mailing address	
School Principal/Leader	
Phone #	
E-mail address	
Signature	
School primary contact person (if different from School Principal/Leader)	
Phone #	
Email address	
Signature	
Eligibility tier	
Grades served	
2010-11 student enrollment	
Chosen intervention model	
Grant amount requested for this school	

<END>

This section is worth 130 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 2A. Instructions

There are 4 main parts to this section of the application:

1. Point of departure
2. Point of arrival
3. Intervention strategy
4. Implementation plan

Utilize the school's needs assessment to determine its current performance level ("Point of departure") and analyze this data to set its annual performance goals for the next three years ("Point of arrival"). From there, use the questions around the school's chosen intervention strategy to determine how it will reach these goals. Finally, complete the implementation plan to identify specific actions to carry out this strategy.

Part 2B. Point of departure: School needs assessment

1. Type of needs assessment conducted (e.g., LANA, Scholastic Audit, Quality Review, SACS, Breaking Ranks II, High Schools That Work, or another similarly accredited needs assessment)

2. Results of needs assessment

(a) Provide a thorough description of the results of the needs assessment and link these results to the intervention selected for this school/campus. (Summarize here and attach the full assessment results to the application.) Describe the areas of student performance most in need of improvement.

(b) Using information gathered from the school's needs assessment and other relevant data, what seem to be the root causes of the school's low-performance and barriers to improvement? (Include causes/barriers linked to the LEA and the school themselves.)

Part 2C. Point of arrival: School performance goals

1. Describe the school's annual performance goals

(a) Based on the school's needs assessment and the historical data available, provide a clear and logical rationale for the annual achievement goals on Louisiana's state assessments (LEAP, iLEAP, GEE , EOC tests) provided on the "Annual performance goals" tab (Tab 3 of this worksheet). Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(b) Based on the school's needs assessment and the historical data available, provide a clear and logical rationale for the annual leading indicator goals, including SPS goals, provided on the "Annual performance goals" tab (Tab 3 of this worksheet). Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(c) Based on the school's needs assessment, provide a clear and logical rationale for the school's annual "State Priority Goals" provided on the "Annual performance goals" tab (Tab 3 of this worksheet). Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(d) Based on the school's needs assessment, describe any other achievement goals for the school. [These goals may be derived from may derived from Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) (including Louisiana Educational Assessment Program Alternative Assessment [LAA]), attendance and/or dropout rates, data on percent proficient, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Pre-K / Kindergarten screening tests, or other standardized assessments and unit assessments.] Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(e) How will the LEA use performance benchmarking to track the school's performance on a regular basis? Describe how the LEA will respond immediately if student outcome and leading indicator data show the restart intervention is off-track.

Part 2D. Intervention strategy: Restart model

1. Justification for selecting the restart model

(a) Explain how the LEA will use the restart intervention model to address the root causes of the school's low-performance as identified under Part 2B above.

(b) If the LEA has begun implementing, in whole or in part, the restart intervention model within the last two years (i.e., during the 2009-10 school year or later) and wishes to continue or complete the intervention, describe the actions it has already taken relative to the restart intervention model requirements.

(c) How many grades will the restart school serve during each year of the three-year grant period (school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014)?

(d) Does the school currently participate in any of the following state-sponsored school improvement programs: Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), Distinguished Educators (DE) program, Literacy program, College-and-Career Readiness (CCR) program, Science Technology Engineering & Math (STEM) program, Extended Learning Time (ELT) program, Advanced Placement (AP) program, or International Baccalaureate (IB) program? If so, describe how the school will leverage the program(s) to support its restart intervention efforts?

(d) What school improvement efforts has this school undertaken in recent years that have**not** resulted in improved student academic performance? Explain why these efforts were not successful and why the restart intervention will be successful in comparison with these prior efforts.

2. External capacity

To implement the restart model, the LEA ***must*** *convert the school or close and reopen it under the operation of a Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Education Management Organization (EMO). Whether the school was placed under CMO or EMO management within the past two years or the school will be placed under CMO or EMO management prior to the beginning of the 2011-12 school year, answer the following questions:*

(a) Describe the process for recruiting, selecting and evaluating the external provider that is managing or will manage the restart school. [This review process must be rigorous and must include the following elements:

- Recruiting several potential operators
- Assessing applicants' reform plans and strategies and their alignment with the restart school's needs assessment
- Assessing applicants' history with low-performing schools
- Assessing applicants' capacity to implement the restart intervention
- Assessing applicants' human capital strategies]

(b) Is the external operator currently managing the restart school? If so, when was the operator put in place and how has the operator impacted the school thus far?

(c) How is the operator held - or how will the operator be held - accountable for producing significant growth in academic achievement at the restart school?

(d) Under what conditions could the operator lose its contract or charter for the restart school?

3. Human capital development
(a) Will the existing school leader and/or any staff be removed from the restart school? If so, describe the criteria for determining which personnel are ineffective as well as the process for removing those personnel. (If personnel changes have already taken place at the school, describe the removal criteria and process used.)
(b) How will the restart operator or LEA recruit and place new, "effective" or "high-potential" personnel in the school? How will student academic growth data factor into personnel selection decisions? Indicate if the operator/LEA will hire teachers from non-traditional preparation programs, such as Teach for America (TFA), to work at the restart school.
(c) What strategies are or will be implemented in the restart school to retain and promote the most talented personnel?
(d) What experience, training, and skills does/will the restart school leader possess?
(e) How they will the operator/LEA evaluate teacher effectiveness at the restart school on an ongoing basis? Will these evaluations take into account student academic growth as one of multiple measures of teacher performance?
(f) How will the operator/LEA use regular teacher evaluations and formative & summative student academic data to develop individualized, job-embedded professional development for all teachers at the restart school?

4. Proven instructional strategies
(a) Describe the rigorous, research-based instructional framework that will be used in all classrooms at the restart school. How is this instructional framework aligned to state academic performance standards?
(b) How will instruction be differentiated based on student needs (e.g., serving ELL, SPED, and overage/under-credited student populations)?
5. Outreach efforts
(a) How will/did the LEA inform school staff, students, parents, and community members about this SIG application and potential operational changes at the school?
(b) How will/did the LEA enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes/wished to attend the restart school?
(c) How will/did the LEA support students who can no longer attend the restart school because the school no longer serves certain grades?

6. Pre-implementation activities

(a) Should this school win SIG funding, the LEA will have the opportunity to conduct "pre-implementation activities." The pre-implementation period will begin approximately in May 2011 and will end in August 2011. Describe any activities the LEA will conduct on behalf of this restart school in order to ensure full and effective implementation of this intervention model beginning September 2011. [Note that *conducting pre-implementation activities is optional but highly recommended* by LDE.]

Approved "pre-implementation activities" include but are not limited to the following:

- Family and community engagement to educate stakeholders about changes taking place at the restart school and to cultivate their ongoing support and involvement at the school.
- Conducting a rigorous recruitment and evaluation process for external providers, especially those taking on school operating responsibilities.
- Recruiting, placing and training a new school leader and school staff.
- Evaluating current school staff based on locally adopted competencies.
- Designing and building new teacher and leader evaluation systems that incorporate student growth data.
- Evaluating and improving school instructional programs, with significant input from the school's incoming principal.
- Providing job-embedded professional development of staff and the school leader that will adequately prepare them to begin school intervention activities in the 2011-2012 school year.
- Developing an LEA data management and accountability system that will allow the LEA to consistently monitor school performance and provide ongoing feedback to the restart school, allowing the school to make informed mid-course corrections.

7. The "big picture"
(a) Articulate how the initiatives and activities proposed in this restart application fit together as one, cohesive strategy or theory of action that addresses 5 core components of school reform: 1. Highly effective teachers 2. Autonomy for school leaders 3. Highly effective school leader 4. Proven instructional strategies 5. Job-embedded professional development
(b) Which LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring that the restart plan proposed in this application is implemented with fidelity? Describe how these individuals will work together to oversee the plan's implementation.

Part 2E. Implementation plan

The LEA must create a 3-year implementation plan for the requirements pertaining to the restart intervention model. The LEA must also work closely with the school's leader/principal to complete this timeline.

The implementation plan should provide detailed activities on an ambitious schedule with significant progress expected by the end of the 2011-12 school year.

Write action steps in the boxes maked "activity" (use as many cells as needed and expand them to the necessary size) and mark an "x" in the cells underneath the months in order to indicate when the activities will take place.

	Activities that took place between Sept. 2009 and Feb. 2011	Pre-Implementation Period	Year 1: 2011 - 2012 School Year			Year 2: 2012 - 2013 School Year			Year 3: 2013 - 2014 School Year		
Intervention activity	*Sept. 2009 - Feb. 2011*	*May 2011 - August 2011*	*1st Quarter: Sept. - Dec*	*2nd Quarter: Jan. - April*	*3rd Quarter: May - Aug.*	*1st Quarter: Sept. - Dec*	*2nd Quarter: Jan. - April*	*3rd Quarter: May - Aug.*	*1st Quarter: Sept. - Dec*	*2nd Quarter: Jan. - April*	*3rd Quarter: May - Aug.*
1. Conduct a comprehensive recruitment process for a highly effective charter school operator, Charter Management Organization (CMO), or Education Management Organization (EMO) in order to convert the school or close and reopen the school under operator management. [See rubric for required elements of this recruitment process.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
2. Conduct a rigorous review process of the operator candidates that adequately assesses their prior performance, ability to work with low-performing schools, capacity to take over management responsibilities for the restart school, ability to recruit and place highly effective personnel in the restart school, and other criteria important to the success of the restart school.											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											

3. Establish a performance-based contract with the restart operator that holds the operator accountable for both student achievement and teacher effectiveness. [See rubric for recommended activities.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
4. Within the grades the restart school serves, allow all stdudents of the former school to attend the restart school. [See additional enrollment requirements in the rubric.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
5. Reach out to parents, school staff, and other community stakeholders regarding management changes that will take place at the restart school. [See rubric for recommended activities.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
Other activities?											

<END>

This section is worth 9 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 3A. Instructions

The applicant must complete the following three sections of annual performance goals:

1. Annual achievement goals
2. Leading indicator goals
3. State Priority Goals

Part 3B. Annual achievement goals

Set annual goals for student achievement on state assessments.

The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement at the school over the next three years. Set goals that increase the percentage of students proficient (i.e., scoring "basic" and above) in both reading and math on state assessments. Also set performance goals for science, social studies, and history, if applicable.

State assessment	Historical data 2008-2009	Historical data 2009-2010	Historical data 2010-2011	Projected annual goals 2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013
iLEAP math (Grade 3)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

iLEAP reading (Grade 3)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP science (Grade 3)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP social studies (Grade 3)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
LEAP math (Grade 4)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
LEAP reading	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students

(Grade 4)	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test	will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year			
iLEAP math (Grade 5)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP reading (Grade 5)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP science (Grade 5)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP social studies (Grade 5)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

iLEAP math (Grade 6)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP reading (Grade 6)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP science (Grade 6)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

iLEAP social studies (Grade 6)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP math (Grade 7)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP reading (Grade 7)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP science (Grade 7)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP social studies (Grade 7)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

LEAP math (Grade 8)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
LEAP reading (Grade 8)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP math (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students				
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP reading (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students				
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP science (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students				
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

iLEAP social studies (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	[redacted]	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test		
GEE math (10th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test		
GEE reading (10th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test		
GEE science (11th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test		

GEE social studies (11th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students		
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
Algebra I*	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
English II*	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

Geometry*		_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
		_____ # students who took test				
Biology*		_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
		_____ # students who took test				
English III*				_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
American History*					_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students

***These are state-administered "End of Course (EOC)" tests**

Part 3C. Leading indicators of performance

Set annual goals on nine leading indicators of performance as well as School Performance Scores (SPS).

The LEA must set leading indicator and SPS goals for the school for the 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 school years. If any historical data prior to the 2010-2011 school year are not available, mark "N/A" in the appropriate box.

Leading indicators		Historical data						Projected annual goals		
		2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Number of minutes within the school year										
Student participation rate on State assessments (i.e., LEAP, *i* LEAP, GEE, End of Course tests) in reading and in mathematics, by student subgroup	American Indian									
	Asian									
	Black									
	Hispanic									
	White									
	Paid									
	Free and Reduced Lunch									
	Disabled									
	Regular and GT									
	LEP									
	Non-LEP									
	Female									
	Male									
	Whole School									
Dropout rate										
Student attendance rate										
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes										
Discipline incidents										
Truants										
Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system										
Teacher attendance rate										

Louisiana School Performance Score (SPS)									

Part 3D. Louisiana State Priority Goals

Set annual goals on Louisiana's "Nine Priority Goals."

The LEA must set quantitative targets for each goal that applies to students served by the SIG-receiving school. If one or more of the priority goals does not pertain to the school, mark "N/A" in the appropriate boxes. For example, if the school does not have a pre-kindergarten program, the goal of having all children "enter kindergarten ready to learn" does not apply to this school.

Louisiana Children Will…	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Eligible schools
Enter kindergarten ready to learn				*Schools with pre-K programs*
Be literate by 3rd grade				*Schools serving grades 3 and below*
Arrive in 4th grade on time				*Schools serving grades 4 and below*
Perform at or above grade level in English Language Arts (ELA) by the 8th grade				*Schools serving grades 6 through 8*
Perform at or above grade level in Mathematics by 8th grade				*Schools serving grades 6 through 8*
Graduate on time				*Schools serving grades 9 through 12*

Enroll in post-secondary education within two years of graduation				*Schools serving grades 9 through 12*
Successfully complete at least one year of college				*Schools serving grades 9 through 12*
Achieve these goals regardless of race or socio-economic status				*All schools*

<END>

This section is worth 15 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 4A. School-level budget narrative

1. Human capital strategy	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the human capital strategy for the eligible school. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its human capital strategy.*	
Recruiting a new leader and additional staff	
Evaluating existing staff to inform dismissal decisions	
Selecting a new leader and staff	
Offering financial incentives, increased career opportunities, flexible work conditions or other similar strategies to develop and retain school staff	
Providing ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development, including expenses for instructional leaders, coaches, mentors, additional common planning time, consultation with outside experts or other strategies	
Supporting teacher, staff and leader effectiveness through mutual consent hiring and/or performance-based dismissals, including through buyouts or negotiations	
Developing rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers, support staff, and principals	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

2. Instructional program	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the LEA's proposed instructional program. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its instructional program strategy.*	
Selecting and implementing an instructional program	
Implementing reform strategies related to comprehensive instructional and learning supports, such as a school-wide RTI model, technology-based supports and interventions, rigorous coursework, transition support programs, or other similar strategies	
Selecting and contracting with an external provider/operator	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

3. Governance	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the LEA's governance plan for the eligible school The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its governance strategy.*	
Granting additional operational autonomy, such as over staffing, calendars, budgeting or other factors	
Adopting a new governance structure such as a district turnaround office, direct report to the district superintendent, or mult-year contract between the school and LEA or SEA	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

4. Extended learning time / additional supports	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the LEA's plan to increase learning time and provide additional supports. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its instructional program and/or student support strategy.*	
Increasing learning time, such as through adjustments to the school schedule, lengthening of the school day or year, or other strategies	
Providing a comprehensive learning supports system, such as through coordinated community resources, partnerships with local agencies, family literacy programs or other similar strategies	
Engaging parents and community partners, such as through direct outreach, orientation programs, public meetings, surveys, coordination with local agencies, or other strategies	
Providing transition supports for impacted students	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

5. Accountability	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to the LEA's plan for monitoring and accountability in the eligible school. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its accountability strategy.*	
Ongoing monitoring of results	
Developing systems to respond if student outcome and leading indicator data show an effort is off-track	
Conducting regular performance benchmarking	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

<END>

This section is worth 5 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 5A. Budget instructions

School-level program budget

As explained in the "LEA SIG Application," the applicant must complete a separate budget for each school for which it hopes to receive a grant award. The school-level program budget below applies only to the school in this particular restart application.

SIG funds may be used for "pre-implementation" activities from May 2011 through August 2011 and for "full implementation" activities from September 2011 through August 2014. If the applicant commits matching funds towards this specific school, indicate how these matching funds will be spent and during what time period(s). Note that *conducting pre-implementation activities is optional but highly encouraged* by LDE.

It is highly recommended that the applicant fill out this school-level budget electronically. Formulas embedded in this spreadsheet will automatically calculate totals for you.

Part 5B. School-level program budget summary

	SIG funding					LEA matching funds (optional)							
	Year 1		Year 2	Year 3		Year 1		Year 2	Year 3	Sustainability: Post SIG grant period			
Category	**(Pre-implementation, *optional*) 5/1/2011 -**	**(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012**	**9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013**	**9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014**	**Total SIG funding**	**(Pre-implementation) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011**	**(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012**	**9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013**	**9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014**	**9/1/2014 - 8/31/2015**	**9/1/2015 - 8/31/2016**	**Total LEA matching funds**	**Total program budget**
100 Salaries					$ -							$ -	$ -
200 Employee Benefits					$ -							$ -	$ -
300 Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs					$ -							$ -	$ -
400 Purchased Property Services					$ -							$ -	$ -
500 Other Purchased Services					$ -							$ -	$ -
600 Supplies					$ -							$ -	$ -
800 Other Objects					$ -							$ -	$ -
Subtotal - Operating Budget	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700 Property					$ -							$ -	$ -
900 Other Uses of Funds					$ -							$ -	$ -
Grand Total					$ -							$ -	$ -

Part 5C. School-level program budget detail

			SIG funding					LEA matching funds (optional)							
			Year 1		Year 2	Year 3		Year 1		Year 2	Year 3	Sustainability period			
Category	Budget Item	Description	(Pre-implementation, *optional*) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013	9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014	Total SIG funding	(Pre-implementation) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013	9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014	9/1/2014 - 8/31/2015	9/1/2015 - 8/31/2016	Total LEA matching funds	Total program budget
100 Salaries							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Salaries			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
200 Employees Benefits							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Employee Benefits			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
300 Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
400 Purchased Property Services							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Purchased Property Services			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

500 Other Purchased Services							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Purchased Services			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
600 Supplies							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Supplies			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
800 Other Objects							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Objects			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Subtotal - Operating Budgets			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700 Property							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Property			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
900 Other Uses of Funds							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Uses of Funds			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Grand Total			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

<END>

Scoring your application

Total score

The LEA applicant will submit just one LEA SIG Application and a School SIG Application for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that it commits to serve. **The LEA SIG Application is worth 90 points, and each School SIG application is worth 160 points; the LEA application plus one school application can receive up to 250 points total.** All applications submitted by one LEA will be scored by the same set of expert reviewers; however, awards will be determined on a school-by-school basis, meaning that an LEA could receive funding for one school but not another depending on the quality of each school's application.

Here's an example:
Galaxy LEA applies for SIG funding on behalf of Jupiter Elementary School, Mars Middle School, and Saturn High School. Galaxy LEA receives 80 points on its "LEA SIG Application," 150 points on the Saturn's "School SIG Application," 130 points on Mars' "School SIG Application," and 100 points on Jupiter's "School SIG Application."

Saturn's total score = 80 (LEA application) + 150 (School application) = 230 out of 250 possible points.
Mars' total score = 80 (LEA application) + 130 (School application) = 210 out of 250 possible points.
Jupiter's total score = 80 (LEA application) + 100 (School application) = 180 out of 250 possible points.

Use this rubric to assess the strength of your SIG applications as you develop them, but be sure to provide answers that honestly reflect current or projected actions.

LEA SIG Application

An LEA SIG Application is worth 90 points total:

General information - 2 points
LEA implementation strategy - 70 points
Assurances - 3 points
LEA budget - 15 points

School SIG Application

A School SIG Application is worth 160 points total. If the school will implement the turnaround, restart, or transformation model, its School SIG Application will be scored as follows:

Part 1. General information - 1 point
Part 2. Intervention strategy (Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation) - 130 points
Part 3. Annual performance goals - 9 points
Parts 4 - 5. School-level budget - 20 points

A school applying to implement the closure model will use a different scoring method because the "Annual performance goals" do not apply to this intervention model. Its School SIG Application can still receive up to 160 points and will be scored as follows:

Part 1. General information - 2 points
Part 2. Closure model - 138 points
Parts 3 - 4. School-level budget - 20 points

Note: The applicant must adddress in its implementation plan all requirements of the intervention model (turnaround, restart, transformation, or closure) selected for the school. A School SIG Application that fails to complete its "implementation plan" will receive zero (0) points for the entire application.

School application (restart model): 160 points total

Part 1. General information (1 point total)		
The applicant provides all information requested on the "General information" tab, including signatures from the School Principal/Leader and the school's primary contact person, if that contact person is not the School Principal/Leader	**0 -** Applicant does not provide some or all of the information requested	**1 -** Applicant provides all information requested

Part 2. Restart model (130 points total)			
Part 2B. Point of departure (7 points)			
1; 2(a) Needs assessment: The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment such as LANA, Scholastic Audit, Quality Review, SACS, Breaking Ranks II, or High Schools That Work; from this needs assessment, the LEA identified the school's core areas for improvement	**0** - The LEA did not conduct a needs assessment of the school; OR this needs assessment was not thorough	**1 -** The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment but did not identify the school's core areas for improvement	**3 -** The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment and used the information to identify the school's core areas for improvement
2(b) Diagnosis: The LEA has identified both the root causes of the school's low-performance and the existing barriers to improvement	**0 -** The LEA did not identify either the root causes of the school's low-performance nor the barriers to improvement	**2 -** The LEA has identified causes of low-performance and barriers to improvement, but no causes/barriers are linked to the LEA or school themselves	**4 -** The LEA has identified causes of low-performance and barriers to improvement, including causes/barriers related to the LEA and school themselves
Part 2C. Point of arrival (16 points)			
1(a) Assessment goals: The LEA provides a clear, logical argument for the school's annual performance goals on state assessments (LEAP, iLEAP, GEE, EOC tests) which are linked to the school's available historical data and needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable	**0 -** The LEA presents a weak argument for the annual state assessment goals selected; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's available historical data and needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA presents a somewhat clear and logical argument for the annual state assessment goals selected; OR the goals are somewhat linked to the school's available historical data	**3 -** The LEA's argument for the school's annual state assessment goals selected is clear and logical; these ambitious yet achievable goals are directly linked to the school's available historial data and needs
1(b) Leading indicator goals: The LEA provides a clear, logical argument for the school's annual leading indicator and School Performance Score (SPS) goals which are linked to the school's available historical data and needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable	**0 -** The LEA presents a weak argument for for the annual leading indicator and SPS goals selected; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's available historical data and needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA presents a somewhat clear and logical argument for the leading indicator and SPS goals selected; OR the goals are somewhat linked to the school's available historical data	**3 -** The LEA's argument for the school's leading indicator and SPS goals selected is clear and logical; these ambitious yet achievable goals are directly linked to the school's available historial data and needs
1(c) State Priority Goals: The LEA provides a clear, logical argument for the school's annual State Priority Goals which are linked to the school's needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable	**0 -** The LEA presents a weak argument for the annual State Priority Goals selected; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA presents a somewhat clear and logical argument for the State Priority Goals goals selected; OR the goals are somewhat linked to the school's available historical data	**3 -** The LEA's argument for the school's State Priority Goals selected is clear and logical; and these ambitious yet achievable goals are directly linked to the school's needs

1(d) Additional goals: The LEA provides additional performance goals that are linked to the school's needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable. [These goals may be derived from may derived from Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) (including Louisiana Educational Assessment Program Alternative Assessment (LAA)), attendance and/or dropout rates, data on percent proficient, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Pre-K/Kindergarten screening tests, or other standardized assessments and unit assessments.]	**0 -** The LEA does not provide additional performance goals for the school; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA provides additional performance goals for the school; however, these goals are somewhat linked to the school's needs assessment.	**3 -** The LEA provides additional ambitious yet achievable performance goals for the school that are directly linked to the school's needs assessment.
1(e) Mid-course corrections: The LEA uses performance benchmarking to track the school's progress on a regular basis and also has a coherent, actionable plan in place to respond immediately if outcome and/or leading indicator data are off track	**0 -** The LEA does not use performance benchmarking on a regular basis; OR the LEA does not have a plan in place to respond immediately if the school's performance data are off track	**2 -** The LEA uses performance benchmarking on a regular basis; AND the LEA has a plan to respond if the school's performance data are off track, but this plan is only somewhat coherent and actionable	**4 -** The LEA uses performance benchmarking on a regular basis and has a coherent, actionable plan to respond immediately if the school's performance data are off track
Part 2D. Intervention strategy (50 points)			
1(a) - 1(e) Justification of chosen model: The LEA clearly explains why the restart intervention model is the right strategy for addressing the school's current needs and for helping the school reach its annual goals	**0 -** It is not clear from the LEA's explanation that the restart model will address the school's current needs and help reach the school reach its annual goals	**4 -** The LEA's explanation for selecting the restart model is somewhat linked to the school's current needs and annual goals	**8 -** The LEA's explanation for selecting the restart model is strongly linked to the school's current needs and annual goals
2(a) - 2(d) External capacity: The LEA is contracting with or will contract with a a high-quality charter school operator, Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Education Management Organization (EMO) to manage the school restart effort; this CMO/EMO has been or will be selected through a rigorous process and is or will be held accountable for the school's performance	**0 -** The LEA is not contracting - and will not contract - with a charter school operator / CMO / EMO to implement the school's restart intervention model	**5 -** The LEA is contracting - or will contract - with a charter school operator / CMO / EMO to implement the school's restart; however, the quality of the selection process described in the application is questionable OR the CMO/EMO is not - or will not be - held fully accountable for the school's performance	**10 -** The LEA is contracting - or will contract - with a charter school operator / CMO / EMO to implement the school's restart; the LEA describes a rigorous selection process and a concrete plan for holding the CMO/EMO fully accountable for the school's performance
3(a) - 3(f) Human capital development: The LEA has a smart, actionable strategy for recruiting, placing, and retaining talented teachers and leaders in the restart school as well as a sustainable plan for removing ineffective staff and leaders	**0 -** The LEA has a weak human capital strategy for recruiting, placing, retaining, or removing staff and leaders	**4 -** The LEA has a moderate human capital strategy for recruiting, placing, retaining, and removing staff and leaders	**9 -** The LEA has a smart, actionable human capital strategy for recruiting, placing, retaining, and removing staff and leaders
4(a) - 4(b) Proven instructional strategies: The LEA describes a research-based, rigorous instructional framework for the turnaround school that is aligned to state academic performance standards and differentiates instruction based on student needs (e.g., serving ELL, SPED, and overage/under-credited student populations)	**0 -** The LEA describes an instructional framework that is not rigorous, research-based, or aligned to state academic performance standards	**4 -** The LEA describes an instructional framework that is rigorous, research-based, and aligned to state academic performance standards; however it is not clear how the instructional framework differentiates instruction based on students needs	**9 -** The LEA describes an instructional framework that is rigorous, research-based, and aligned to state academic performance standards; this instructional framework clearly differentiates instruction based on students needs

5(a) - 5(c) Outreach: The LEA has informed and/or will inform school staff, students, parents, and community members about operational changes at the school	**0 -** The LEA has made little to no attempts to inform school staff, school students, parents, or community members about the SIG application; OR the LEA has no strong plan in place to inform these stakeholders about the school's intervention	**3 -** The LEA has had some communications with stakeholders about the SIG application and has a moderate plan for continued communications pending receipt of grant funds	**7 -** The LEA has communicated clearly with stakeholders about the SIG application and also has a strong plan for continued communciations pending receipt of grant funds
7(a) - 7(b) Overall restart strategy: The LEA explains how the activities proposed in this school application fit together as one, cohesive strategy or theory of action that addresses 5 core components of school reform: 1. Highly effective teachers 2. Autonomy for school leaders 3. Highly effective school leader 4. Proven instructional strategies 5. Job-embedded professional development Additionally, the LEA describes how LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring that the restart plan is implemented with fidelity.	**0 -** The LEA's strategy or theory of action does not address any of the 5 core components of school reform OR the LEA does not describe how LEA central office and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring that the restart plan is implemented with fidelity	**3 -** The LEA describes how LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring full implementation of the restart plan, and the LEA presents an overarching strategy or theory of action for the activities proposed in this application; however, the LEA does not address all 5 core components of school reform	**7 -** The LEA describes how LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring full implementation of the restart plan, and the LEA presents a cohesive strategy or theory of action for the activities proposed in this application that addresses all 5 core components of school reform

Part 2E. Implementation plan (57 points) **[Reminder: If any implementation requirement of the restart model is not addressed in the implementation plan, the LEA will receive 0 points for the school's entire application.]**			
1. Recruit restart operator: The LEA describes detailed activities it will take or already has taken to recruit a highly effective charter school operator, a Charter Management Organization (CMO), or an Education Management Organization (EMO) for the restart school; the LEA recruited or will recruit several potential operators and provides one or more operator names; recruitment activities may include but are not limited to, • Releasing a Request for Proposals (RFP) from potential providers that clearly delineates the LEA's expectations • Conducting outreach efforts, including phone or in-person interviews of potential providers	**0 -** The LEA does not detail activities for recruiting a highly effective charter school operator, CMO, or EMO for the restart school; OR the LEA's activities do not include recruiting more than one operator	**4 -** The LEA describes activities that constitute a moderate plan for recruiting a highly effective charter school operator, CMO, or EMO for the restart school; OR the LEA's recruiting process involves limited outreach efforts	**8 -** The LEA describes several activities that constitute a comprehensive plan for recruiting a highly effective charter school operator, CMO, or EMO for the restart school; AND the LEA's recruiting process involves releasing an RFP as well as other outreach efforts
2. Select restart operator: The LEA describes detailed activities it will take or has already taken to rigorously review potential operators for the restart school; the LEA's review process involves the following activities: • Assessing applicants' reform plans and strategies and their alignment with the restart school's needs assessment • Assessing applicants' history with low-performing schools • Assessing applicants' capacity to implement the restart intervention • Assessing applicants' human capital strategies	**0 -** The LEA does not detail activities for rigorously reviewing potential operators for the restart school; OR the LEA's approach to assessing applicant quality is weak	**7 -** The LEA describes activities for reviewing potential operators for the restart school, but the LEA's approach to assessing applicant quality is not comprehensive	**15** - The LEA describes several activities for rigorously reviewing potential operators for the restart school; these activities demonstrate a comprehensive approach to assessing applicant quality
3. Contracting process: The LEA describes detailed activities it will take to establish a contract with the restart operator that holds the operator accountable for student achievement and monitors the operator's progress; these activities may include but are not liminted to, • Negotiating a performance-based contract that clearly specifies LEA and operator responsibilities, autonomies, and expected outcomes • Determining the conditions of contract continuation, renewal and/or extension • Building monitoring instruments and a monitoring process that relies heavily on student academic performance and teacher effectiveness • Determining the conditions under which the contract may be terminated and, if applicable, the restart school may be closed	**0 -** The LEA does not describe the steps it will take to establish a performance-based contract with the selected restart operator; OR the performance contract will not hold the operator accountable for improving student achievement	**5 -** The LEA describes activities that constitute a moderate plan for establishing a performance-based contract with the selected restart operator; the operator will be held accountable for student academic performance OR teacher effectiveness, but not both	**10 -** The LEA describes several activities that constitute a comprehensive plan for establishing a performance-based contract with the selected restart operator; the operator will be held accountable for both student academic performance and teacher effectiveness

4. Enrollment: The LEA describes detailed activities that will ensure that the restart school will enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school; the charter school operator / CMO / EMO may require all former students who wish to attend the restart school to sign student or parent/student agreements covering student behavior, attendance, or other commitments related to academic performance, but the CMO/EMO **may not** require students to meet, for example, certain academic standards prior to enrolling in the school	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities for enrolling all students who wish to attend the restart school within the grades it serves; OR the LEA's enrollment plan is weak; OR the LEA's plan will require parent/student agreements that require students to meet certain academic standards prior to enrolling in the restart school	**5 -** The LEA describes activities that constitute a moderate plan for enrolling all students who wish to attend the restart school within the grades it serves; the LEA has no plans to require students to meet certain academic standards prior to enrolling in the restart school	**10 -** The LEA describes several activities that constitute a comprehensive plan for enrolling all students who wish to attend the restart school within the grades it serves; the LEA has no plans to require students to meet certain academic standards prior to enrolling in the restart school
5. Family and community outreach: The LEA describes detailed activities it will take to inform parents, school staff and students, and other community stakeholders about the change in operational leadership at the school. The activities may include but are not limited to any of the following: • Making detailed information about the restart process available online and/or through newsletters • Holding public meetings to educate stakeholders about the restart operator • Involving parents in the development of the restart school's new mission, vision, and values	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities that will inform stakeholders about operational changes taking place at the restart school; OR the LEA's proposed activities constitute a weak plan	**7 -** The LEA describes activities that constitute a moderate plan to inform stakeholders about operational changes taking place at the restart school	**14 -** The LEA describes several activities that constitute a strong plan to inform stakeholders about operational changes taking place at the restart school

Part 3. Annual performance goals (9 points total)			
Part 3A. Annual achievement goals (3 points)			
The LEA set ambitious but achievable annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in reading and math (and science and social studies or history, if applicable) for each grade served by the school AND these goals are based on historical data, if the data are available	**0 -** The LEA does not provide annual achievement goals on State assessments; OR the goals are unrealistic; OR the goals are not ambitious	**1 -** The LEA provides annual achievement goals on State assessments, based on historical data, that are achievable but only somewhat ambitious	**3 -** The LEA provides annual achievement goals on State assessments, based on historical data, that are ambitious yet still achievable
Part 3B. Leading indicator goals (3 points)			
The LEA set ambitious but achievable annual goals for the school on all leading indicators provided, including School Performance Scores, AND these goals are based on historical data, if the data are available	**0 -** The LEA does not set annual leading indicator and SPS goals; OR the goals are unrealistic; OR the goals are not ambitious	**1 -** The LEA set annual leading indicator and SPS goals, based on historical data, that are achievable but only somewhat ambitious	**3 -** The LEA set annual leading indicator and SPS goals, based on historical data, that are ambitious yet still achievable
Part 3C. State Priority Goals (3 points)			
The LEA set ambitious but achievable annual goals for the school on all nine State Priority Goals	**0 -** The LEA does not set annual State Priority Goals; OR the goals are unrealistic; OR the goals are not ambitious	**1 -** The LEA set annual State Priority Goals that are achievable but only somewhat ambitious	**3 -** The LEA set annual State Priority Goals that are ambitious yet still achievable

Parts 4-5. School budget (20 points total)			
Part 4. Budget narrative (15 points)			
Part 4A, 1. Human capital strategy: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's human capital strategy	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed human capital strategy	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed human capital strategy	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed human capital strategy
Part 4A, 2. Instructional program: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's instructional program	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed instructional program	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed instructional program	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed instructional program
Part 4A, 3. Governance: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the new governance structure	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed governance structure	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed governance structure	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed governance structure
Part 4A, 4. Extended learing time / add'l supports: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's extended learning time and additional student supports plan	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed plan	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed plan	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed plan
Part 4A, 5. Accountability: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's accountability efforts	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed accountability plan	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed accountability plan	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed accountability plan
Overall, the school-level budget narrative addresses all of the core expenditures of the school's proposed intervention strategy	**0 -** The LEA's school-level budget narrative addresses none or few of the core expenditures related to its intervention	**3 -** The LEA's school-level budget narrative addresses some but not all of the core expenditures related to its intervention	**5 -** The LEA's school level-budget narrative addresses all of the core expenditures related to its intervention
Part 5. Budget detail (5 points)			
Part 5B and 5C: The proposed expenditures for this school are reasonable and necessary to implement the school's intervention model fully and effectively	**0 -** The LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are insufficient or exaggerated for its proposed intervention strategy	**3 -** Many but not all of the LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are reasonable and necessary for its proposed intervention strategy	**5 -** All of the LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are reasonable and necessary for its proposed intervention strategy

This section is worth 1 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application.
(See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 1A. Instructions
For a Tier I, Tier II OR Tier III school, complete each of the following tabs:
1. General information
2. Transformation model
3. Annual performance goals
4. School-level budget narrative
5. School-level budget items

Part 1B. Provide the folllowing information:	
School name	
Site Code	
Mailing address	
School Principal/Leader	
Phone #	
E-mail address	
Signature	
School primary contact person (if different from School Principal/Leader)	
Phone #	
Email address	
Signature	
Eligibility tier	
Grades served	
2010-11 student enrollment	
Chosen intervention model	
Grant amount requested for this school	

<END>

This section is worth 130 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 2A. Instructions

There are 4 main parts to this section of the application:

1. Point of departure
2. Point of arrival
3. Intervention strategy
4. Implementation plan

Utilize the school's needs assessment to determine its current performance level ("Point of departure") and analyze this data to set its annual performance goals for the next three years ("Point of arrival"). From there, use the questions around the school's chosen intervention strategy to determine how it will reach these goals. Finally, complete the implementation plan to identify specific actions to carry out this strategy.

Part 2B. Point of departure: School needs assessment

1. Type of needs assessment conducted (e.g., LANA, Scholastic Audit, Quality Review, SACS, Breaking Ranks II, High Schools That Work, or another similarly accredited needs assessment)

2. Results of needs assessment

(a) Provide a thorough description of the results of the needs assessment and link these results to the intervention selected for this school/campus. (Summarize here and attach the full assessment results to the application.) Describe the areas of student performance most in need of improvement.

(b) Using information gathered from the school's needs assessment and other relevant data, what seem to be the root causes of the school's low-performance and barriers to improvement? (Include causes/barriers linked to the LEA and the school themselves.)

Part 2C. Point of arrival: School performance goals

1. Describe the school's annual performance goals

(a) Based on the school's needs assessment and the historical data available, provide a clear and logical rationale for the annual achievement goals on Louisiana's state assessments (LEAP, iLEAP, GEE , EOC tests) provided on the "Annual performance goals" tab (Tab 3 of this worksheet). Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(b) Based on the school's needs assessment and the historical data available, provide a clear and logical rationale for the annual leading indicator goals, including SPS goals, provided on the "Annual performance goals" tab (Tab 3 of this worksheet). Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(c) Based on the school's needs assessment, provide a clear and logical rationale for the school's annual "State Priority Goals" provided on the "Annual performance goals" tab (Tab 3 of this worksheet). Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(d) Based on the school's needs assessment, describe any other achievement goals for the school. [These goals may derived from Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) (including Louisiana Educational Assessment Program Alternative Assessment [LAA]), attendance and/or dropout rates, data on percent proficient, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Pre-K/Kindergarten screening tests, or other standardized assessments and unit assessments.] Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(e) How will the LEA use performance benchmarking to track the school's performance on a regular basis? Describe how the LEA will respond immediately if student outcome and leading indicator data show the transformation intervention is off-track.

Part 2D. Intervention strategy: Transformation model

1. Justification for selecting the transformation model

(a) Explain how the LEA will use the transformation intervention model to address the root causes of the school's low-performance as identified under Part 2B above.

(b) If the LEA has begun implementing, in whole or in part, the transformation intervention model within the last two years (i.e., during the 2009-10 school year or later) and wishes to continue or complete the intervention, describe the actions it has already taken relative to the transformation intervention model requirements.

(c) Does the school currently participate in any of the following state-sponsored school improvement programs: Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), Distinguished Educators (DE) program, Literacy program, College-and-Career Readiness (CCR) program, Science Technology Engineering & Math (STEM) program, Extended Learning Time (ELT) program, Advanced Placement (AP) program, or International Baccalaureate (IB) program? If so, describe how the school will leverage the program(s) to support its transformation intervention efforts?

(d) What school improvement efforts has this school undertaken in recent years that have **not** resulted in improved student academic performance? Explain why these efforts were not successful and why the transformation intervention will be successful in comparison with these prior efforts.

2. Human capital development
(a) A requirement of the transformation model is to identify and remove ineffective staff from the transformation school. How does, or will, the LEA define "ineffective," and what is the plan for removing these personnel?
(b) What will happen to the school leader and staff members who are removed from the transformation school (e.g., Will they be reassigned to other schools in the LEA?)?
(c) How will the LEA recruit and place new, "effective" or "high-potential" personnel, including a new principal, in the transformation school? How will student academic growth data factor into personnel selection decisions? Indicate if the LEA will hire teachers from non-traditional preparation programs, such as Teach for America (TFA), to work at the transformation school.
(d) What experience, training, and skills does/will the new school leader possess?
(e) What strategies are or will be implemented in the transformation school to retain and promote the most talented personnel?
(f) How they will the LEA evaluate teacher effectiveness at the transformation school, taking into account student academic growth as one of multiple measures of teacher performance?
(g) How will the LEA use regular teacher evaluations and formative & summative student academic data to develop individualized, job-embedded professional development for all teachers at the transformation school?

3. External capacity

If the LEA is contracting or will contract with an external provider (including, but not limited to, CMOs and EMOs) to manage the transformation school, answer the following questions:

(a) Describe the process for recruiting, selecting and evaluating the external provider that is managing or will manage the transformation school.

(b) Is the external provider currently managing the transformation school? If so, when was the provider put in place and how has the provider impacted the school thus far?

(c) How is the provider held - or how will the provider be held - accountable for producing significant growth in academic achievement at the school?

4. Proven instructional strategies

(a) Describe the rigorous, research-based instructional framework that will be used in all classrooms at the transformation school. How is this instructional framework aligned to state academic performance standards?

(b) How will instruction be differentiated based on student needs (e.g., serving ELL, SPED, and overage/under-credited student populations)?

5. Outreach efforts

(a) How will/did the LEA inform school staff, students, parents, and community members about this SIG application and potential operational changes at the school?

6. Pre-implementation activities

(a) Should this school win SIG funding, the LEA will have the opportunity to conduct "pre-implementation activities." The pre-implementation period will begin approximately in May 2011 and will end in August 2011. Describe any activities the LEA will conduct on behalf of this transformation school in order to ensure full and effective implementation of this intervention model beginning September 2011. [Note that pre-implementation activities are *optional* but *highly recommended by LDE* .]

Approved "pre-implementation activities" include but are not limited to the following:

- Family and community engagement to educate stakeholders about changes taking place at the transformation school and to cultivate their ongoing support and involvement at the school.
- Conducting a rigorous recruitment and evaluation process for external providers, especially those taking on school operating responsibilities.
- Recruiting, placing and training a new school leader and school staff.
- Evaluating current school staff based on locally adopted competencies.
- Designing and building new teacher and leader evaluation systems that incorporate student growth data.
- Evaluating and improving school instructional programs, with significant input from the school's incoming principal.
- Providing job-embedded professional development of staff and the school leader that will adequately prepare them to begin school intervention activities in the 2011-2012 school year.
- Developing an LEA data management and accountability system that will allow the LEA to consistently monitor school performance and provide ongoing feedback to the transformation school, allowing the school to make informed mid-course corrections.

7. The "big picture"
(a) Articulate how the initiatives and activities proposed in this transformation application fit together as one, cohesive strategy or theory of action that addresses 5 core components of school reform: 1. Highly effective teachers 2. Autonomy for school leaders 3. Highly effective transformation leader 4. Proven instructional strategies 5. Job-embedded professional development
(b) Which LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring that the transformation plan proposed in this application is implemented with fidelity? Describe how these individuals will work together to oversee the plan's implementation.

Part 2E. Implementation plan

The LEA must create a 3-year implementation plan for the requirements pertaining to the transformation intervention model. If the new principal of the transformation school has already been selected, the LEA must also work closely with the principal to complete this timeline.

The implementation plan should provide detailed activities on an ambitious schedule with significant progress expected by the end of the 2011-12 school year.

Write action steps in the boxes maked "activity" (use as many cells as needed and expand them to the necessary size) and mark an "x" in the cells underneath the months in order to indicate when the activities will take place.

	Activities that took place between Sept. 2009 and Feb. 2011	Pre-Implementation Period	Year 1: 2011 - 2012 School Year			Year 2: 2012 - 2013 School Year			Year 3: 2013 - 2014 School Year		
Intervention activity	*Sept. 2009 - Feb. 2011*	*May 2011 - August 2011*	*1st Quarter: Sept. - Dec*	*2nd Quarter: Jan. - April*	*3rd Quarter: May - Aug.*	*1st Quarter: Sept. - Dec*	*2nd Quarter: Jan. - April*	*3rd Quarter: May - Aug.*	*1st Quarter: Sept. - Dec*	*2nd Quarter: Jan. - April*	*3rd Quarter: May - Aug.*
1. Replace the school's principal. [The applicant must address the new principal's expertise specific to the needs of the transformation school.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
2. Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement a fully comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											

3. Ensure the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO)											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
4. Use strategies such as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions to recruit, place, and retain staff for the school. [The applicant must identify activities related to each of these strategies: staff recruitment, staff placement, and staff retention.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
5. Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for the school principal and teachers that 1) take into account data on student growth as one of multiple measures of performance and 2) are designed and developed with principal and teacher involvement.											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											

6. Identify and reward the school leader, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement (and high school graduation rates) and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to improve their professional practice, have not done so											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
7. Provide high-quality, job-embedded professional development for staff that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, is designed with school staff, and incorporates teacher evaluation and student academic data (formative and summative). [See rubric for required and optional elements of the proposed professional development program.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
8. Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time. [The applicant must include the % increase in learning time for this school.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											

9. Identify and implement an instructional program that is vertically aligned between grades as well as aligned with with State academic standards											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
10. Promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
11. Provide ongoing mechanism for family and community engagement											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
Other activities?											

<END>

This section is worth 9 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 3A. Instructions

The applicant must complete the following three sections of annual performance goals:

1. Annual achievement goals
2. Leading indicator goals
3. State Priority Goals

Part 3B. Annual achievement goals

Set annual goals for student achievement on state assessments.

The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement at the school over the next three years. Set goals that increase the percentage of students proficient (i.e., scoring "basic" and above) in both reading and math on state assessments. Also set performance goals for science, social studies, and history, if applicable.

State assessment	Historical data 2008-2009	Historical data 2009-2010	Historical data 2010-2011	Projected annual goals 2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013
iLEAP math (Grade 3)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP reading (Grade 3)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

iLEAP science (Grade 3)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
iLEAP social studies (Grade 3)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
LEAP math (Grade 4)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
LEAP reading (Grade 4)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				

iLEAP math (Grade 5)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
iLEAP reading (Grade 5)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
iLEAP science (Grade 5)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
iLEAP social studies (Grade 5)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
iLEAP math (Grade 6)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				

iLEAP reading (Grade 6)	% proficient, all students # students who took test	% proficient, all students # students who took test	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
iLEAP science (Grade 6)	% proficient, all students # students who took test	% proficient, all students # students who took test	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
iLEAP social studies (Grade 6)	% proficient, all students # students who took test	% proficient, all students # students who took test	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
iLEAP math (Grade 7)	% proficient, all students # students who took test	% proficient, all students # students who took test	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students

iLEAP reading (Grade 7)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP science (Grade 7)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP social studies (Grade 7)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
LEAP math (Grade 8)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
LEAP reading (Grade 8)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

iLEAP math (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test	
iLEAP reading (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test	
iLEAP science (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test	

iLEAP social studies (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	[redacted]	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test		
GEE math (10th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test		
GEE reading (10th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test		
GEE science (11th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test		

GEE social studies (11th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students		
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
Algebra I*	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
English II*	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
Geometry*		_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
		_____ # students who took test				

Biology*		_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
		_____ # students who took test				
English III*				_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
American History*					_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students

***These are state-administered "End of Course (EOC)" tests**

Part 3C. Leading indicators of performance

Set annual goals on nine leading indicators of performance as well as School Performance Scores (SPS).

The LEA must set leading indicator and SPS goals for the school for the 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 school years. If any historical data prior to the 2010-2011 school year are not available, mark "N/A" in the appropriate box.

Leading indicators		Historical data						Projected annual goals		
		2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Number of minutes within the school year										
Student participation rate on State assessments (i.e., LEAP, *i* LEAP, GEE, End of Course tests) in reading and in mathematics, by student subgroup	American Indian									
	Asian									
	Black									
	Hispanic									
	White									
	Paid									
	Free and Reduced Lunch									
	Disabled									
	Regular and GT									
	LEP									
	Non-LEP									
	Female									
	Male									
	Whole School									
Dropout rate										
Student attendance rate										
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes										
Discipline incidents										
Truants										
Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system										
Teacher attendance rate										
Louisiana School Performance Score (SPS)										

Part 3D. Louisiana State Priority Goals

Set annual goals on Louisiana's "Nine Priority Goals."

The LEA must set quantitative targets for each goal that applies to students served by the SIG-receiving school. If one or more of the priority goals does not pertain to the school, mark "N/A" in the appropriate boxes. For example, if the school does not have a pre-kindergarten program, the goal of having all children "enter kindergarten ready to learn" does not apply to this school.

Louisiana Children Will…	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Eligible schools
Enter kindergarten ready to learn				*Schools with pre-K programs*
Be literate by 3rd grade				*Schools serving grades 3 and below*
Arrive in 4th grade on time				*Schools serving grades 4 and below*
Perform at or above grade level in English Language Arts (ELA) by the 8th grade				*Schools serving grades 6 through 8*
Perform at or above grade level in Mathematics by 8th grade				*Schools serving grades 6 through 8*
Graduate on time				*Schools serving grades 9 through 12*

Enroll in post-secondary education within two years of graduation				*Schools serving grades 9 through 12*
Successfully complete at least one year of college				*Schools serving grades 9 through 12*
Achieve these goals regardless of race or socio-economic status				*All schools*

<END>

This section is worth 15 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 4A. School-level budget narrative

1. Human capital strategy	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the human capital strategy for the eligible school. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its human capital strategy.*	
Recruiting a new leader and additional staff	
Evaluating existing staff to inform dismissal decisions	
Selecting a new leader and staff	
Offering financial incentives, increased career opportunities, flexible work conditions or other similar strategies to develop and retain school staff	
Providing ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development, including expenses for instructional leaders, coaches, mentors, additional common planning time, consultation with outside experts or other strategies	
Supporting teacher, staff and leader effectiveness through mutual consent hiring and/or performance-based dismissals, including through buyouts or negotiations	
Developing rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers, support staff, and principals	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

2. Instructional program	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the LEA's proposed instructional program. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its instructional program strategy.*	
Selecting and implementing an instructional program	
Implementing reform strategies related to comprehensive instructional and learning supports, such as a school-wide RTI model, technology-based supports and interventions, rigorous coursework, transition support programs, or other similar strategies	
Selecting and contracting with an external provider/operator	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

3. Governance	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the LEA's governance plan for the eligible school The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its governance strategy.*	
Granting additional operational autonomy, such as over staffing, calendars, budgeting or other factors	
Adopting a new governance structure such as a district turnaround office, direct report to the district superintendent, or mult-year contract between the school and LEA or SEA	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

4. Extended learning time / additional supports	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the LEA's plan to increase learning time and provide additional supports. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its extended learning time or student support strategy.*	
Increasing learning time, such as through adjustments to the school schedule, lengthening of the school day or year, or other strategies	
Providing a comprehensive learning supports system, such as through coordinated community resources, partnerships with local agencies, family literacy programs or other similar strategies	
Engaging parents and community partners, such as through direct outreach, orientation programs, public meetings, surveys, coordination with local agencies, or other strategies	
Providing transition supports for impacted students	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

5. Accountability	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to the LEA's plan for monitoring and accountability in the eligible school. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its accountability strategy.*	
Ongoing monitoring of results	
Developing systems to respond if student outcome and leading indicator data show an effort is off-track	
Conducting regular performance benchmarking	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

<END>

This section is worth 5 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 5A. Budget instructions

School-level program budget

As explained in the "LEA SIG Application," the applicant must complete a separate budget for each school for which it hopes to receive a grant award. The school-level program budget below applies only to the school in this particular transformation application.

SIG funds may be used for "pre-implementation" activities from May 2011 through August 2011 and for "full implementation" activities from September 2011 through August 2014. If the applicant commits matching funds towards this specific school, indicate how these matching funds will be spent and during what time period(s). Note that *conducting pre-implementation activities is optional but highly encouraged* by LDE.

It is highly recommended that the applicant fill out this school-level budget electronically. Formulas embedded in this spreadsheet will automatically calculate totals for you.

Part 5B. School-level program budget summary

	SIG funding					LEA matching funds (optional)							
	Year 1		Year 2	Year 3		Year 1		Year 2	Year 3	Sustainability: Post SIG grant period			
Category	**(Pre-implementation, *optional*) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011**	**(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012**	**9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013**	**9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014**	**Total SIG funding**	**(Pre-implementation) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011**	**(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012**	**9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013**	**9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014**	**9/1/2014 - 8/31/2015**	**9/1/2015 - 8/31/2016**	**Total LEA matching funds**	**Total program budget**
100 Salaries					$ -							$ -	$ -
200 Employee Benefits					$ -							$ -	$ -
300 Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs					$ -							$ -	$ -
400 Purchased Property Services					$ -							$ -	$ -
500 Other Purchased Services					$ -							$ -	$ -
600 Supplies					$ -							$ -	$ -
800 Other Objects					$ -							$ -	$ -
Subtotal - Operating Budget	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700 Property					$ -							$ -	$ -
900 Other Uses of Funds					$ -							$ -	$ -
Grand Total					$ -							$ -	$ -

Part 5C. School-level program budget detail

			SIG funding					LEA matching funds (optional)							
			Year 1		Year 2	Year 3		Year 1		Year 2	Year 3	Sustainability period			
Category	Budget Item	Description	(Pre-implementation, *optional*) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013	9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014	Total SIG funding	(Pre-implementation) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013	9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014	9/1/2014 - 8/31/2015	9/1/2015 - 8/31/2016	Total LEA matching funds	Total program budget
100 Salaries							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Salaries			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
200 Employees Benefits							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Employee Benefits			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
300 Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
400 Purchased Property Services							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Purchased Property Services			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

500 Other Purchased Services							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Purchased Services			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
600 Supplies							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Supplies			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
800 Other Objects							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Objects			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Subtotal - Operating Budgets			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700 Property							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Property			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
900 Other Uses of Funds							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Uses of Funds			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Grand Total			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

<END>

Scoring your application

Total score

The LEA applicant will submit just one LEA SIG Application and a School SIG Application for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that it commits to serve. **The LEA SIG Application is worth 90 points, and each School SIG application is worth 160 points; the LEA application plus one school application can receive up to 250 points total.** All applications submitted by one LEA will be scored by the same set of expert reviewers; however, awards will be determined on a school-by-school basis, meaning that an LEA could receive funding for one school but not another depending on the quality of each school's application.

Here's an example:
Galaxy LEA applies for SIG funding on behalf of Jupiter Elementary School, Mars Middle School, and Saturn High School. Galaxy LEA receives 80 points on its "LEA SIG Application," 150 points on the Saturn's "School SIG Application," 130 points on Mars' "School SIG Application," and 100 points on Jupiter's "School SIG Application."

Saturn's total score = 80 (LEA application) + 150 (School application) = 230 out of 250 possible points.
Mars' total score = 80 (LEA application) + 130 (School application) = 210 out of 250 possible points.
Jupiter's total score = 80 (LEA application) + 100 (School application) = 180 out of 250 possible points.

Use this rubric to assess the strength of your SIG applications as you develop them, but be sure to provide answers that honestly reflect current or projected actions.

LEA SIG Application

An LEA SIG Application is worth 90 points total:

General information - 2 points
LEA implementation strategy - 70 points
Assurances - 3 points
LEA budget - 15 points

School SIG Application

A School SIG Application is worth 160 points total. If the school will implement the turnaround, restart, or transformation model, its School SIG Application will be scored as follows:

Part 1. General information - 1 point
Part 2. Intervention strategy (Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation) - 130 points
Part 3. Annual performance goals - 9 points
Parts 4 - 5. School-level budget - 20 points

A school applying to implement the closure model will use a different scoring method because the "Annual performance goals" do not apply to this intervention model. Its School SIG Application can still receive up to 160 points and will be scored as follows:

Part 1. General information - 2 points
Part 2. Closure model - 138 points
Parts 3 - 4. School-level budget - 20 points

Note: The applicant must adddress in its implementation plan all requirements of the intervention model (turnaround, restart, transformation, or closure) selected for the school. A School SIG Application that fails to complete its "implementation plan" will receive zero (0) points for the entire application.

School application (transformation model): 160 points total

Part 1. General information (1 point total)

The applicant provides all information requested on the "General information" tab, including signatures from the School Principal/Leader and the school's primary contact person, if that contact person is not the School Principal/Leader	**0 -** Applicant does not provide some or all of the information requested	**1 -** Applicant provides all information requested

Part 2. Transformation model (130 points total)

Part 2B. Point of departure (7 points)

1; 2(a)Needs assessment: The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment such as LANA, Scholastic Audit, Quality Review, SACS, Breaking Ranks II, or High Schools That Work; from this needs assessment, the LEA identified the school's core areas for improvement	**0** - The LEA did not conduct a needs assessment of the school; OR this needs assessment was not thorough	**1 -** The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment but did not identify the school's core areas for improvement	**3 -** The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment and used the information to identify the school's core areas for improvement
2(b) Diagnosis: The LEA has identified both the root causes of the school's low-performance and the existing barriers to improvement	**0 -** The LEA did not identify either the root causes of the school's low-performance nor the barriers to improvement	**2 -** The LEA has identified causes of low-performance and barriers to improvement, but no causes/barriers are linked to the LEA or school themselves	**4 -** The LEA has identified causes of low-performance and barriers to improvement, including causes/barriers related to the LEA and school themselves

Part 2C. Point of arrival (16 points)			
1(a) Assessment goals: The LEA provides a clear, logical argument for the school's annual performance goals on state assessments (LEAP, iLEAP, GEE, EOC tests) which are linked to the school's available historical data and needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable	**0 -** The LEA presents a weak argument for the annual state assessment goals selected; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's available historical data and needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA presents a somewhat clear and logical argument for the annual state assessment goals selected; OR the goals are somewhat linked to the school's available historical data	**3 -** The LEA's argument for the school's annual state assessment goals selected is clear and logical; these ambitious yet achievable goals are directly linked to the school's available historial data and needs
1(b) Leading indicator goals: The LEA provides a clear, logical argument for the school's annual leading indicator and School Performance Score (SPS) goals which are linked to the school's available historical data and needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable	**0 -** The LEA presents a weak argument for for the annual leading indicator and SPS goals selected; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's available historical data and needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA presents a somewhat clear and logical argument for the leading indicator and SPS goals selected; OR the goals are somewhat linked to the school's available historical data	**3 -** The LEA's argument for the school's leading indicator and SPS goals selected is clear and logical; these ambitious yet achievable goals are directly linked to the school's available historial data and needs
1(c) State Priority Goals: The LEA provides a clear, logical argument for the school's annual State Priority Goals which are linked to the school's needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable	**0 -** The LEA presents a weak argument for the annual State Priority Goals selected; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA presents a somewhat clear and logical argument for the State Priority Goals goals selected; OR the goals are somewhat linked to the school's available historical data	**3 -** The LEA's argument for the school's State Priority Goals selected is clear and logical; and these ambitious yet achievable goals are directly linked to the school's needs
1(d) Additional goals: The LEA provides additional performance goals that are linked to the school's needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable. [These goals may be derived from may derived from Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) (including Louisiana Educational Assessment Program Alternative Assessment (LAA)), attendance and/or dropout rates, data on percent proficient, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Pre-K/Kindergarten screening tests, or other standardized assessments and unit assessments.]	**0 -** The LEA does not provide additional performance goals for the school; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA provides additional performance goals for the school; however, these goals are somewhat linked to the school's needs assessment.	**3 -** The LEA provides additional ambitious yet achievable performance goals for the school that are directly linked to the school's needs assessment.
1(e) Mid-course corrections: The LEA uses performance benchmarking to track the school's progress on a regular basis and also has a coherent, actionable plan in place to respond immediately if outcome and/or leading indicator data are off track	**0 -** The LEA does not use performance benchmarking on a regular basis; OR the LEA does not have a plan in place to respond immediately if the school's performance data are off track	**2 -** The LEA uses performance benchmarking on a regular basis; AND the LEA has a plan to respond if the school's performance data are off track, but this plan is only somewhat coherent and actionable	**4 -** The LEA uses performance benchmarking on a regular basis and has a coherent, actionable plan to respond immediately if the school's performance data are off track

Part 2D. Intervention strategy (50 points)			
1(a) - 1(d) Justification of chosen model: The LEA clearly explains why the transformation intervention model is the right strategy for addressing the school's current needs and for helping the school reach its annual goals	**0 -** It is not clear from the LEA's explanation that the transformation model will address the school's current needs and help reach the school reach its annual goals	**4 -** The LEA's explanation for selecting the transformation model is somewhat linked to the school's current needs and annual goals	**9 -** The LEA's explanation for selecting the transformation model is strongly linked to the school's current needs and annual goals
2(a) - 2(g) Human capital development: The LEA has a smart, actionable strategy for recruiting, placing, and retaining talented teachers and leaders in the transformation school as well as a sustainable plan for removing ineffective staff and leaders	**0 -** The LEA has a weak human capital strategy for recruiting, placing, retaining, or removing staff and leaders	**5 -** The LEA has a moderate human capital strategy for recruiting, placing, retaining, and removing staff and leaders	**12 -** The LEA has a smart, actionable human capital strategy for recruiting, placing, retaining, and removing staff and leaders
3(a) - 3(c) External capacity: The LEA is contracting with or will contract with a a high-quality external provider to manage the school transformation effort; this external provider has been or will be selected through a rigorous process and is or will be held accountable for the school's performance	**0 -** The LEA is not contracting - and will not contract - with an external provider to implement the school's transformation intervention model	**3 -** The LEA is contracting - or will contract - with an external provider to implement the school's transformation; however, the quality of the selection process described in the application is questionable OR the provider is not - or will not be - held accountable for the school's performance	**6 -** The LEA is contracting - or will contract - with an external provider to implement the school's transformation; the LEA describes a rigorous selection process and a concrete plan for holding the provider partially or fully accountable for the school's performance
4(a) - 4(b) Proven instructional strategies: The LEA describes a research-based, rigorous instructional framework for the transformation school that is aligned to state academic performance standards and differentiates instruction based on student needs (e.g., serving ELL, SPED, and overage/under-credited student populations)	**0 -** The LEA describes an instructional framework that is not rigorous, research-based, or aligned to state academic performance standards	**4 -** The LEA describes an instructional framework that is rigorous, research-based, and aligned to state academic performance standards; however it is not clear how the instructional framework differentiates instruction based on students needs	**9 -** The LEA describes an instructional framework that is rigorous, research-based, and aligned to state academic performance standards; this instructional framework clearly differentiates instruction based on students needs
5(a) Outreach: The LEA has informed and/or will inform school staff, students, parents, and community members about operational changes at the school	**0 -** The LEA has made little to no attempts to inform school staff, school students, parents, or community members about the SIG application; OR the LEA has no strong plan in place to inform these stakeholders about the school's intervention	**3 -** The LEA has had some communications with stakeholders about the SIG application and has a moderate plan for continued communications pending receipt of grant funds	**7 -** The LEA has communicated clearly with stakeholders about the SIG application and also has a strong plan for continued communciations pending receipt of grant funds

7(a) - 7(b) Overall transformation strategy: The LEA explains how the activities proposed in this school application fit together as one, cohesive strategy or theory of action that addresses 5 core components of school reform: 1. Highly effective teachers 2. Autonomy for school leaders 3. Highly effective transformation leader 4. Proven instructional strategies 5. Job-embedded professional development Additionally, the LEA describes how LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring that the transformation plan is implemented with fidelity.	**0 -** The LEA's strategy or theory of action does not address any of the 5 core components of school reform; OR the LEA does not describe how LEA central office and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring that the transformation plan is implemented with fidelity	**3 -** The LEA describes how LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring full implementation of the transformation plan, and the LEA presents an overarching strategy or theory of action for the activities proposed in this application; however, the LEA does not address all 5 core components of school reform	**7 -** The LEA describes how LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring full implementation of the transformation plan, and the LEA presents a cohesive strategy or theory of action for the activities proposed in this application that addresses all 5 core components of school reform

Part 2E. Implementation plan (57 points) [Reminder: If any implementation requirement of the transformation model is not addressed in the implementation plan, the LEA will receive 0 points for the school's entire application.]			
1. Replace school principal: The LEA describes activities to replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation intervention, and the new principal selected will have expertise specific to the needs of the transformation school	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities it will conduct to replace the principal who led the school prior to the commencement of the intervention; OR the LEA's activities do not address the qualifications of the new principal	**2 -** The LEA describes activities it will conduct to replace the principal who led the school prior to the commencement of the intervention, but it is unclear that the principal will have expertise specific to the needs of the transformation school	**5 -** The LEA describes activities it will conduct to replace the principal who led the school prior to the commencement of the intervention, and the LEA's activities emphasize the selection of a principal with expertise specific to the needs of the transformation school
2. Operational flexibility: The LEA describes activities it will conduct to grant the school sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and, if applicable, increase high school graduation rates	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities it will conduct to grant the principal increased operational flexibility; OR the LEA's proposed activities will only grant the principal minimal operational flexibility	**3 -** The LEA describes activities it will conduct to grant the principal a moderate level of operational flexibility over staffing, calendars/time, AND/OR budgeting	**5 -** The LEA describes activities it will conduct to grant the school a substantial level of operational flexibility over staffing, calendars/time, AND budgeting
3. Additional capacity: The LEA describes activities it will conduct to ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO)	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities it will conduct to ensure the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support; OR the LEA's proposed activities constitute a weak plan	**2 -** The LEA describes some activities that constitute a moderate plan for providing the school technical assistance and related support	**4 -** The LEA describes several activities that constitute a comprehensive plan for ensuring the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support
4. Human capital strategies: The LEA describes activities designed to recruit, further develop, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school, including one or more of the following strategies: • Recruitment beyond traditional entry routes; • Offering significant financial incentives; • Providing increased learning opportunities for promotion and career growth, including opportunities to serve larger numbers of students; • Offering more flexible work conditions; or, • Similar strategies designed to build and retain a strong staff	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities to recruit, develop, and retain staff; OR the LEA's proposed activities do not address any of the strategies listed	**3 -** The LEA describes activities to recruit, develop, and retain staff, and these activities incorporate only one of the strategies listed	**7 -** The LEA describes activities to recruit, develop, and retain staff, and these activities incorporate multiple strategies listed and fit into a cohesive human capital strategy

5. Data-based performance evaluations: The LEA describes activities it will implement to develop rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for the school principal and teachers that incorporate all of the following elements: 1) Take into account data on student growth as a significant factor; 2) Use other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; 3) Differentiate teachers into multiple rating categories, with a high bar for achieving the highest ratings; and 4) Are designed and developed with teacher, support staff, and principal involvement	**0 -** LEA does not describe activities to develop evaluation systems for the school principal and teachers; OR the LEA's activities include none of the required elements	**3 -** The LEA describes activities for developing evaluation systems that include some but not all 4 of the required elements	**5 -** The LEA describes activities for developing evaluation systems that include all of the 4 required elements
6. Staff removal and promotion: The LEA describes steps it will take to identify and reward the school leader, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement (and high school graduation rates) and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided to improve their professional practice, have not done so	**0 -** The LEA does not describe any steps it will take to reward effective teachers or remove those who haven't improved their professional practice; OR the LEA's proposed steps	**2 -** The LEA describes steps it will take to reward effective teachers but does not describe steps it will take to remove ineffective teachers; OR the LEA describes steps it will take to remove ineffective teachers but does not describe steps it will take to reward effective teachers	**5 -** The LEA describes steps it will take to both reward effective teachers and remove those teachers who have not improved their professional practice
7. Professional development: The LEA details activities that will provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that includes the following **required elements**: • Occurs on a regular basis (daily or weekly); • Is aligned with the school's comprehensive instrucitonal and learning supports programs (standards, curriculum, school improvement goals); • Involves educators working collaborativley; • Is facilitated by instructional leaders, coaches, or mentors with appropriate expertise related to instruction and learning supports; • Requires active engagement The PD might also include one or more of the following **optional elements**: • Coaching to enhance classroom and school-wide instructional and learning supports practices; • A system for measuring changes in instructional and learning supports practices resulting from PD; • Structured common planning time; • Meetings with mentors; • Consultation with outside experts, such as LDE; or, • Observation of classroom and learning supports practices	**0 -** The LEA does not describe professional development activities; OR the LEA's proposed activities do not address all of the required elements	**3 -** The LEA describes professional development activities that constitute a moderate plan incorporating all of the required elements but none of the optional elements	**5 -** The LEA describes professional development activities that constitute a comprehensive plan incorporating all of the required elements and one or more of the optional elements into a systemic approach to staff development

8. Extended learning time: The LEA describes a high-quality plan to increase learning time in the transformation school, such as through: • Adjustments to the school schedule • Lengthening of the school day or year	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities to increase learning time; OR the LEA's proposed activities will not increase learning time at the school by at least 10%	**3 -** The LEA describes activities that include moderate increases to learning time at the school (equal to or greater than 10% and less than 20%) through one or more methods	**6 -** The LEA describes activities that includes dramatic increases to learning time at the school (equal to or greater than 20%) through multiple methods
9. Aligned instruction: The LEA details activities to implement an instructional program that is vertically aligned between grades as well as aligned with State academic standards	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities to develop a vertically-aligned instructional program; OR the LEA's proposed activities are not aligned with State academic standards	**3 -** The LEA describes activities that develop a vertically-aligned instructional program, but this program is not strongly aligned with State academic standards	**6 -** The LEA describes activities that develop a vertically-aligned instructional program that is strongly aligned with State academic standards
10. Data-driven instruction: The LEA describes activities to promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities to develop a data-driven instructional program; OR the LEA's proposed activities are not linked to the continuous use of student data and differentiated instruction	**3 -** The LEA describes activities that develop a data-driven instructional program, but it is not clear how this program will promote the continuous use of student data and differentiate instruction	**6 -** The LEA describes activities that develop a data-driven instructional program that will both promote the continuous use of student data and differentiate instruction
11. Family/community engagement: The LEA describes activities that will promote ongoing family and community engagement in the transformation school. [The activities may include but are not limited to any of the following: • Outreach to connect with hard-to-reach families • Enhancement of welcoming and social supports for newcomers • Establishment of a range of family involvement opportunities • Holding public meetings to review school performance and develop school improvement plans • Using surveys to gauge satisfaction and support for schools • Implementing complaint procedures for families • Coordinating with local social and health service providers • Providing adult education classes (GED, adult literacy, ELL programs)]	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities that will promote ongoing family and community engagement in the school; OR the LEA's proposed activities constitute a weak plan	**2 -** The LEA describes activities that constitute a moderate plan for promoting ongoing family and community engagement in the school	**3 -** The LEA describes activities that constitute a strong plan for promoting ongoing family and community engagement in the school

Part 3. Annual performance goals (9 points total)			
Part 3A. Annual achievement goals (3 points)			
The LEA set ambitious but achievable annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in reading and math (and science and social studies or history, if applicable) for each grade served by the school AND these goals are based on historical data, if the data are available	**0 -** The LEA does not provide annual achievement goals on State assessments; OR the goals are unrealistic; OR the goals are not ambitious	**1 -** The LEA provides annual achievement goals on State assessments, based on historical data, that are achievable but only somewhat ambitious	**3 -** The LEA provides annual achievement goals on State assessments, based on historical data, that are ambitious yet still achievable
Part 3B. Leading indicator goals (3 points)			
The LEA set ambitious but achievable annual goals for the school on all leading indicators provided, including School Performance Scores, AND these goals are based on historical data, if the data are available	**0 -** The LEA does not set annual leading indicator and SPS goals; OR the goals are unrealistic; OR the goals are not ambitious	**1 -** The LEA set annual leading indicator and SPS goals, based on historical data, that are achievable but only somewhat ambitious	**3 -** The LEA set annual leading indicator and SPS goals, based on historical data, that are ambitious yet still achievable
Part 3C. State Priority Goals (3 points)			
The LEA set ambitious but achievable annual goals for the school on all nine State Priority Goals	**0 -** The LEA does not set annual State Priority Goals; OR the goals are unrealistic; OR the goals are not ambitious	**1 -** The LEA set annual State Priority Goals that are achievable but only somewhat ambitious	**3 -** The LEA set annual State Priority Goals that are ambitious yet still achievable

Parts 4-5. School budget (20 points total)			
Part 4. Budget narrative (15 points)			
Part 4A, 1. Human capital strategy: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's human capital strategy	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed human capital strategy	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed human capital strategy	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed human capital strategy
Part 4A, 2. Instructional program: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's instructional program	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed instructional program	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed instructional program	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed instructional program
Part 4A, 3. Governance: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the new governance structure	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed governance structure	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed governance structure	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed governance structure

Part 4A, 4. Extended learing time / add'l supports: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's extended learning time and additional student supports plan	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed plan	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed plan	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed plan
Part 4A, 5. Accountability: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's accountability efforts	**0 -** The LEA does not describe expenditures related to all critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed accountability plan	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed accountability plan	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the type of strategy proposed
Overall, the school-level budget narrative addresses all of the core expenditures of the school's proposed intervention strategy	**0 -** The LEA's school-level budget narrative addresses none or few of the core expenditures related to its intervention	**3 -** The LEA's school-level budget narrative addresses some but not all of the core expenditures related to its intervention	**5 -** The LEA's school level-budget narrative addresses all of the core expenditures related to its intervention
Part 5. Budget detail (5 points)			
Part 5B and 5C: The proposed expenditures for this school are reasonable and necessary to implement the school's intervention model fully and effectively	**0 -** The LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are insufficient or exaggerated for its proposed intervention strategy	**3 -** Many but not all of the LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are reasonable and necessary for its proposed intervention strategy	**5 -** All of the LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are reasonable and necessary for its proposed intervention strategy

<END>

This section is worth 1 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application.
(See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 1A. Instructions
For a Tier I, Tier II OR Tier III school, complete each of the following tabs:
1. General information
2. Turnaround model
3. Annual performance goals
4. School-level budget narrative
5. School-level budget items

Part 1B. Provide the folllowing information:	
School name	
Site Code	
Mailing address	
School Principal/Leader	
Phone #	
E-mail address	
Signature	
School primary contact person (if different from School Principal/Leader)	
Phone #	
Email address	
Signature	
Eligibility tier	
Grades served	
2010-11 student enrollment	
Chosen intervention model	
Grant amount requested for this school	

<END>

This section is worth 130 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 2A. Instructions

There are 4 main parts to this section of the application:

1. Point of departure
2. Point of arrival
3. Intervention strategy
4. Implementation plan

Utilize the school's needs assessment to determine its current performance level ("Point of departure") and analyze this data to set its annual performance goals for the next three years ("Point of arrival"). From there, use the questions around the school's chosen intervention strategy to determine how it will reach these goals. Finally, complete the implementation plan to identify specific actions to carry out this strategy.

Part 2B. Point of departure: School needs assessment

1. Type of needs assessment conducted (e.g., LANA, Scholastic Audit, Quality Review, SACS, Breaking Ranks II, High Schools That Work, or another similarly accredited needs assessment)

2. Results of needs assessment

(a) Provide a thorough description of the results of the needs assessment and link these results to the intervention selected for this school/campus. (Summarize here and attach the full assessment results to the application.) Describe the areas of student performance most in need of improvement.

(b) Using information gathered from the school's needs assessment and other relevant data, what seem to be the root causes of the school's low-performance and barriers to improvement? (Include causes/barriers linked to the LEA and the school themselves.)

Part 2C. Point of arrival: School performance goals

1. Describe the school's annual performance goals

(a) Based on the school's needs assessment and the historical data available, provide a clear and logical rationale for the annual achievement goals on Louisiana's state assessments (LEAP, iLEAP, GEE , EOC tests) provided on the "Annual performance goals" tab (Tab 3 of this worksheet). Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(b) Based on the school's needs assessment and the historical data available, provide a clear and logical rationale for the annual leading indicator goals, including SPS goals, provided on the "Annual performance goals" tab (Tab 3 of this worksheet). Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(c) Based on the school's needs assessment, provide a clear and logical rationale for the school's annual "State Priority Goals" provided on the "Annual performance goals" tab (Tab 3 of this worksheet). Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.

(d) Based on the school's needs assessment, describe any other achievement goals for the school. [These goals may derived from Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) (including Louisiana Educational Assessment Program Alternative Assessment [LAA]), attendance and/or dropout rates, data on percent proficient, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Pre-K/Kindergarten screening tests, or other standardized assessments and unit assessments.) Explain how these goals are ambitious yet achievable.]

(e) How will the LEA use performance benchmarking to track the school's performance on a regular basis? Describe how the LEA will respond immediately if student outcome and leading indicator data show the turnaround intervention is off-track.

Part 2D. Intervention strategy: Turnaround model

1. Justification for selecting the turnaround model

(a) Explain how the LEA will use the turnaround intervention model to address the root causes of the school's low-performance as identified under Part 2B above.

(b) If the LEA has begun implementing, in whole or in part, the turnaround intervention model within the last two years (i.e., during the 2009-10 school year or later) and wishes to continue or complete the intervention, describe the actions it has already taken relative to the turnaround intervention model requirements.

(c) Does the school currently participate in any of the following state-sponsored school improvement programs: Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), Distinguished Educators (DE) program, Literacy program, College-and-Career Readiness (CCR) program, Science Technology Engineering & Math (STEM) program, Extended Learning Time (ELT) program, Advanced Placement (AP) program, or International Baccalaureate (IB) program? If so, describe how the school will leverage the program(s) to support its turnaround intervention efforts?

(d) What school improvement efforts has this school undertaken in recent years that have**not** resulted in improved student academic performance? Explain why these efforts were not successful and why the turnaround intervention will be successful in comparison with these prior efforts

2. Human capital development
(a) A requirement of the turnaround model is to replace 50% or more of the school's staff using locally adopted competencies to measure their effectiveness. How does, or will, the LEA define "ineffective," and what is the plan for removing these personnel?
(b) What will happen to the school leader and staff members who are removed from the turnaround school (e.g., Will they be reassigned to other schools in the LEA?)?
(c) How will the LEA recruit and place new, "effective" or "high-potential" personnel, including a new principal, in the turnaround school? How will student academic growth data factor into personnel selection decisions? Indicate if the LEA will hire teachers from non-traditional preparation programs, such as Teach for America (TFA), to work at the turnaround school.
(d) What experience, training, and skills does/will the new school leader possess?
(e) What strategies are or will be implemented in the turnaround school to retain and promote the most talented personnel?

(f) How they will the LEA evaluate teacher effectiveness at the turnaround school on an ongoing basis? Will these evaluations take into account student academic growth as one of multiple measures of teacher performance?
(g) How will the LEA use regular teacher evaluations and formative & summative student academic data to develop individualized, job-embedded professional development for all teachers at the turnaround school?
3. External capacity *If the LEA is contracting or will contract with an external provider (including, but not limited to, CMOs and EMOs) to manage the turnaround school, answer the following questions:*
(a) Describe the process for recruiting, selecting and evaluating the external provider that is managing or will manage the turnaround school.
(b) Is the external provider currently managing the turnaround school? If so, when was the provider put in place and how has the provider impacted the school thus far?
(c) How is the provider held - or how will the provider be held - accountable for producing significant growth in academic achievement at the school

4. Proven instructional strategies
(a) Describe the rigorous, research-based instructional framework that will be used in all classrooms at the turnaround school. How is this instructional framework aligned to state academic performance standards?
(b) How will instruction be differentiated based on student needs (e.g., serving ELL, SPED, and overage/under-credited student populations)?
5. Outreach efforts
(a) How will/did the LEA inform school staff, students, parents, and community members about this SIG application and potential operational changes at the school?

6. Pre-implementation activities

(a) Should this school win SIG funding, the LEA will have the opportunity to conduct "pre-implementation activities." The pre-implementation period will begin approximately in May 2011 and will end in August 2011. Describe any activities the LEA will conduct on behalf of this turnaround school in order to ensure full and effective implementation of this intervention model beginning September 2011. [Note that pre-implementation activities are*optional but highly recommended by LDE*.]

Approved "pre-implementation activities" include but are not limited to the following:

- Family and community engagement to educate stakeholders about changes taking place at the turnaround school and to cultivate their ongoing support and involvement at the school.
- Conducting a rigorous recruitment and evaluation process for external providers, especially those taking on school operating responsibilities.
- Recruiting, placing and training a new school leader and school staff.
- Evaluating current school staff based on locally adopted competencies.
- Designing and building new teacher and leader evaluation systems that incorporate student growth data.
- Evaluating and improving school instructional programs, with significant input from the school's incoming principal.
- Providing job-embedded professional development of staff and the school leader that will adequately prepare them to begin school intervention activities in the 2011-2012 school year.
- Developing an LEA data management and accountability system that will allow the LEA to consistently monitor school performance and provide ongoing feedback to the turnaround school, allowing the school to make informed mid-course corrections.

7. The "big picture"

(a) Articulate how the initiatives and activities proposed in this turnaround application fit together as one, cohesive strategy or theory of action that addresses 5 core components of school reform:

1. Highly effective teachers
2. Autonomy for school leaders
3. Highly effective turnaround leader
4. Proven instructional strategies
5. Job-embedded professional development

(b) Which LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring that the turnaround plan proposed in this application is implemented with fidelity? Describe how these individuals will work together to oversee the plan's implementation.

Part 2E. Implementation plan

The LEA must create a 3-year implementation plan for the requirements pertaining to the turnaround intervention model. The LEA must also work closely with the school's leader/principal to complete this timeline.

The implementation plan should provide detailed activities on an ambitious schedule with significant progress expected by the end of the 2011-12 school year.

Write action steps in the boxes maked "activity" (use as many cells as needed and expand them to the necessary size) and mark an "x" in the cells underneath the months in order to indicate when the activities will take place.

	Activities that took place between Sept. 2009 and Mar. 2011	Pre-Implementation Period	Year 1: 2011 - 2012 School Year			Year 2: 2012 - 2013 School Year			Year 3: 2013 - 2014 School Year		
Intervention activity	*Sept. 2009 - Feb. 2011*	*May 2011 - August 2011*	*1st Quarter: Sept. - Dec*	*2nd Quarter: Jan. - April*	*3rd Quarter: May - Aug.*	*1st Quarter: Sept. - Dec*	*2nd Quarter: Jan. - April*	*3rd Quarter: May - Aug.*	*1st Quarter: Sept. - Dec*	*2nd Quarter: Jan. - April*	*3rd Quarter: May - Aug.*
1. Create an LEA Turnaround Office or other new governance structure within the central office. [See governance structure examples in the rubric on Tab 6 of this worksheet.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
2. Replace the school's principal. [The applicant must address the new principal's expertise specific to the needs of the turnaround school.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
3. Replace 50% or more of the staff using locally adopted competencies to measure their effectiveness and select the most effective personnel to remain at the school.											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											

4. Give the principal operational flexibility (including staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement a fully comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
5. Use strategies such as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions to recruit, place, and retain staff for the school. [The applicant must identify activities related to each of these strategies: staff recruitment, staff placement, and staff retention.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
6. Provide high-quality, job-embedded professional development for staff that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program, is designed with school staff,and incorporates teacher evaluation and student academic data (formative and summative). [See rubric for required and optional elements of the proposed professional development program.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
7. Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time. [The applicant must include the % increase in learning time for this school.]											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
8. Identify and implement an instructional program that is vertically aligned between grades as well as aligned with with State academic standards											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											

9. Promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
10. Provide socio-emotional and community-oriented services for students											
Activity 1											
Activity 2											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
.											
Activity 10, etc											
Other activities?											

<END>

This section is worth 9 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 3A. Instructions

The applicant must complete the following three sections of annual performance goals:

1. Annual achievement goals
2. Leading indicator goals
3. State Priority Goals

Part 3B. Annual achievement goals

Set annual goals for student achievement on state assessments.

The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement at the school over the next three years. Set goals that increase the percentage of students proficient (i.e., scoring "basic" and above) in both reading and math on state assessments. Also set performance goals for science, social studies, and history, if applicable.

State assessment	Historical data 2008-2009	Historical data 2009-2010	Historical data 2010-2011	Projected annual goals 2011-2012	Projected annual goals 2012-2013	Projected annual goals 2012-2013
iLEAP math (Grade 3)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

iLEAP reading (Grade 3)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP science (Grade 3)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP social studies (Grade 3)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
LEAP math (Grade 4)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
LEAP reading (Grade 4)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

iLEAP math (Grade 5)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP reading (Grade 5)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP science (Grade 5)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP social studies (Grade 5)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

iLEAP math (Grade 6)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
iLEAP reading (Grade 6)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
iLEAP science (Grade 6)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
iLEAP social studies (Grade 6)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				
iLEAP math (Grade 7)	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students	% proficient, all students
	# students who took test	# students who took test				

iLEAP reading (Grade 7)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP science (Grade 7)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
iLEAP social studies (Grade 7)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
LEAP math (Grade 8)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
LEAP reading (Grade 8)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

iLEAP math (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test	
iLEAP reading (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test	
iLEAP science (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test	
iLEAP social studies (9th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	[redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test	
GEE math (10th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year [redacted]
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test	

GEE reading (10th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year			
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
GEE science (11th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students		
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
GEE social studies (11th grade)	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students		
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
Algebra I*	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				
English II*	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
	_____ # students who took test	_____ # students who took test				

Geometry*		_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
		_____ # students who took test				
Biology*		_____ % proficient, all students	If the school wins SIG funding, this information will be collected prior to the 2011-12 school year	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
		_____ # students who took test				
English III*				_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students
American History*					_____ % proficient, all students	_____ % proficient, all students

***These are state-administered "End of Course (EOC)" tests.**

Part 3C. Leading indicators of performance

Set annual goals on nine leading indicators of performance as well as School Performance Scores (SPS).

The LEA must set leading indicator and SPS goals for the school for the 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 school years. If any historical data prior to the 2010-2011 school year are not available, mark "N/A" in the appropriate box.

Leading indicators		Historical data						Projected annual goals		
		2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Number of minutes within the school year										
Student participation rate on State assessments (i.e., LEAP, *i* LEAP, GEE, End of Course tests) in reading and in mathematics, by student subgroup	American Indian									
	Asian									
	Black									
	Hispanic									
	White									
	Paid									
	Free and Reduced Lunch									
	Disabled									
	Regular and GT									
	LEP									
	Non-LEP									
	Female									
	Male									
	Whole School									
Dropout rate										
Student attendance rate										
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes										
Discipline incidents										
Truants										
Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system										
Teacher attendance rate										
Louisiana School Performance Score (SPS)										

Part 3D. Louisiana State Priority Goals

Set annual goals on Louisiana's "Nine Priority Goals."

The LEA must set quantitative targets for each goal that applies to students served by the SIG-receiving school. If one or more of the priority goals does not pertain to the school, mark "N/A" in the appropriate boxes. For example, if the school does not have a pre-kindergarten program, the goal of having all children "enter kindergarten ready to learn" does not apply to this school.

Louisiana Children Will…	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Eligible schools
Enter kindergarten ready to learn				*Schools with pre-K programs*
Be literate by 3rd grade				*Schools serving grades 3 and below*
Arrive in 4th grade on time				*Schools serving grades 4 and below*
Perform at or above grade level in English Language Arts (ELA) by the 8th grade				*Schools serving grades 6 through 8*
Perform at or above grade level in Mathematics by 8th grade				*Schools serving grades 6 through 8*
Graduate on time				*Schools serving grades 9 through 12*

Enroll in post-secondary education within two years of graduation				*Schools serving grades 9 through 12*
Successfully complete at least one year of college				*Schools serving grades 9 through 12*
Achieve these goals regardless of race or socio-economic status				*All schools*

<END>

This section is worth 15 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 4A. School-level budget narrative

1. Human capital strategy	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the human capital strategy for the eligible school. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its human capital strategy.*	
Recruiting a new leader and additional staff	
Evaluating existing staff to inform dismissal decisions	
Selecting a new leader and staff	
Offering financial incentives, increased career opportunities, flexible work conditions or other similar strategies to develop and retain school staff	
Providing ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development, including expenses for instructional leaders, coaches, mentors, additional common planning time, consultation with outside experts or other strategies	
Supporting teacher, staff and leader effectiveness through mutual consent hiring and/or performance -based dismissals, including through buyouts or negotiations	
Developing rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers, support staff, and principals	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

2. Instructional program	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the LEA's proposed instructional program. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its instructional program strategy.*	
Selecting and implementing an instructional program	
Implementing reform strategies related to comprehensive instructional and learning supports, such as a school -wide RTI model, technology-based supports and interventions, rigorous coursework, transition support programs, or other similar strategies	
Selecting and contracting with an external provider/operator	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

3. Governance	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the LEA's governance plan for the eligible school The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its governance strategy.*	
Granting additional operational autonomy, such as over staffing, calendars, budgeting or other factors	
Adopting a new governance structure such as a district turnaround office, direct report to the district superintendent, or multi -year contract between the school and LEA or SEA	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

4. Extended learning time / additional supports	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to each element of the LEA's plan to increase learning time and provide additional supports. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan. The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its extended learning time and/or student support strategy.*	
Increasing learning time, such as through adjustments to the school schedule, lengthening of the school day or year, or other strategies	
Providing a comprehensive learning supports system, such as through coordinated community resources, partnerships with local agencies, family literacy programs or other similar strategies	
Engaging parents and community partners, such as through direct outreach, orientation programs, public meetings, surveys, coordination with local agencies, or other strategies	
Providing transition supports for impacted students	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

5. Accountability	Amount
Provide a brief description of the expenditures related to the LEA's plan for monitoring and accountability in the eligible school. The lines below are provided as examples of possible expenditures. The LEA may modify and/or add to these lines to reflect actual elements of its plan.The LEA must identify in this narrative any ***pre-implementation activities*** *(i.e., activities that will take place in May 2011 through August 2011) relating to its accountability strategy.*	
Ongoing monitoring of results	
Developing systems to respond if student outcome and leading indicator data show an effort is off -track	
Conducting regular performance benchmarking	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Other>	
<Include brief narrative here>	

<END>

This section is worth 5 out of 160 total points for the School SIG Application. (See scoring rubric for detailed breakdown of points.)

Part 5A. Budget instructions

School-level program budget

As explained in the "LEA SIG Application," the applicant must complete a separate budget for each school for which it hopes to receive a grant award. The school-level program budget below applies only to the school in this particular turnaround application.

SIG funds may be used for "pre-implementation" activities from May 2011 through August 2011 and for "full implementation" activities from September 2011 through August 2014. If the applicant commits matching funds towards this specific school, indicate how these matching funds will be spent and during what time period(s). Note that *conducting pre-implementation activities is optional but highly encouraged* by LDE.

It is highly recommended that the applicant fill out this school-level budget electronically. Formulas embedded in this spreadsheet will automatically calculate totals for you.

Part 5B. School-level program budget summary

	SIG funding					LEA matching funds (optional)							
	Year 1		Year 2	Year 3		Year 1		Year 2	Year 3	Sustainability: Post SIG grant period			
Category	**(Pre-implementation, *optional*) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011**	**(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012**	**9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013**	**9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014**	**Total SIG funding**	**(Pre-implementation) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011**	**(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012**	**9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013**	**9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014**	**9/1/2014 - 8/31/2015**	**9/1/2015 - 8/31/2016**	**Total LEA matching funds**	**Total program budget**
100 Salaries					$ -							$ -	$ -
200 Employee Benefits					$ -							$ -	$ -
300 Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs					$ -							$ -	$ -
400 Purchased Property Services					$ -							$ -	$ -
500 Other Purchased Services					$ -							$ -	$ -
600 Supplies					$ -							$ -	$ -
800 Other Objects					$ -							$ -	$ -
Subtotal - Operating Budget	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700 Property					$ -							$ -	$ -
900 Other Uses of Funds					$ -							$ -	$ -
Grand Total					$ -							$ -	$ -

Part 5C. School-level program budget detail

			SIG funding					LEA matching funds (optional)							
			Year 1		Year 2	Year 3		Year 1		Year 2	Year 3	Sustainability period			
Category	Budget Item	Description	(Pre-implementation, *optional*) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013	9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014	Total SIG funding	(Pre-implementation) 5/1/2011 - 8/31/2011	(Full implementation) 9/1/2011 - 8/31/2012	9/1/2012 - 8/31/2013	9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014	9/1/2014 - 8/31/2015	9/1/2015 - 8/31/2016	Total LEA matching funds	Total program budget
100 Salaries							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Salaries			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
200 Employees Benefits							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Employee Benefits			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
300 Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Purchased Professional/Tech Svcs			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
400 Purchased Property Services							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Purchased Property Services			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

500 Other Purchased Services							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Purchased Services			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
600 Supplies							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Supplies			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
800 Other Objects							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Objects			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Subtotal - Operating Budgets			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700 Property							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Property			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
900 Other Uses of Funds							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
							$ -							$ -	$ -
Total: Other Uses of Funds			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Grand Total			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

<END>

Scoring your application

Total score

The LEA applicant will submit just one LEA SIG Application and a School SIG Application for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that it commits to serve. **The LEA SIG Application is worth 90 points, and each School SIG application is worth 160 points; the LEA application plus one school application can receive up to 250 points total.** All applications submitted by one LEA will be scored by the same set of expert reviewers; however, awards will be determined on a school-by-school basis, meaning that an LEA could receive funding for one school but not another depending on the quality of each school's application.

Here's an example:
Galaxy LEA applies for SIG funding on behalf of Jupiter Elementary School, Mars Middle School, and Saturn High School. Galaxy LEA receives 80 points on its "LEA SIG Application," 150 points on the Saturn's "School SIG Application," 130 points on Mars' "School SIG Application," and 100 points on Jupiter's "School SIG Application."

Saturn's total score = 80 (LEA application) + 150 (School application) = 230 out of 250 possible points.
Mars' total score = 80 (LEA application) + 130 (School application) = 210 out of 250 possible points.
Jupiter's total score = 80 (LEA application) + 100 (School application) = 180 out of 250 possible points.

Use this rubric to assess the strength of your SIG applications as you develop them, but be sure to provide answers that honestly reflect current or projected actions.

LEA SIG Application

An LEA SIG Application is worth 90 points total:

General information - 2 points
LEA implementation strategy - 70 points
Assurances - 3 points
LEA budget - 15 points

School SIG Application

A School SIG Application is worth 160 points total. If the school will implement the turnaround, restart, or transformation model, its School SIG Application will be scored as follows:

Part 1. General information - 1 point
Part 2. Intervention strategy (Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation) - 130 points
Part 3. Annual performance goals - 9 points
Parts 4 - 5. School-level budget - 20 points

A school applying to implement the closure model will use a different scoring method because the "Annual performance goals" do not apply to this intervention model. Its School SIG Application can still receive up to 160 points and will be scored as follows:

Part 1. General information - 2 points
Part 2. Closure model - 138 points
Parts 3 - 4. School-level budget - 20 points

Note: The applicant must adddress in its implementation plan all requirements of the intervention model (turnaround, restart, transformation, or closure) selected for the school. A School SIG Application that fails to complete its "implementation plan" will receive zero (0) points for the entire application.

School application (turnaround model): 160 points total

Part 1. General information (1 point total)

The applicant provides all information requested on the "General information" tab, including signatures from the School Principal/Leader and the school's primary contact person, if that contact person is not the School Principal/Leader	**0 -** Applicant does not provide some or all of the information requested	**1 -** Applicant provides all information requested

Part 2. Turnaround model (130 points total)

Part 2B. Point of departure (7 points)			
1; 2(a) Needs assessment: The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment such as LANA, Scholastic Audit, Quality Review, SACS, Breaking Ranks II, or High Schools That Work; from this needs assessment, the LEA identified the school's core areas for improvement	**0** - The LEA did not conduct a needs assessment of the school; OR this needs assessment was not thorough	**1 -** The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment but did not identify the school's core areas for improvement	**3 -** The LEA has conducted a thorough needs assessment and used the information to identify the school's core areas for improvement
2(b) Diagnosis: The LEA has identified both the root causes of the school's low-performance and the existing barriers to improvement	**0 -** The LEA did not identify either the root causes of the school's low-performance nor the barriers to improvement	**2 -** The LEA has identified causes of low-performance and barriers to improvement, but no causes/barriers are linked to the LEA or school themselves	**4 -** The LEA has identified causes of low-performance and barriers to improvement, including causes/barriers related to the LEA and school themselves
Part 2C. Point of arrival (16 points)			
1(a) Assessment goals: The LEA provides a clear, logical argument for the school's annual performance goals on state assessments (LEAP, iLEAP, GEE, EOC tests) which are linked to the school's available historical data and needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable	**0 -** The LEA presents a weak argument for the annual state assessment goals selected; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's available historical data and needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA presents a somewhat clear and logical argument for the annual state assessment goals selected; OR the goals are somewhat linked to the school's available historical data	**3 -** The LEA's argument for the school's annual state assessment goals selected is clear and logical; these ambitious yet achievable goals are directly linked to the school's available historial data and needs assessment
1(b) Leading indicator goals: The LEA provides a clear, logical argument for the school's annual leading indicator and School Performance Score (SPS) goals which are linked to the school's available historical data and needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable	**0 -** The LEA presents a weak argument for for the annual leading indicator and SPS goals selected; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's available historical data and needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA presents a somewhat clear and logical argument for the leading indicator and SPS goals selected; OR the goals are somewhat linked to the school's available historical data	**3 -** The LEA's argument for the school's leading indicator and SPS goals selected is clear and logical; these ambitious yet achievable goals are directly linked to the school's available historial data and needs assessment
1(c) State Priority Goals: The LEA provides a clear, logical argument for the school's annual State Priority Goals which are linked to the school's needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable	**0 -** The LEA presents a weak argument for the annual State Priority Goals selected; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA presents a somewhat clear and logical argument for the State Priority Goals goals selected; OR the goals are somewhat linked to the school's available historical data	**3 -** The LEA's argument for the school's State Priority Goals selected is clear and logical; and these ambitious yet achievable goals are directly linked to the school's needs assessment

1(d) Additional goals: The LEA provides additional performance goals that are linked to the school's needs assessment and are ambitous yet achievable. [These goals may be derived from may derived from Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT) (including Louisiana Educational Assessment Program Alternative Assessment (LAA)), attendance and/or dropout rates, data on percent proficient, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Pre-K/Kindergarten screening tests, or other standardized assessments and unit assessments.]	**0 -** The LEA does not provide additional performance goals for the school; OR the goals have no clear linkage to the school's needs assessment	**1 -** The LEA provides additional performance goals for the school; however, these goals are somewhat linked to the school's needs assessment.	**3 -** The LEA provides additional ambitious yet achievable performance goals for the school that are directly linked to the school's needs assessment.
1(e) Mid-course corrections: The LEA uses performance benchmarking to track the school's progress on a regular basis and also has a coherent, actionable plan in place to respond immediately if outcome and/or leading indicator data are off track	**0 -** The LEA does not use performance benchmarking on a regular basis; OR the LEA does not have a plan in place to respond immediately if the school's performance data are off track	**2 -** The LEA uses performance benchmarking on a regular basis; AND the LEA has a plan to respond if the school's performance data are off track, but this plan is only somewhat coherent and actionable	**4 -** The LEA uses performance benchmarking on a regular basis and has a coherent, actionable plan to respond immediately if the school's performance data are off track
Part 2D. Intervention strategy (50 points)			
1(a) - 1(d) Justification of chosen model: The LEA clearly explains why the turnaround intervention model is the right strategy for addressing the school's current needs and for helping the school reach its annual goals	**0 -** It is not clear from the LEA's explanation that the turnaround model will address the school's current needs and help reach the school reach its annual goals	**4 -** The LEA's explanation for selecting the turnaround model is somewhat linked to the school's current needs and annual goals	**9 -** The LEA's explanation for selecting the turnaround model is strongly linked to the school's current needs and annual goals
2(a) - 2(g) Human capital development: The LEA has a smart, actionable strategy for recruiting, placing, and retaining talented teachers and leaders in the turnaround school as well as a sustainable plan for removing ineffective staff and leaders	**0 -** The LEA has a weak human capital strategy for recruiting, placing, retaining, or removing staff and leaders	**5 -** The LEA has a moderate human capital strategy for recruiting, placing, retaining, and removing staff and leaders	**12 -** The LEA has a smart, actionable human capital strategy for recruiting, placing, retaining, and removing staff and leaders
3(a) - 3(c) External capacity: The LEA is contracting with or will contract with a high-quality external provider to manage the school turnaround effort; this external provider has been or will be selected through a rigorous process and is or will be held accountable for the school's performance	**0 -** The LEA is not contracting - and will not contract - with an external provider to implement the school's turnaround intervention model	**3 -** The LEA is contracting - or will contract - with an external provider to implement the school's turnaround; however, the quality of the selection process described in the application is questionable OR the provider is not - or will not be - held accountable for the school's performance	**6 -** The LEA is contracting - or will contract - with an external provider to implement the school's turnaround; the LEA describes a rigorous selection process and a concrete plan for holding the provider partially or fully accountable for the school's performance
4(a) - 4(b) Proven instructional strategies: The LEA describes a research-based, rigorous instructional framework for the turnaround school that is aligned to state academic performance standards and differentiates instruction based on student needs (e.g., serving ELL, SPED, and overage/under-credited student populations)	**0 -** The LEA describes an instructional framework that is not rigorous, research-based, or aligned to state academic performance standards	**4 -** The LEA describes an instructional framework that is rigorous, research-based, and aligned to state academic performance standards; however it is not clear how the instructional framework differentiates instruction based on students needs	**9 -** The LEA describes an instructional framework that is rigorous, research-based, and aligned to state academic performance standards; this instructional framework clearly differentiates instruction based on students needs

5(a) Outreach: The LEA has informed and/or will inform school staff, students, parents, and community members about operational changes at the school	**0 -** The LEA has made little to no attempts to inform school staff, school students, parents, or community members about the SIG application; OR the LEA has no strong plan in place to inform these stakeholders about the school's intervention	**3 -** The LEA has had some communications with stakeholders about the SIG application and has a moderate plan for continued communications pending receipt of grant funds	**7 -** The LEA has communicated often with stakeholders about the SIG application and also has a strong plan for continued communciations pending receipt of grant funds
7(a) - 7(b) Overall turnaround strategy: The LEA explains how the activities proposed in this school application fit together as one, cohesive strategy or theory of action that addresses 5 core components of school reform: 1. Highly effective teachers 2. Autonomy for school leaders 3. Highly effective turnaround leader 4. Proven instructional strategies 5. Job-embedded professional development Additionally, the LEA describes how LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring that the turnaround plan is implemented with fidelity.	**0 -** The LEA's strategy or theory of action does not address any of the 5 core components of school turnaround; OR the LEA does not describe how LEA central office and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring that the turnaround plan is implemented with fidelity	**3 -** The LEA describes how LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring full implementation of the turnaround plan, and the LEA presents an overarching strategy or theory of action for the activities proposed in this application; however, the LEA does not address all 5 core components of school turnaround	**7 -** The LEA describes how LEA and school leadership staff will be held accountable for ensuring full implementation of the turnaround plan, and the LEA presents a cohesive strategy or theory of action for the activities proposed in this application that addresses all 5 core components of school turnaround

Part 2E. Implementation plan (57 points) **[Reminder: If any implementation requirement of the turnaround model is not addressed in the implementation plan, the LEA will receive 0 points for the school's entire application.]**			
1. Governance structure: The LEA describes activities to adopt a new governance structure which may include, but is not limited to requiring the school to: • Report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA • Hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the LEA Superintendent/President • Enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities it will carry out to adopt a new governance structure; OR the proposed governance structure will not provide direct support to the SIG-receiving schools	**2 -** The LEA describes activities to adopt a new governance structure that will provide moderate support to the SIG-receiving schools	**5 -** The LEA describes activities to adopt a new governance structure that will provide substantial support to the SIG-receiving schools
2. Replace school principal: The LEA describes activities to replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the turnaround intervention, and the new principal selected will have expertise specific to the needs of the turnaround school	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities it will conduct to replace the principal who led the school prior to the commencement of the intervention; OR the LEA's activities do not address the qualifications of the new principal	**2 -** The LEA describes activities it will conduct to replace the principal who led the school prior to the commencement of the turnaround intervention, but it is unclear that the principal will have expertise specific to the needs of the turnaround school	**5 -** The LEA describes activities it will conduct to replace the principal who led the school prior to the commencement of the turnaround intervention, and the LEA's activities emphasize the selection of a principal with expertise specific to the needs of the turnaround school
3. Replace 50% or more of staff: The LEA describes activities to meaningfully evaluate all existing staff in the turnaround school and rehire no more than 50%, and the LEA's evaluation criteria are based on personnel effectiveness	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities it will conduct to evaluate all existing staff in the turnaround school and then rehire no more than 50%; OR the LEA's selection criteria are not based on personnel effectiveness	**3 -** The LEA describes activities it will conduct to evaluate all existing staff in the turnaround school and then rehire no more than 50%; however, the LEA's selection criteria are only moderately based on personnel effectiveness	**7 -** The LEA describes activities that constitute a comprehensive plan for both evaluating all existing staff in the turnaround school and then rehiring no more than 50%; the LEA's selection criteria are strongly based on personnel effectiveness
4. Operational flexibility: The LEA describes activities it will conduct to grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and, if applicable, increase high school graduation rates	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities it will conduct to grant the principal increased operational flexibility; OR the LEA's proposed activities will only grant the principal minimal operational flexibility	**3 -** The LEA describes activities it will conduct to grant the principal a moderate level of operational flexibility over staffing, calendars/time, AND/OR budgeting	**5 -** The LEA describes activities it will conduct to grant the school a substantial level of operational flexibility over staffing, calendars/time, AND budgeting
4. Human capital strategies: The LEA describes activities designed to recruit, further develop, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a turnaround school, including one or more of the following strategies: • Recruitment beyond traditional entry routes; • Offering significant financial incentives; • Providing increased learning opportunities for promotion and career growth, including opportunities to serve larger numbers of students; • Offering more flexible work conditions; or, • Similar strategies designed to build and retain a strong staff	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities to recruit, develop, and retain staff; OR the LEA's proposed activities do not address any of the strategies listed	**3 -** The LEA describes activities to recruit, develop, and retain staff, and these activities incorporate only one of the strategies listed	**7 -** The LEA describes activities to recruit, develop, and retain staff, and these activities incorporate multiple strategies listed and fit into a cohesive human capital strategy

6. Professional development: The LEA describes activities to provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that includes the following **required elements**: • Occurs on a regular basis (daily or weekly); • Is aligned with the school's comprehensive instrucitonal and learning supports programs (standards, curriculum, school improvement goals); • Involves educators working collaborativley; • Is facilitated by instructional leaders, coaches, or mentors with appropriate expertise related to instruction and learning supports; • Requires active engagement. The PD might also include one or more of the following **optional elements:** • Coaching to enhance classroom and school-wide instructional and learning supports practices; • A system for measuring changes in instructional and learning supports practices resulting from PD; • Structured common planning time; • Meetings with mentors; • Consultation with outside experts, such as LDE; or, • Observation of classroom and learning supports practices	**0 -** The LEA does not describe professional development activities; OR the LEA's proposed activities do not address all of the required elements	**3 -** The LEA describes professional development activities that constitute a moderate plan incorporating all of the required elements but none of the optional elements	**5 -** The LEA describes professional development activities that constitute a comprehensive plan incorporating all of the required elements and one or more of the optional elements into a systemic approach to staff development
7. Extended learning time: The LEA describes a high-quality plan to increase learning time in the turnaround school, such as through: • Adjustments to the school schedule • Lengthening of the school day or year	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities to increase learning time; OR the LEA's proposed activities will not increase learning time at the school by at least 10%	**3 -** The LEA describes activities that include moderate increases to learning time at the school (equal to or greater than 10% and less than 20%) through one or more methods	**6 -** The LEA describes activities that includes dramatic increases to learning time at the school (equal to or greater than 20%) through multiple methods
8. Aligned instruction: The LEA details activities to implement an instructional program that is vertically aligned between grades as well as aligned with with State academic standards	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities to develop a vertically-aligned instructional program; OR the LEA's proposed activities are not aligned with State academic standards	**3 -** The LEA describes activities that develop a vertically-aligned instructional program, but this program is not strongly aligned with State academic standards	**6 -** The LEA describes activities that develop a vertically-aligned instructional program that is strongly aligned with State academic standards
9. Data-driven instruction: The LEA describes activities to promote the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities to develop a data-driven instructional program; OR the LEA's proposed activities are not linked to the continuous use of student data and differentiated instruction	**3 -** The LEA describes activities that develop a data-driven instructional program, but it is not clear how this program will promote the continuous use of student data and differentiate instruction	**6 -** The LEA describes activities that develop a data-driven instructional program that will both promote the continuous use of student data and differentiate instruction

10. Socio-emotional, community-oriented student supports: The LEA describes activities to provide a comprehensive learning supports system, such as by: • Coordinating, integrating, and redeploying LEA resources to support community resources (e.g., health, nutrition, and social services) • Engaging in partnerships with health, nutrition, and social services agencies • Adopting family literacy programs • Adopting other interventions that have been shown to be effective	**0 -** The LEA does not describe activities that will provide comprehensive learning supports to the school; OR the LEA's proposed activities do not constitute a comprehensive learning supports system	**2 -** The LEA describes activities that constitute a moderate plan for providing comprehensive learning supports to the school	**5 -** The LEA describes activities that constitute a strong plan for providing comprehensive learning supports to the school
Part 3. Annual performance goals (9 points total)			
Part 3A. Annual achievement goals (3 points)			
The LEA set ambitious but achievable annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in reading and math (and science and social studies or history, if applicable) for each grade served by the school AND these goals are based on historical data, if the data are available	**0 -** The LEA does not provide annual achievement goals on State assessments; OR the goals are unrealistic; OR the goals are not ambitious	**1 -** The LEA provides annual achievement goals on State assessments, based on historical data, that are achievable but only somewhat ambitious	**3 -** The LEA provides annual achievement goals on State assessments, based on historical data, that are ambitious yet still achievable
Part 3B. Leading indicator goals (3 points)			
The LEA set ambitious but achievable annual goals for the school on all leading indicators provided, including School Performance Scores, AND these goals are based on historical data, if the data aree available	**0 -** The LEA does not set annual leading indicator and SPS goals; OR the goals are unrealistic; OR the goals are not ambitious	**1 -** The LEA set annual leading indicator and SPS goals, based on historical data, that are achievable but only somewhat ambitious	**3 -** The LEA set annual leading indicator and SPS goals, based on historical data, that are ambitious yet still achievable
Part 3C. State Priority Goals (3 points)			
The LEA set ambitious but achievable annual goals for the school on all nine State Priority Goals	**0 -** The LEA does not set annual State Priority Goals; OR the goals are unrealistic; or the goals are not ambitious	**1 -** The LEA set annual State Priority Goals that are achievable but only somewhat ambitious	**3 -** The LEA set annual State Priority Goals that are ambitious yet still achievable
Parts 4-5. School budget (20 points total)			
Part 4. Budget narrative (15 points)			
Part 4A, 1. Human capital strategy: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's human capital strategy	**0 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to zero or few critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed human capital strategy	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed human capital strategy	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed human capital strategy
Part 4A, 2. Instructional program: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's instructional program	**0 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to zero or few critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed instructional program	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed instructional program	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed instructional program

Part 4A, 3. Governance: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the new governance structure	**0 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to zero or few critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed governance structure	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed governance structure	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed governance structure
Part 4A, 4. Extended learing time / add'l supports: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's extended learning time and additional student supports plan	**0 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to zero or few critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed plan	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed plan	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed plan
Part 4A, 5. Accountability: The LEA describes reasonable expenditures related to all critical elements of the school's accountability plan	**0 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to zero or few critical elements; OR the proposed expenditures are not reasonable for the proposed accountability plan	**1 -** The LEA describes expenditures related to many but not all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed accountability plan	**2 -** The LEA describe expenditures related to all critical elements, and these expenditures are reasonable for the proposed accountability plan
Overall, the school-level budget narrative addresses all of the core expenditures of the school's proposed intervention strategy	**0 -** The LEA's school-level budget narrative addresses zero or few of the core expenditures related to its intervention	**3 -** The LEA's school-level budget narrative addresses many but not all of the core expenditures related to its intervention	**5 -** The LEA's school level-budget narrative addresses all of the core expenditures related to its intervention
Part 5. Budget detail (5 points)			
Part 5B and 5C: The proposed expenditures for this school are reasonable and necessary to implement the school's intervention model fully and effectively	**0 -** The LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are insufficient or exaggerated for its proposed intervention strategy	**3 -** Many but not all of the LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are reasonable and necessary for its proposed intervention strategy	**5 -** All of the LEA's proposed school-level expenditures are reasonable and necessary for its proposed intervention strategy

<END>

From: John Hanley [John.Hanley@LA.GOV]
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 11:19 AM
To: Jen Shea
Cc: jhanley314@gmail.com
Subject:FW: FY 2010 SIG Waivers Request--public notice
Attachments: FY 2010 SIG Waivers Requested by LDE_11.29.10b.pdf; FY 2010 School Improvement Grants, USED final requirements.pdf

From: Nicole Honore
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 7:44 PM
To: 'jbourque@acadia.k12.la.us'; 'mdoucet@allen.k12.la.us'; 'Patrice.Pujol@apsb.org'; 'emartinez@assumptionschools.com'; 'dlemoine@avoyellespsb.com'; 'tcooley@beau.k12.la.us'; 'wbritt@bpsb.us'; 'dc.machen@bossierschools.org'; 'gdawkins@caddo.k12.la.us'; 'wayne.savoy@cpsb.org'; 'johnsartin@caldwelledu.org'; 'stephanie_rodrigue@camsch.org'; 'gfreeman@cpsbla.org'; 'jwilliam@claibornepsb.org'; 'lorettap@cpsbla.us'; 'wlee@desotopsb.com'; 'jdilworth@ebrschools.org'; 'volmillikin@e-carrollschools.org'; 'superintendent@mail.efpsb.k12.la.us'; 'toni.hamlin@epsb.com'; 'drj@fpsb.us'; 'sjackson@gpsb.org'; 'dhenderson@iberia.k12.la.us'; 'edwardcancienne@ipsb.net'; 'walford@jpsb.us'; 'Diane.Roussel@jppss.k12.la.us'; 'david.clayton@jdpsbk12.org'; 'superintendent@lpssonline.com'; 'jmatthews@lafourche.k12.la.us'; 'rbreithaupt@lasallepsb.com'; 'dbell2@lincolnschools.org'; 'bill.spear@lpsb.org'; 'samuel.dixon@madisonpsb.org'; 'tthrower@mpsb.us'; 'duke@nat.k12.la.us'; 'darryl_kilbert@nops.k12.la.us'; 'superintendent@opsb.net'; 'drousselle@ppsb.org'; 'lindad@pcpsb.k12.la.us'; 'jones@rapides.k12.la.us'; 'keasley@rrpsb.com'; 'cathy@richland.k12.la.us'; 'djackson@sabine.k12.la.us'; 'dvoitier@sbpsb.org'; 'rlafon@stcharles.k12.la.us'; 'dslan@sthpk-12.net'; 'lluce@stjames.k12.la.us'; 'cmillet@stjohn.k12.la.us'; 'mdn5170@slp.k12.la.us'; 'richard_lavergne@stmartin.k12.la.us'; 'daguillard@stmary.k12.la.us'; 'trey.folse@stpsb.org'; 'mark.kolwe@tangischools.org'; 'csjohnsn@tensaspsb.org'; 'pmartin@tpsd.org'; 'doziers@unionpsd.org'; 'randys@vrml.k12.la.us'; 'jself@vpsb.k12.la.us'; 'dfairburn@wpsb.org'; 'wwilliam@websterpsb.org'; 'dcorona@wbrschools.k12.la.us'; 'mrdavis@wcpsb.com'; 'miltonh@wfpsb.org'; 'sbartlett@winnpsb.org'; 'mfaulk@centralcss.org'; 'kathleen.harris@mcschools.net'; 'rhorne@bogalusaschools.org'; 'warren.drake@zacharyschools.org'; 'iwalker@bakerschools.org'; Paul Vallas; Elizabeth Moore; 'amorgan@firstlineschools.org'; 'henryshepard@advancebr.org';

'aperry@uno.edu'; 'andrea.thomas-reynolds@theacsa.org'
Cc: Rayne Martin; Elliot Sanchez; John Hanley
Subject: FY 2010 SIG Waivers Request--public notice

As shared in previous communications, the LA Department of Education is preparing to submit its state application for FY 10 School Improvement Grant Funds 1003g. As required by federal guidance regarding state School Improvement Grant applications, we are providing LEAs with a list of waivers we are requesting in our state's FY 10 SIG application (see attachment 1). The requested waivers are also posted on our website at http://www.louisianaschools.net/lde/comm/hpsi.html. Further details regarding the SIG requirements can be found in the Federal Register (see attachment 2).

Please send any comments regarding the requested waivers to John.Hanley@la.gov by Tuesday, December 7, 2010. We will include any comments shared within our state's application. Should you have questions, please contact my office.
Thank you.

Nicole J. Honoré
Executive Director
School Turnaround Office
LA Department of Education
Nicole.Honore@la.gov<mailto:Nicole.Honore@la.gov>
(p) 225.342.3466
(f) 225.342.1055